

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
800 Burrard Street, 2nd Floor
800, rue Burrard, 2e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8
Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer
Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes
National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)
Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

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

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

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Public Works and Government Services Canada -
Pacific Region
800 Burrard Street, 12th Floor
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8

Title - Sujet Imaging Hardware NMSO	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EZ107-120003/C	Date 2013-05-08
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EZ107-120003	Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
File No. - N° de dossier VAN-2-35013 (576)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$VAN-576-6971	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2013-03-27	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-05-14	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Sobhee, Sachin	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur van576
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (604) 775-7022 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (604) 775-7526
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

This amendment is created to make changes to the RFSO and to answer questions from bidders.

Please note that there was an error with the data entry site that was corrected last week. The error was that when a rate was entered for the cost per page rate (which are displayed to 5 decimal places), the site was deleting the zeros immediately after the decimal place. For example, if a rate was entered as \$0.0056, it would appear as \$0.56. **Offerors should check all their cost per page rates for all their entries to ensure that the correct rates are appearing on the site.**

Change to the RFSO:

We have decided to award a 2% evaluated price reduction to offers achieving in excess of 80% of the maximum available points for the Management Offer. At all references of the 5% evaluated price reduction for the management offer, it is now changed to 2% or 5% evaluated price reduction.

At Annex J, J4 (e) and J5 (f),

Delete: Less the 5% Management Offer deduction in applicable

Insert: Less the 2% or 5% Management Offer deduction if applicable

At Annex L, Management Offer,

Insert: Offers achieving in excess of 80% of the maximum available points (in aggregate of all sections) will have a 2% evaluated price reduction applied to the value factor calculation of each of their offered products.

At Annex L, Section B (bottom of the table),

Insert: Offerors achieving between 281 to 315 points inclusive will receive a 2% evaluated price reduction.

Questions and Answers:

Q1) Categories 3.1 (pg51) and 4.1 (pg55) both request A4 letter/legal machines with three paper sources to be placed on stands. Our request would be to allow for either an A4 or an A3 (tabletop) in these categories and our reasoning is as follows:

- On stands, both products will take up comparable space
- Depending on volume, the A3 may well be less expensive as cost per impression charges are generally less.
- Where does it say a vendor has to deliver less? The customer may not need 11 x 17 but the scan capability is surely an asset.

We certainly agree an A3 tabletop is a stretch however, given that there are likely to be four to five alternatives to choose from, we can see no problem with an A3 offering on a stand in this category so long as it is a different solution to the solution offered in 3.4 or 4.3.

A1) Categories 3.2, 3.3, 4.1 and 4.2 have been changed through a previous amendment to "desktop or floor standing models". Category 3.1 will remain as a desktop model.

Q2) Under Section I 10.1 Overall Hardware Score methodology we note a weighting for speed of 25%. Under technical requirements we also note that each category has a minimum rated speed and a maximum rated speed. The question is, are these minimums and maximums mandatory and might a vendor, for example, offer a 42ppm unit or a 28ppm unit in a category rated at 30 minimum and 39 maximum?

As this has relevance re colour units when the mono speed might exceed the colour speed, some flexibility would be appreciated given that deficiencies would be weighted.

A2) In monochrome sub-categories, the monochrome print speed must not exceed the maximum speed of the sub-category.

In colour sub-categories, the colour print speed must not exceed the maximum speed of the sub-category. Also in colour sub-categories, the monochrome print speed of a device is allowed to exceed the maximum speed of the sub-category. This is because the speed specifications of colour sub-categories applies to the colour print speed only.

Q3) Re B1.2.5 Part B I – Zone A service

As covered previously, an 8 hour on site service response is diametrically opposed to what “Managed Print” consultants such as Gartner Consulting would recommend. If the Federal Government hopes to transition departments from a 1:2 / 1:3 ratio of print devices to staff to the Federal mandated 1:8 ratio, it only makes sense to retain the historical 4 hour on site service response levels. As anything less will cause work stoppages and a reluctance on the part of staff to part with their desktop printers, we strongly urge PWGSC to reconsider this specification. Zone A deserves a 4 hour response.

SPECIAL NOTE:

Copier-centric corporations have historically delivered a 4 hour response and have evolved to accommodate this demand nationwide. Printer-centric corporations have not; as with a 1:2 – 1:3 ratio of devices to staff, there had not been a need. If Federally, Canada is to move to the 1:8 ratio of device to staff, printer-centric corporations had best step up to the plate and deliver accordingly. Dumbing down response time to accommodate one group of vendors is not the solution. Likewise, 16 hours re Zone B (ie 2 business days) vs the previous 8 hours makes no sense either.

A3) The service response times have been changed back to their original levels via amendment. This is because we are point rating the service response time for Zone A through the Management Offer. Those vendors who can offer better than the minimum level of response time should specify this in their management offer and may receive the 5% evaluated price reduction as a result.

Q4) B5.8 “If Imaging Consumables are not replaceable, the contractor must arrive on site to install the consumables in respect to the response times cited above”.

As noted above re B5.3.1, some of the consumables are packages as maintenance kits which may need to be added at 100K, 200K, 300-600K intervals. As the manufacturers interest is to have their equipment fully serviced at the set intervals, can we suggest that:

1. Consumables be listed as user or vendor replaceable
2. That where vendor replaceable, that the vendor also do what might be expected (ie clean, inspect, etc) if the client were on a regular “all in” cost per page plan with labour included.

Perhaps the vendor needs to outline what each consumable cost per page might be with a sub total.

A4) Since no consumables will be listed on the NMSO, we will not be able to indicate whether specific individual consumables are user replaceable or vendor replaceable.

Additional maintenance services will not be added to the cost per page program for consumables only.

Q5) Under C1 – part (a) Section 1 we note that vendors will be recognized for: “The reduction or elimination of environmentally hazardous materials”

Our request would be for the above to be expanded to include “emissions”.

Until about 2008 the long term impact of exposure to ozone on life expectancy was unknown. As has been documented, even exposures in extremely low concentrations can do irreparable damage to our lungs.

With respect to the copier/printer industry, there has been virtually no commentary on the subject as all manufacturers have at one time produced products that have released ozone. Only now that some have completely corrected the problem is the word getting out. We expect this to be a major issue in future.

From EPA tests we learned that ozone filters break down thus allowing emissions to soar 16-33 times what has been reported. Our field experience confirms this to be true. As World Health notes increased mortality numbers with increased exposures of just $10\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and as some of the current NMSO rated products have submitted test results in the 20- $30\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ range, the prospect of actual field emissions soaring to above $100\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is frightening. If we examine the key brands reported on the NMSO currently we see that virtually every manufacturer has chosen a different way of recording its ozone emissions. We think this is a mistake.

Attached please find an October 11, 2012 report that acknowledges that there is a problem re pollution and that ozone tops the list of emissions that need stricter guidelines.

As this issue will gain in importance in the future as manufacturers who have corrected the problem spread the word, we would think it prudent for PWGSC to enquire of all vendors not just what their test emissions were, but how they plan to ensure there will not be an increase in emissions over time as has been uncovered by the EPA.

Attached please find a copy of the October 11/12 Globe report.

A5) Vendors are not being “recognized” for having “The reduction or elimination of environmentally hazardous materials”. This is a mandatory criterion and all vendors must meet this criterion in order to be compliant. We will consider emissions to be an environmentally hazardous material.

Q6) In the current “NMSO for printer 2010” Solicitation number EZ107-100002, Section 9B2.2 point b) states

“When Canada requests remedial maintenance, the contractor’s service representative must respond in 24hrs”

The amendment 004 for solicitation EZ107-120003/C revises this response time down to 4 hours, from the current 24 hour (8 business hour) requirement.

The current industry standard for response for desktop printer is 8 hours. There are significant cost impacts to a manufacturer and, ultimately Canada, to support the staffing and infrastructure required to support a 4 hours response time for desktop printers. Would Canada consider revising response time for categories 1 and 2 to 8 business hours for all Zones to reflect the current service level for these products?

A6) The changes made to the service response times have been changed back to their original levels.

Q7) The changes made to Annex B, B1.2.5 Service Response Times During Principal Period of Maintenance, have a substantial impact to our service support network and product mix of our response. At least 2 additional weeks will be needed to fully comprehend the impacts of the decreased response times to our required service infrastructure and the associate costs. As well, potential changes to products being offered may be required based on the financial analysis.

Will Canada consider extending the close date from May 7th to May 21st.

A7) The changes made to the service response times have been changed back to their original levels. No further extension is granted at this time.

Q8) PWGSC is requesting suppliers commit to 4 hour on-site response for all categories. Some of these categories are lower end single function devices and a 4 hour on-site response service is not offered in all Zone A locations. Without the 40 points allocated to Service Response time it would be difficult and likely impossible to achieve in excess of 90% of the maximum available points (in aggregate of all sections) for the 5% evaluated price reduction that would be applied to the value factor calculation of each of their offered products.

Would PWGSC consider one of the following?

1) Eliminate the lower end categories (Category 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 3.1) from the commitment required for 4 hour response in the Management Offer as in some case only Next Business Day or exchange service is offered by manufacturers.

2) Provide a 3% discount for those suppliers meeting 80% of the maximum available points.

A8) We have decided to award a 2% evaluated price reduction to offers achieving in excess of 80% of the maximum available points. See changes to the RFSO above.

Q9) 7.8.3 Call-ups of Hardware from more than one sub-category: Would PWGSC be able to provide a couple of samples of how call-ups for more than one sub-category would be calculated to show what the call up limit(s) would be?

A9) An example of this would be if a call-up is placed for a product from one sub-category with a call-up limitation of \$400K and for another product with a limitation of \$100K. The sum of these two would be \$500K however the call-up limitation would remain at \$400K because individual call-ups by client departments cannot exceed \$400K. Requirements that will exceed \$400K will be processed in accordance to Annex E.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EZ107-120003/C

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

van576

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

EZ107-120003

File No. - N° du dossier

VAN-2-35013

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Another example would be if a call-up is placed for a product from one sub-category with a call-up limitation of \$100K and for another product from a different sub-category also with a limitation of \$100K. In this case, the call-up limitation for this call-up would be \$200K.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFSO REMAIN UNCHANGED.