

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

Title - Sujet PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UNDER THE	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W6369-10P5BZ/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W6369-10P5BZ	Date 2012-11-23
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-608-25064	
File No. - N° de dossier 608zm.W6369-10P5BZ	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-12-13	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Kelly, James	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 608zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5701 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Question 13 We understand for the System Analyst Level 2 and System Administrator Level 3 categories, 8+ years and 10+ years of experience are required, for respectively Level 2 and Level3, with "... web based programming language C# or Scripting language PowerShell". Based on details provided in the SOW in terms of what constitutes the DND collaboration and RDM environment, can the client please explain/elaborate how the required programming languages for the mentioned categories will be used in the existing RDM/Collaboration environment?

Answer 13 Upon further review, rated criterion R2 under the System Administrator and the System Analyst categories is deleted from this solicitation because experience with Web-based programming language c# or scripting language PowerShell is not significant under these categories. Experience with Web-based programming language c# or scripting language PowerShell under R2 of the Programmer/Software Developer category will be kept because the experience with these products is beneficial for the Programmer/Software Developer role. See revised evaluation tables below.

Question 14 One of the rated requirements for the System Analyst Level 2, Technology Architect Level 3, System Administrator Level 3 categories, requires 8+ years and 10+ years of experience, for respectively Level 2 and Level3, with "...either Oracle 10g or SQL 2007 databases or higher version". Oracle 10g hasn't been around for 10+ or 8+ years, so it will be impossible for a candidate to achieve max score for this requirement for the above mentioned categories. Can the client please amend the number of years required for these versions, or the version of databases accordingly? Also, can you please explain what does the client mean by "SQL 2007 databases"?

Answer 14 See Answer 10, Amendment 002.

Question 15 Ref 4.2 (c) i (pg 13) states, in part "Canada will conduct their reference check ...". Ref 4.2. (c) v (pg 14) states, in part "Whether or not to conduct reference checks is discretionary." These two phrases appear inconsistent in that one states that Canada WILL conduct their reference check, and the other states that it is discretionary. Would Canada please indicate if the reference checks will take place or are discretionary?

Answer 15 The two sub-articles 4.2(c)(i) and 4.2(c)(v) are not inconsistent. PWGSC will choose at it's discretion whether or not reference checks will be conducted. Bidders are reminded that references must be provided in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation including Mandatory Bidder Evaluation Criteria M1 regardless of whether or not reference checks will be conducted.

Question 16 Ref (Pg 60 of 92), APPENDIX C TO ANNEX A contains the instruction "When completing the resource grids, the specific information which demonstrates the requested criteria and reference to the page number of the resume should be incorporated so that the evaluator can verify this information." Does this instruction apply also to (pg 78) Annex C Evaluation Criteria? While the instruction requests a page number in the resume for a particular 'experience', page numbers are a moving target as we format resumes to meet proposal formatting requirements. We prefer to use Reference numbers which refer to the individual's project experience in reverse chronological order (oldest is #1). These numbers remain fixed despite formatting changes applied to the resume. This has been accepted practice for many years when referencing project experience in resumes for

proposals for Canada. Will Canada accept the use of sequential project experience reference numbers in lieu of page numbers in the resumes and in the response tables?

Answer 16 Appendix C to Annex A applies to evaluation of additional resources after contract award. Annex D - Evaluation Criteria, applies to resource and bidder criteria to be evaluated as part of the bid solicitation. See article 4.2(d) of the solicitation for further clarification.

Question 17 We are interested in bidding on this RFP for professional services. We note that there is only 22 calendar days (9 business days) from publishing to closing of the RFP. As this is a large requirement requiring the qualification and presentation of 10 resources, we respectfully request 2 additional weeks (10 additional business days) to allow enough time to properly respond to the requirement.

Answer 17 PWGSC agrees to extend the closing date until December 13, 2012. Bidders should budget their time accordingly and submit any questions as soon as possible, as PWGSC does not intend to grant any further extensions for this requirement. Although the bid closing date is being extended, the date for answering questions is only being extended until December 3, 2012. Therefore, bidders should submit all questions by this time. Canada does not commit to answer questions received after this.

Question 18 Would the client consider amending the Rated Criteria for Categories I.13 (R4), and I.9 (R3) which currently awards maximum points for 10+ years using Oracle 10g. Since Oracle 10g was released in 2003 it is currently not possible for candidates with Oracle 10g experience (exclusively) to score full points on this criteria. Further SQL 2007 was released in 2007 so the maximum number of points that any candidate in these categories could achieve (if they were using exclusively SQL 2007) is 2 points.

Answer 18 See Answer 10, Amendment 002

Question 19 The Evaluation Criteria for the Bidder on page 79 of the RFP states "The bidder must have provided at least 10 resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months". Please confirm, to be compliant with this requirement, the bidder must have provided the SAME 10 (or more) resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months.

Answer 19 No, the individual resources do not have to be the same.

Question 20 We respectfully request a 7 day extension as our question dated November 14, 2012 has not been answered. This answer will significantly impact our recruitment of qualified candidates.

Answer 20 See Answer 17.

Question 21 On page 70 – A.11 Tester, Level 2 and B.14 Technical Writer, Level 2 - rated criteria (R1, R2 and R3), we believe there is a error with the experience points:
 1 point - 2+ to 5 years
 2 points - 5+ to 8 years
 3 points - 8+ to 11 years
 4 points - 11+ years

It should be the following:

- 1 point - 1 to 3 years 4
- 2 points - 3+ to 5 years
- 3 points - 5+ to 8 years
- 4 points - 8+ years

- Answer 21 There is no error with this scoring. Canada will not change the evaluation criteria identified.
- Question 22 As SQL 2007 does not exist, would Canada accept MS SQL Server 2000 or higher?
- Answer 22 See Answer 10, Amendment 002. Canada will accept SQL Server 2005 or higher.
- Question 23 As Oracle 10g released in 2003, would Canada accept Oracle 9i or higher?
- Answer 23 See Answer 10, Amendment 002.
- Question 24 On page 78, Enterprise Collaboration Software products, Microsoft Share Point 2010, Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007 (MOSS 2007) and Windows SharePoint Services (WSS) did not exist prior to 2007. Please update the rated points as it is impossible to score full points.
- Answer 24 Canada will accept SharedPoint Team Services (STS) as an Enterprise Collaboration Software product. STS was released in 2002 and was often referred to as WSS 1.0. Canada will not modify the rated points for the RDM or Collaboration experience because the RDM tools have been in existence for over 11 years, and points can be acquired using a combination of both RDM and Collaboration products.
- Question 25 With regards to "Evaluation Criteria – Bidder", Annex D, Page 79 of the RFP, M1 requires two references for two individual IM/IT contracts. Can these two references include contracts from all of the following: crown corporations, Canadian municipal, provincial, and federal government, and private industry?
- Answer 25 Yes, the references required under criteria M1 can be from any public sector, private sector or nonprofit organization including those listed in the question above.
- Question 26 Given that 35 resources are required for this solicitation, all of which need to be compliant, rated, and priced, the large workload that this imposes on our staff is overwhelming. We fully understand that only 10 resumes and grids need to be completed, but to arrive at the pricing, we need pricing from each resource to be able to arrive at the category pricing. Additionally, we must determine that the resource is compliant before we can use the pricing for that resource. Would Canada please extend the closing date from the current 29 November to 13 December 2012 to allow us to provide a high quality and price competitive proposal?
- Answer 26 See Answer 17.
- Question 27 The basis of selection is a 60/40 weighting of Technical Score to Price Score. The resources identified in this RFP include five (5) Level 3 resources and five (5) Level 2 resources. For the Level 2 resources, the majority of them require experience consistent

with a Level 3 resource in order to achieve maximum points. In other words, the RFP appears to be seeking highly experienced resources. However, the price ratio has the potential to counter that apparent objective. With a weighting of 40% on price and only 60% on technical capabilities, this exposes DND to the potential that a respondent with inferior resources could effectively "buy the business" with a lower-priced score. This could create notable resource quality issues that will have a significant negative impact. Given the strategic importance of this initiative and the nature of the skills that are being requested, we would suggest and request that the weighting be amended to a 70/30 ratio of Technical to Price.

Answer 27 The contractor selection method is based on a best value methodology and was chosen in accordance with the specific requirements of this solicitation. The degree of importance between the technical merit and cost was chosen because it represents optimum value to Canada. Canada will not change the basis of selection requirements of this solicitation.

Question 28 Can you clarify that R1 for all resources is asking for experience in an RDM or Collaboration environment above and beyond the mandatory years of experience defined in M2 for all resources?

Answer 28 Yes. Please refer to the resource evaluation criteria tables.

Question 29 This question relates to the rated requirement R5 for the System Analyst resource. Oracle 10g was released in 2003, which allows for maximum points (8+ years). SQL 2008 was released in 2008 (SQL 2007 does not exist), which means a maximum score (8+ years) is not possible for SQL 2008. Will Canada consider revising this requirement?

Answer 29 See Answer 10, Amendment 002

Question 30 This question relates to the rated requirement R4 for both the Technology Architect resource, and System Administrator resource. Oracle 10g was released in 2003, which allows for maximum points (8+ years). SQL 2007 does not exist and SQL 2008 was released in 2008, which means a maximum score (8+ years) is not possible. Will Canada consider revising this requirement?

Answer 30 See Answer 10, Amendment 002 of this solicitation.

Question 31 Can the crown please advise if a contract for IT Application and Development over \$5M would meet the requirement for M1?

Answer 31 For the purpose of criteria M1, an IT Application and Development contract would be considered an IM/IT contract however bids must meet all the requirements of M1 not just the value threshold.

Question 32 Based on outstanding questions that are required for clarification purposes for rated point allocation discrepancies for resource requirements and the potential impact /changes to resource scoring of candidates, can the crown please provide a 2 week extension in order for potential bidders to incorporate these changes into their submissions when answers are received?

Answer 32 See Answer 17.

Question 33 Ref pg. 31, Item 7.15- Insurance Requirements. Clause (b) requires '... not less than \$10 million ...' for Commercial General Liability (CGL) and Clause (d) requires '... not less than \$1 million ...' for Errors and Omissions Insurance. Please review the requirement as it has been our experience that Canadian Federal Government RFPs typically require the reverse insurance coverage, i.e, \$5 million Errors and Omissions and \$1 million Commercial General Liability (CGL). Please advise.

Answer 33 Article 7.15 Insurance Requirements is correct as stated in the solicitation. Canada will not change this article.

Question 34 Reference Bidder Evaluation Criteria M1, these criteria unfortunately limit the pool of qualified IM and collaboration firms that DND could use for this work. Would the department consider relaxing these criteria to the following:

That the contract value is at least \$2 M and the duration is at least one year;
 That the services under the contract were provided using Task Authorizations;
 That the bidder provided at least 10 resources on an "as and when needed basis" for a period of at least 12 consecutive months; and
 That the bidder was the Prime Contractor, or in the case of a joint venture, that any of the JV members provided these services.

Answer 34 See Answer 5, amendment 001 and answer 37 below.

Question 35 An SRCL does not appear to be provided in Annex C. Could DND please clarify whether Enhanced Reliability clearance is acceptable for all categories of personnel?

Answer 35 An SRCL was provided with the solicitation published on MERX November 7, 2012. Furthermore, the security requirements are specified in Part 6 - Security, Financial and Other Requirements and Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses of the solicitation.

Question 36 Can you confirm our understanding of Article 3.3(b) of the solicitation:

Does this means that rates can increase in Contract Year 2 & 3, as well as in the Option years?

Answer 36a Yes, but the rate bid must not exceed the limits described in sub-article (b)(i) of Article 3.3 Section II: Financial Bid.

Are rates bid in any year after Contract Year 1 allowed to exceed the rates set out in Annex C to Part A Schedule of Per Diem Rates (as long as they do not increase by more than 5% from one period to the next), i.e. can our proposed rates exceed our current maximum Per Diem Rates for our supply arrangement? For example, if our per diem for a System Administrator Level 2 is \$650/day, can our rate in Year 2 and/or beyond be bid at \$675/day, which is less than 5% but which exceeds the maximum Per Diem rate in our supply arrangement for that Role/Level?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W6369-10P5BZ/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

003

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

608zm

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

W6369-10P5BZ

File No. - N° du dossier

608zmW6369-10P5BZ

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Answer 36b

See Answer 36a.

Question 37 In response to Question 7, it was stated that "the purpose of the prime contractor requirement is to ensure that bidders have experience managing requirements of this nature as a contractor, etc." We can demonstrate experience managing requirements of this nature, which meets and exceeds the scale specified in M1, if Canada will consider project experience that has been accomplished within the last 7 years. We ask that the term specified within M1 be changed from 5 to 7 years.

Answer 37 For criteria M1, Canada will accept two references for two individual IM/IT contracts (one reference for each contract) managed within the last seven years. All other requirements of M1 remain unchanged.

A.8 SYSTEM ANALYST - Level 2					
	REQUIREMENT	POINTS	MAX SCORE	SCORE	JUSTIFICATION
R1	Demonstrated additional experience working as a SA in a Records and Document Management or Collaboration environment.	1 point - 2+ to 5 years 2 points - 5+ to 6 years 3 points - 6+ to 8 years 4 points - 8+ years	4		
R2	Demonstrated experience working in a Government information systems environment.	1 point - 1 to 3 years 2 points - 3+ to 5 years 3 points - 5+ to 8 years 4 points - 8+ years	4		
R3	Demonstrated experience reviewing, creating and maintaining technical documentation.	1 point - 1 to 3 years 2 points - 3+ to 5 years 3 points - 5+ to 8 years 4 points - 8+ years	4		
R4	Demonstrated experience working with either Oracle 10g or SQL 2005 databases or higher versions.	1 point - 1 to 2 years 2 points - 2+ to 5 years 3 points - 5+ to 7 years 4 points - 7+ years	4		
Minimum Pass Mark: 10			16		

SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR Level 3					
	REQUIREMENT	POINTS	MAX SCORE	SCORE	JUSTIFICATION
R1	Demonstrated additional experience working as a SA in a Records and Document Management or Collaboration environment.	1 point - 5+ to 7 years 2 points - 7+ to 9 years 3 points - 9+ to 11 years 4 points - 11+ years	4		
R2	Demonstrated experience working with either Oracle 10g or SQL 2005 databases or higher versions.	1 point - 1 to 2 years 2 points - 2+ to 5 years 3 points - 5+ to 7 years 4 points - 7+ years	4		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W6369-10P5BZ/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

W6369-10P5BZ

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

003

File No. - N° du dossier

608zmW6369-10P5BZ

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

608zm

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR Level 3					
	REQUIREMENT	POINTS	MAX SCORE	SCORE	JUSTIFICATION
R3	Demonstrated experience working in a Government information systems environment.	1 point - 1 to 4 years 2 points - 4+ to 7 years 3 points - 7+ to 10 years 4 points - 10+ years	4		
Minimum Pass Mark: 7			12		