

**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 (See original solicitation  
document.)

**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> CIC IM/IT/PM TBIPS OMNIBUS	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> B8289-100575/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 007
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> B8289-100575	<b>Date</b> 2012-03-31
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-380-23739	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 380zm.B8289-100575	<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 2012-04-10</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Cook, Gail	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 380zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-2591 ( )	<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>  CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA	

**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>	

---

## AMENDMENT NO. 007

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and answer Bidders' questions.

### **RFP REVISIONS:**

#### **1. At Solicitation Amendment No. 005, Questions and Answers, A43. (b):**

Delete: Yes, in terms of M1 (d) and M2 (b)

Insert: Confirmed.

#### **2. At Annex D-G1, Stream G1 - Architecture and Integration, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 1. The Bidder, M1 and M2, Notes, 4th bullet:**

Delete: The Bidder must provide two references, including name of client organization, and names, titles, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses for the primary and secondary client contacts.

Insert: The Bidder must provide a minimum of one reference for each contract, including name of client organization, and name, title, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address.

#### **3. At Annex D-G2, Stream G2 - Application Development, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 1. The Bidder, M1 and M2, Notes, 4th bullet:**

Delete: The Bidder must provide two references, including name of client organization, and names, titles, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses for the primary and secondary client contacts.

Insert: The Bidder must provide a minimum of one reference for each contract, including name of client organization, and name, title, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address.

#### **4. At Annex D-G4, Stream G4 - Project Management, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 1. The Bidder, M1 and M2, Notes, 4th bullet:**

Delete: The Bidder must provide two references, including name of client organization, and names, titles, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses for the primary and secondary client contacts.

Insert: The Bidder must provide a minimum of one reference for each contract, including name of client organization, and name, title, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

Q81. With regards to Amendment 003 Q12 and A12

There is no question with where the bar has been set, except in Stream G1 Architecture. We would ask that the Crown reconsider having the Enterprise Architecture category excluded as part of the Corporate Mandatory References. The point made in Q12, that the Enterprise Architect is an uncommon call-up, sometimes only one required for the entire organization, is valid.

A81. Enterprise Architect will remain a G1 Core Category and as such part of the Bidder's Corporate Capacity M1 requirement.

Q82. Can the Crown please confirm that Bidders may use the following approach instead of page numbers:

All projects demonstrating experience for mandatory and rated requirements are detailed in the consultant's résumé provided in Appendix A. Projects in the résumé are listed in descending order, identified by project number (i.e. **Project 20**). Relevant expertise for each mandatory and rated requirement is identified in the project description using the number of the criteria at the beginning of the bulleted experience (i.e. **{M1, R2}**). Please refer to the identified projects in the resume for substantiation of each requirement.

A82. Confirmed.

Q83. RE: G1: Architecture and Integration, ERP Categories A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5; Amendment 5 Q&A 29; and, Amendment 6 Q&A 76 Basis of Payment

In Q&A 29, it was indicated that a Common Departmental Financial System (CDFS) would be an acceptable ERP system for the purposes of the bid. We accept the fact that the ERP field can encompass a wide variety of technologies, however this definition affects ERP Categories A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5 wherein the range of rates from one ERP speciality to the next is vast (Oracle versus SAP versus PeopleSoft versus Freebalance versus JD Edwards etc.). It is well established in this marketplace that resources with PeopleSoft and SAP skills in particular, command much higher billing rates than those with Oracle Financials or JD Edwards expertise. Since CIC requires competent resources supporting these major ERP systems such as PeopleSoft, SAP and Seibel, these bidders would not be able to compete rate-wise on a level playing field with resources who do not possess these skill sets and their attendant lower rates but who would still comply with the published technical evaluation grids. Moreover, Q&A 76 stated that the Basis of Payment is a Firm Per Diem Rate and not a ceiling rate.

We request that CIC treat the ERP categories as the specialized resources that they are and for the purposes of the financial evaluation allow bidders to provide separate rates for the specific CIC ERP system (PeopleSoft, SAP or SAS) for each of the G1 A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5 rate categories.

A83. Specialized ERP categories are to be provided for Streams S1, S2 and S3. ERP categories in Stream G1 are generic and bidders may propose firm per diem rates accordingly.

- 
- Q84. Amendment 5, Q&A 26 indicates that a Bidder is to illustrate that core resources and associated tasks were fulfilled in the corporate reference by providing a client reference who will validate that these types of tasks were performed. Q&A 37 provides a sample of what is required for an M1 contract reference: contract client, contract value, contract period, core categories, client contact (to verify contract value, duration and categories). Amendment 6, Q&A 71 now states that "...it is expected that Bidders will demonstrate that a resource has experience in performing the board scope of category responsibilities". Our interpretation of this is that the Crown is now expecting a mapping exercise; that is, mapping the RFSA resource category responsibilities to that of the contract reference responsibilities per core resource. This is a time consuming and cumbersome task that we feel does not really contribute to the purpose of M1 which requires the Bidder to demonstrate in two separate contracts (per stream) each with a single client within the last 5 years that had a minimum value of \$1,000,000.00, with a minimum duration of one year. Each of these projects must have included the provision of resources in the Core Categories for each applicable stream. For M1 the Bidder must include client contact information for verification. It is our understanding these two contract references for M1 are to provide the Crown with evidence of the Bidder's capability to successfully manage large sized contracts involving varied resource categories and levels. Asking Bidders to map duties/responsibilities of resource categories will not add any value to whether the Bidder has successfully delivered and managed these size contracts. Given the fact that there is not much variation in the duties/tasks in resource categories within Federal Government contracts, we respectfully ask that the mapping exercise be eliminated and that the Crown focus more on the Bidder's ability to manage contracts. If this requirement is not eliminated, due the amount of work involved, we request a further extension to the April 10<sup>th</sup> due date.
- A84. There is no requirement for Bidders to map a proposed resource's experience to the contracts referenced under M1 and M2 for the Bidder under Item 1., Annex D, Bid Evaluation Criteria. The reference check will serve to validate that the applicable core categories were provided under the referenced M1 and M2 contracts. Separately, the Bidder is expected to demonstrate that a proposed resource has the required experience in performing the board scope of responsibilities of the applicable category.
- Q85. Ref: Basis of Selection (pg. 15 of 164): "Each of the two lowest-priced technically responsive bids for each Stream will be recommended for award of a contract." Given that prices below the median will be evaluated at the median, it is possible that more than two bids will all be evaluated at the median, resulting in a tie among more than two bids. In that event, will Canada issue more than two contracts? Or, if limited to two contracts, will they be awarded to the two lowest bid prices? That would seem to be inconsistent with the principle Canada has established of discouraging unreasonably low prices. Technical scores may well also not distinguish among the bids. Therefore, would Canada award them to the two bids closest to but below the medians?
- A85. As stated in the Basis of Selection, "The maximum number of two contracts may be awarded for each of the Streams as a result of this solicitation. Each of the two lowest-priced technically responsive bids for each Stream will be recommended for award of a contract." Although it is possible for more than one bidder to obtain the same Total Bid Price, it is less likely that more than one bidder will obtain the same score for all the rated requirements. However, in the event that two or more Bidders have identical technical scores on both the corporate and resource rated criteria, the bid with the lower price on the basis of actual rates submitted will be ranked first. In the event that the two lowest-priced technically responsive bids for each Stream are still identical, Canada will apply the process detailed in the Supply Manual, Section 5.65 Identical Low Bids - Best Value.

- 
- Q86. Amendment 5 – Question 43 addresses how overlapping projects should be counted. Answer 43 (b) states: Yes in terms of M1 (d) and M2 (b). Please confirm the reference to M1 (d) and M2 (b) is an error and can be removed from this answer as there are no M1 (d) or M2 (b) in any of the resource matrices.
- A86. Confirmed.
- Q87. M1 and M2 (for all streams) require contact information including the name of client organization, and names, titles, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses for the primary and secondary client contacts. In cases where we are unable to provide two client references due to retirement, maternity leave, unforeseen circumstances, etc., please confirm it is acceptable to provide one available client contact.
- A87. The Bidder must provide a minimum of one reference for each contract, including name of client organization, and name, title, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address. Note the requirement at Solicitation Part 4 para 4.2 (c) for references to provide timely responses.
- Q88. Due to significant number of changes to resource response templates we are respectfully requesting a two-week extension to the current closing date of April 10, 2012.
- A88. Due to strict time constraints an extension will not be granted.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**

**NOTE: A BID ALREADY SUBMITTED MAY BE AMENDED PRIOR TO THE CLOSING DATE. AMENDING CORRESPONDENCE SHALL ADDRESS THE SOLICITATION NUMBER AND THE CLOSING DATE AND SHALL BE ADDRESSED TO:**

**BID RECEIVING  
PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA  
PLACE DU PORTAGE, PHASE III  
MAIN LOBBY, ROOM 0A1  
11 LAURIER STREET  
GATINEAU, QUEBEC K1A 0S5**