

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -**  
**TPSGC**  
**11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier**  
**Place du Portage, Phase III**  
**Core 0A1 / Noyau 0A1**  
**Gatineau**  
**Québec**  
**K1A 0S5**  
**Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776**

## **SOLICITATION AMENDMENT MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

### **Comments - Commentaires**

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY  
REQUIREMENT

### **Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

### **Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Informatics Professional Services Division / Division  
des services professionnels en informatique  
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier  
3C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UNDER THE	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W6369-10P5BZ/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W6369-10P5BZ	<b>Date</b> 2012-11-27
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-608-25064	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 608zm.W6369-10P5BZ	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2012-12-13</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Kelly, James	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 608zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-5701 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-1207
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Question 38** For each resource category, the M2 criteria state: "Demonstrated experience working as a resource in a Records and Document Management environment or in a Collaboration environment." The Crown further defines the acceptable environment on page 78 of this RFP for Record and Document Management and Collaboration to be Open Text and SharePoint respectively. Will you please confirm that, based on this definition, it is acceptable to have worked in an environment that has these technologies implemented, or on a project that involved the use of these technologies?

**Answer 38** For the Project Manager, Business Analyst and the Project Scheduler categories, Canada will accept experience in an environment that involved the use of RDM or Collaboration products defined in Annex D Evaluation Criteria, as amended. For all other categories, experience must be demonstrated by working with the RDM or Collaboration products in an RDM or Collaboration environment.

**Question 39** Is there a Fairness Monitor for this proposal? If so, who is the Fairness Monitor? Has the Fairness Monitor provided any guidance that addresses whether the evaluation process is sufficiently fair vis-a-vis the incumbent and new bidders? And, if so, what was that advice?

**Answer 39** A Fairness Monitor (FM) has not been assigned for this requirement because it was determined not required in accordance with PWGSC policy for a requirement of this nature. Furthermore, there was no indication during development of the procurement strategy that FM coverage was warranted.

**Question 40** Would Canada please extend the closing date of the solicitation by two weeks?

**Answer 40** See Answer 17 of Amendment 003

**Question 41** Would Canada please provide the expected tentative makeup of the first TA (quantities of resources by category(ies), starting date(s), and duration(s)) for each of the two contracts?

**Answer 41** The content and details of Task Authorizations to be issued against awarded contracts are not available at this time and will not be available until after a contract is awarded. Please refer to the solicitation for the estimated number of resources and estimated number of days per category for the contract and option periods.

**Question 42** A.8 SYSTEM ANALYST – Level 2 Rated Requirement R2 (RFP page 66) requires "Demonstrated experience working with Web Based programming language c# or scripting language PowerShell" Would Canada accept JavaScript as equivalent to C#? Would Canada accept Visual Basic Scripting as equivalent to PowerShell?

**Answer 42** See answer 13, amendment 003.

**Question 43** For the M2 criteria that require consultants have 5 years of experience (within the last 10 years) working in a Record and Document Management environment or a Collaboration environment, the corresponding Rated requirement (R1 in most cases) requests "additional experience working as a consultant in a Records and Document Management or Collaboration environment. In order to receive a full score of 4 points for the corresponding rated criterion, the proposed resource must demonstrate 11+ years of experience. Can the Crown please confirm that "additional experience" in the rated category is not meant to

suggest that 11+ years must be added to the 5 years of experience referenced in the M2 and therefore requires that consultants have 16+ years of experience for a full score, but rather that a consultant will score full points in these criteria for having 11+ years of experience total to cover off the related record document management mandatory and rated requirements?

**Answer 43** For the rated criteria, points are award based on the proposed resource's total number of years of experience rather than number of years of experience above and beyond what has already been counted in the mandatory criteria. For example, in rated criterion R1 of Project Manager Level 3, the proposed resource will earn 4 points if he or she has demonstrated experience working as a Project Manager in a Records and Document Management or Collaboration environment for a total of more than 11 years (as opposed to more than 16 years).

**Question 44** Reference Answer 28 of Amendment 003: requiring experience "above and beyond the mandatory years of experience defined in M2 for all resources" as asked in Q28, would mean a level 2 resource would be required to have over 13 years experience to gain full points. Level 2 within TBIPS is defined as 5- < 10 years of experience. For example, the Technical Writer Level 2 would need over 13 years experience to score full points based on this understanding. Would the Crown please confirm that in the example above, the scoring schema for R1 is awarding maximum points (4 points) for 11+ years of experience and not 13+ years of experience.

**Answer 44** See answer 43 above. With regards to rated criteria R1 and R2 of the Technical Writer category, maximum points will be awarded for the required experience over and above 11 years, not 13 years.