

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

**Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement**

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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Electronic Information Technology Professional Srv
Div/Div des srv professionnels en technologie de
l'information électronique
11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier
Portage III 0A1 - 1
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-055605/E		Date 2013-03-25
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-055605		Amendment No. - N° modif. 015
File No. - N° de dossier 003ei.EN578-055605	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EI-003-25338		
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement		2013-01-18
Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale		
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-04-03		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Benoit(003ei), Real		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 003ei
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 934-4667 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-7827	
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 solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.		

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		

Solicitation Amendment #15

This solicitation amendment is raised to make the following:

- A: Modification # 19**
C: Questions and Answers
-

A: Modification #19

Under the Resulting contract clauses for the Standing Offer - 7.4 [Applies if required by the ACF] Security Requirement:

Delete Options 2 and 3:

[Option 2] The Security Requirement (SRCL and related clausung) applicable to this contract is provided as attached at Annex C or as specified in the ACF via an SRCL Number.

Additionally, resources may be assessed for Reliability Status by the Technical Authority prior to commencing the Work, and from time to time throughout the Contract Period. The assessment may include a credit check. Upon request of the Technical Authority, in respect of any given resource, the Contractor must submit

- (i) the current level of security clearance granted or approved by CISD/PWGSC; and
- (ii) a completed signed TBS 330-23 Form - Personnel Screening Consent and Authorization (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/tbsf-fsct/330-23-eng.pdf>).

In the event a resource does not pass the Technical Authority's assessment, Canada may immediately, and without further notice, terminate the Contract for default in accordance with the General Conditions.

[Option 3] There is no PWGSC Security Requirement applicable to this Contract, however there is a Technical Authority Security Requirement. However, the Technical Authority may conduct its own local law enforcement checks, may conduct a security interview and fingerprinting session, may enforce an escorting requirement on its facilities or sites, and may deny access to a facility or site based on the results of any of these actions.

Additionally, resources may be assessed for Reliability Status by the Technical Authority prior to commencing the Work, and from time to time throughout the Contract Period. The assessment may include a credit check. Upon request of the Technical Authority, in respect of any given

resource, the Contractor must submit a completed signed TBS 330-23 Form - Personnel Screening Consent and Authorization (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/tbsf-fsct/330-23-eng.pdf>).

In the event a resource does not pass the Technical Authority's assessment, Canada may immediately, and without further notice, terminate the Contract for default in accordance with the General Conditions.

Insert Options 2 and 3:

[Option 2] The Security Requirement (SRCL and related clausing) applicable to this contract is provided as attached at Annex C or as specified in the ACF via an SRCL Number.

Additionally, resources may be assessed by the Technical Authority for the required level of security status (as such status has been specified in Annex C, elsewhere in this contract, or in the ACF that was let for this requirement) prior to commencing the Work, and from time to time throughout the Contract Period. The assessment may include a credit check. Upon request of the Technical Authority, in respect of any given resource, the Contractor must submit

- (i) the current level of security clearance granted or approved by CISD/PWGSC; and
- (ii) a completed signed TBS 330-23 Form - Personnel Screening Consent and Authorization (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/tbsf-fsct/330-23-eng.pdf>).

In the event a resource does not pass the Technical Authority's assessment, Canada may immediately, and without further notice, terminate the Contract for default in accordance with the General Conditions.

[Option 3] There is no PWGSC Security Requirement applicable to this Contract, however there is a Technical Authority Security Requirement. The Technical Authority may conduct its own local law enforcement checks, may conduct a security interview and fingerprinting session, may enforce an escorting requirement on its facilities or sites, and may deny access to a facility or site based on the results of any of these actions.

Resources may be assessed by the Technical Authority for the required level of security status (as such status has been specified in Annex C, elsewhere in this contract, or in the ACF that was let for this requirement) prior to commencing the Work, and from time to time throughout the Contract Period. The assessment may include a credit check. Upon request of the Technical Authority, in respect of any given resource, the Contractor must submit a completed signed TBS 330-23 Form - Personnel Screening Consent and Authorization (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/tbsf-fsct/330-23-eng.pdf>).

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EN578-055605/E

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

015

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

003ei

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

EN578-055605

File No. - N° du dossier

003eiEN578-055605

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

In the event a resource does not pass the Technical Authority's assessment, Canada may immediately, and without further notice, terminate the Contract for default in accordance with the General Conditions.

Q 216**About your answer to Q129****You stated:**

One of the objectives of Pro-Services is to provide greater access to SMEs where professional services requirements in the federal government are concerned.

Your answer needs a clarification because it does lead to confusion: If PWGSC really wants to give more access to incorporated Subject Matter Expert (SME) and smaller enterprises; the one way is to allow the independent experts to be able to provide such services above the NAFTA threshold. Experts are highly paid consultants and the NAFTA threshold is a problem, this problematic has been reported repeatedly

QUESTION: If an average contract in 2009-2010 was \$255K as stated in the procurement reform, how are IT Subject Matter Experts (SME) supposed to stay in business with an access below the NAFTA threshold?

Simply stating that PWGSC conducted some consultations does not replace the need for PWGSC to measure itself in a way to demonstrate the fairness, transparency and success level for Enterprises of any size and within the pertinence of the context and the reality of the economy. Starting by giving the definition of a Small and Medium Enterprise (0-499 employees would help clarifying the context to the reader surfing on the PWGSC web site). Splitting that one big market segment (0-499) into smaller segments would help the credibility of the PWGSC statistics as it relates to the fair access and success of enterprises of any sizes in the IT sector and especially for micro-enterprises 1-5 employees.

Providers and mainly independents who do everything (run the company and work for more value to the tax payer as our overhead is lower) have limited time to consult and sit down with the paid employees of PWGSC. PWGSC needs to do its job and measure appropriately all market segments of their Small and Medium Enterprise definition. A business of one employee/consultant right now cannot easily stay in business at the expert level in IT if he or she wants to keep doing business with the federal government directly as an independent. Far from being encouraged to do business with the government, we are being discouraged.... . The statistics in the procurement reform document was lacking context....

QUESTION: Can you please let me know if PWGSC has changed its measurement method and that it will now measure the average business volume/per year awarded directly by the GOC to an enterprise of 1 consultant/1 employee working in Information Technology? If PWGSC has decided not to brake down the 1 segment of 0-499 employee business, what is the rational for this decision because this issue was raised several times and did not need to

be since it is just pure logic to demonstrate fairness in the access. Thanks for bringing a clarification.

A 216

The vast majority of the current qualified suppliers under TBIPS are small and medium firms. Please note there is no intent to build a system to monitor the quantity of contracts awarded to single owner/employee firms.

Not sure on what the \$255K number for average contract value was based on, but if 1 contract valued at \$10M was awarded while 100 other contracts valued at \$50K were awarded the same year, the average value would be just under \$150K. But in reality 99% of the contracts were valued at \$50K.

The overall Government contracts' average value is extremely difficult to track as a number since each and every departments issue most services contracts on their own.

The methods of supply are designed to be complementary – each fulfilling separate but related needs, both for government and for suppliers. We have worked hard to make sure that there is a tool that provides the ability for companies of all sizes, including the very smallest, to provide their services to the government.

We are encouraging all SMEs (and Micro-Enterprises - as you referred) to register to the PS-Online (and soon the Pro-Services) method of Supply to help them develop their network, augment their experience and volume and hopefully reach a level where they would qualify under other larger methods of Supply.

Q 217

To qualify for the Tier 2 SA we must provide substantiation that we have billed \$12.5M for IPS within the last three years.

The suggested sample grid to provide the substantiation contains the column “End Date”.

Q: Please confirm that we can reference projects that are still on-going provide we only account for actual billings/invoices that have been issued to date (within the last 3 years).

A 217

Confirmed. Please note that the TCVB for the SATier 2 is \$12.0 million.

Q 218

I am an existing Tier 1 TBIPS supplier who has been using this vehicle since 2008. In this refresh, I would like to add more categories and 1 new stream.

Does this mean that I am modifying my qualification?

A 218

Yes

Q 219

Part of this process involves submitting information via DCC ad well as submitting hard copies. I am a vendor that will be doing a refresh as well as a new bid as a JV. What is the best way to label the hard copy documents (envelopes) so that they correctly get matched for our respective DCC information.

A 219

The hard copy of the bid must indicate the legal name of the bidder as specified the DCC.

Q 220

I was asked to clarify certain possible scenarios, hypothetical, but possible in a future solicitation (in a few months)

Here are the possible scenarios:

- 1. Company A and company B each owns a TBIPS agreement. If they form a JV, and the JV submits an acceptable proposal to a TBIPS refresh, they each keep their own agreement, and the JV has its own too.**
- 2. Company A owns a TBIPS agreement, but is acquired by Company D, while remaining an independent division. Company A would keep its own agreement, and Company D would not have one, unless it submits an acceptable proposal.**
- 3. Company A and company B decide to merge and forms Company E, while remaining independent divisions of E. A and B would keep their own agreement, and Company E would have to submit an acceptable proposal.**

A 220

1. Confirmed. The JV would be considered as a new Bidder.
2. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #8, A115.
3. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #8, A115.

Q 221

We are still not clear on the rates under the TBIPS SA being discontinued. We understand that for this refresh we only need to input our SO rates into the DCC but our question is, after the refresh how will suppliers propose rates in their submissions.

For TBIPS SA only:

- If there are no ceiling rates will suppliers be able to propose any per diem rate they wish in a TBIPS SA RFP response?

A 221

Yes, suppliers will propose a per diem rate as part of their response to an RFP.

Q 222

We have a few questions with regards to the 2013 TBIPS Refresh:

1. (a) With the change in due date, will firms with a fiscal year ending of March 31st need to revise their bids to cite 2013-03-31 as the fiscal year ending for M.1 Financial Certification, or

(b) will a fiscal year ending of 2012-03-31 remain acceptable particularly in circumstances where the bid has already been submitted?

2. Given the change on March 1, 2013 to the text of the “Code of Conduct” Certification in the CPSS DCC, will bidders who had already submitted their response via CPSS need to resubmit?

A 222

1.(a) Yes

1.(b) No

2. No. If the submitted response hasn't changed, then there is no need to re-submit.

Q 223

With modifications (16a & 16b) made through amendment 13, we remain confused about the nature of information required to satisfy the Crown's requirements for M4. For the table that has been provided, we believe that the type of information required for most of the columns is clearly understood. For example, terms such as Project Number, Start Date, End Date and Amount Billed are all easily definable and not open to broad interpretation.

1) However, the term “Description of the Service Performed” is open to widely ranging interpretations and responses from a simple one line certification to a multi-page statement of work. Given this wide range of interpretations, vendors are left guessing as to what specific information is required, at minimum, to satisfy PWGSC and be deemed compliant.

2) With the inclusion of the most recent modifications, the addition of “or any information relevant to invoicing that is/was used to refer to such project(s) by the client(s) or by the Bidder’s accounts payable” only serves to add another layer of confusion. Are we now required to provide invoicing information or is this optional?

3) Furthermore, the answer to the question 175 refers to Answer 136.1 in Amendment 10. Question 136 indicates that “The description of services rendered must explain how it is an IM/IT project or how the tasks performed were for informatics professional services”. Again, PWGSC has not been clear about the minimum level of information that is required to demonstrate compliance. Without appropriate guidance, vendors are left guessing as to the scope and nature of substantiation that might be required by PWGSC. For the original TBIPS RFSA in 2007, all PWGSC required for M.4 TVCB was a dollar value, with no other substantiation at time of bid. While we understand that PWGSC now requires a breakdown of the cumulative value by project, it would seem to be sufficient that in the column headed “Description of the Service Performed“ we declare that “[Company Name] provided services directly related to the functions of [any informatics professional services functional Category] as described in this solicitation”. To be clear, we believe that this statement is different from stating “provided [any informatics professional services functional Category]”, because the prior declaration indicates that we have reviewed our Statement of Work and confirmed that the services we provided were in alignment with the functions for a specific and accepted Informatics Professional Services category. In making this statement, a vendor is making the claim that the services fit within the definition required by PWGSC. It is acknowledged that this information can be challenged by PWGSC during the evaluation, if desired. If this type of response is insufficient, will PWGSC please state clearly and definitively what specific information is required in order to be deemed compliant for M.4?

A 223

1) For the purpose of M.4, a description is a statement that describes a project in words. Bidders must explain how a project is an IM/IT or how the tasks performed were for informatics professional services.

2) Bidders are not required to submit invoices with their bid submission.

3) Please refer to 1) above.

Q 224

It has been confirmed that for the CYBER PROTECTION SERVICES / IT SECURITY SERVICES STREAM, current CPSA holders automatically get 6 substantiated categories and 3 unsubstantiated categories for a total of 9 categories. For the remaining 8 categories, if a bidder submits references to substantiate all 8 categories and for some reason 2 categories are not accepted leaving 6 substantiated categories, will PWGSC automatically award the remaining two categories as unsubstantiated?

A 224

No

Q 225

I have one question, and wondering if you can help me on that. One of the criteria (M2) for the company to take part on TBIPS, is a proof that it exist more than 3 years ago. My curent company is around 2 years and 9 months old, but prior to that I along with my other colleagues which are now part of one company had individual companies and were doing the same business individually. 2 years and nine months ago we came into one umbrella.

My question is can we substantiate our claim that we are more than 3 years old by giving the example I mentioned in above para.

A 225

Please refer to Attachment B and/or C, M.2 Minimum Years in Business, article 3.

Q 226

As a new user to the DCC, we are quite nervous about verifying all submission content is included and need more time to assess the state of our submission.

PWGSC has generously extended the due date to 03 April. However, we ask that we may be given a few more days, particularly since the new due date falls after the statutory holiday of Good Friday and most of our key reviewers are away on Easter Monday. We have also lost some time from our key reviewers during the week long Canadian March break where reviewers spent time with their families.

We are respectfully asking to move the due date to 08 April (Monday) to allow for appropriate review of our online content as well as our hardcopy submission.

A 226

The closing date remains unchanged.

Q 227

- 1. "Question 88 in Amendment 7 clarified that the revised eligible period for calculation of the total cumulative value billed is 4 March 2010 to 15 March 2013. Now that the RFP deadline has been postponed till April, could you kindly confirm whether the revised eligible period has changed. Is the eligible period still bounded by the above 2 referenced dates?**
- 2. In M.2 (in DSS) Minimum Years in Business, "Supplier Information" asks for Page Reference. What is it? Please clarify.**

A 227

1. For the purpose of this bid solicitation, the 3 year period starts on March 4, 2010 and ends on the closing date whether extended or not.
2. In the field titled "page reference", the Bidder inputs the page number, of the hard copy of the bid, where the information can be found.

Q 228

- 1. With regards to M.4 Total Cumulative Value Billed, now that it has been extended until April 3rd, are the invoice dates now 'within the last 3 years immediately prior to April 3, 2013 (closing date)' (April 3, 2010 to April 3, 2013)?**
- 2. Are we allowed to put 2 contacts to substantiate a contract/project for M5?**

A 228

1. Please refer to A 227 above from this solicitation amendment.
2. No. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #9, A134 (a) and (b).

Q 229

We are in the process of refreshing our TBIPS SO rates. Is there any RFP criteria that restricts the rates to a specific range?

A 229

Yes. Please refer to Attachment D - Standing Offer Financial Evaluation, FO.2.

Q 230**M4 (3)**

If the Bidder is a parent company, invoices demonstrating experience provided previously by any wholly owned subsidiary will be counted towards the TCVB, so long as such invoice total amount makes up no more than 50% of the total TCVB.

Questions raised due to M4 (3) above:

(a) If a subsidiary who holds its own individual TBIPS SO/SA, provides resources to an Outside Client via a parent's TBIPS SA/SO, does this same 50% of the total TCVB apply? The subsidiary is bidding (in a JV) – parent company not in JV.

(b) If a company who holds its own individual TBIPS SO/SA, provides resources to an Outside Client via an affiliated company's TBIPS SA/SO, does this same 50% of the total TCVB apply, or can 100% of the TCVB be counted?

A 230

(a) The subsidiary invoiced amount to its parent is the only amount that can be used towards its TCVB.

(b) The company's invoiced amount to its affiliated company is the only amount that can be used towards its TCVB.

Q 231

We are already on the Standing Agreement Tier 1 list, and are looking to add a stream. In the act of adding a category, and providing the reference information in order to substantiate a category, it asks for a Project name/Contract number. I am unsure what to place in this category, as I believe it is supposed to reference the Projects listed from the Total cumulative Value Billed (TCVB) section, however since we are already on the SA 1 list, we are not required to provide TCVB details as we are grandfathered in, and the Submission Grid states only TCVB project details is required if you are applying for a new tier (i.e. Tier 2), which we are not. Thus, are we required to provide project details in the TCVB to link to our new stream/categories references we are substantiating, or can we simply supply an internal invoice number and the grandfather certification will suffice.

A 231

If you are a current TBIPS Holder that is applying for an additional Stream (categories), but not applying for additional Tier(s), then:

(i) The Grandfather Certification will satisfy the requirements under the Mandatory Criterion "M.4. - Total Cumulative Value Billed" (TCVB), and

(ii) References are required to substantiate the new categories. Please refer to " M.5 Identification of Categories" of Attachment B and/or C.

Q 232

I'm sorry to bother you but after looking through all the Questions and Answers to better understand the Refresh process, and looking ahead at the Easter Holidays, we need some time to put together some information with a new JV potential. Can an another week extension please be granted, PLEASE????

A 232

The closing date remains unchanged.

Q 233

Could you kindly confirm the bid validity period for the above referenced TBIPS Refresh notice?

A 233

Refer to Attachment H - 05 Submission of bids, article 4.

Q 234

I am hoping you can answer the following questions as I am slightly confused and this is my first time doing a refresh bid.

1) I have logged into the Supplier Module to complete the sections (tiers, company info, regional information, etc.). Once I verified and accepted all the terms and click "submit response" do I have to submit/mail any hard copy files?

2) Sometimes it says "the Bidder must submit _____ effective as of the date of bid submission with the hard copy of its bid to the Bid Receiving Unit by the date of bid submission."

What should I do when it says that? Where do I mail it to? For some reason, I thought doing it online would suffice..

A 234

- 1) Please refer to Component I, , Part 3 - Bid Preparation Instructions
- 2) Please refer to the top left hand corner of the front page of the RFSO/RFS.A.

Q 235

1. We have the following questions in regards to the attachment E.

We are an existing supplier under the SO and the SA and would like to use the grandfathering option offered. Since we have been awarded the SO and the SA, we changed our legal name. We would like to resubmit information for some of the mandatory criteria (M.1, M.2, M.3, M.6) but not for all.

a) How should we complete attachment E?

b) Should we only put initials beside the criteria for which we want to use the documents on file?

2. For M.2 in the online component, how should the information be entered for a JV? We entered the information in the JV member information. The supplier information appears to be mandatory.

a) Should we enter the information of the lead member?

b) Should we enter the date when the JV was created (even if it is just a few weeks ago?)

Please clarify.

3. We are experiencing technical difficulties (freezes) with the online data entry component which slow down our data entry and QA processes. I noticed the following note on the web site:

Courtesy Notice

CPSS is currently experiencing intermittent technical difficulty. Thank you for your patience and understanding.

For the above reason, we would like to request a two weeks extension to enable bidders enough time to capture and QA the data into the online component.

A 235

1.a) The certifications of Attachment E are to be initialed in order to certify that the documents on file are still applicable against each mandatory criteria.

1.b) Yes. Please refer to 1.a) above

2.a) Yes

2.b) Yes

3. Please refer to A 232 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Q 236

How do I grandfather all data from my prior submissions - is it simply the 1 form from Attach E for all grandfathering?

A 236

Yes

Q 237

I am filling out the information for the solicitation number EN578-055605/E on CPSS. I have these questions:

- 1. In specifying the Financial Rates, are the rates daily or hourly?**
- 2. Do the references provided for PS Online registration count towards "Substantiation" for CPSS?**
- 3. Does the Financial Certification apply for Tier 1? If not does it have to be completed?**

A 237

- 1) Per diem (daily)
- 2) No
- 3) Yes

Q 238

Qn. With the latest change of the RFSO submission date we are changing the end dates of our chosen projects for M4 and including March 2013 invoice data in the M4 calculation. I presume this is ok with Public Works?

A 238

Yes

Q 239

We are existing TBIPS vendors, the questions are as follows:

1) When entering values in the “Financial Rates for Standing offer” in Stream 2 (Geomatic Services), for any category in the various region and metropolitan areas, is it acceptable to enter values (per diem rates) in the following format?

1080.00

2) If for Stream 2, in a specific category, i.e: such as G.6 GIS Infrastructure Architect 1, In the Ottawa area, (NCR) ‘Junior position’ we are not providing services and therefore have no per diem rate to input for that specific one, is it correct to leave it blank?

3) Also, (in regards to question 2 above), if once again, for Stream 2 (still NCR region), G.6 Infrastructure Architect 1, Junior Position only we are not providing services and did not include a rate in the “Financial Rates Standing Offer”, (but did provide services for the other two levels), does this mean that we would answer “NO” in the “Services Offering for Supply Arrangement, for the same category G.6 Infrastructure Architect 1, Junior Position?

A 239

1) When entering the rates in the "Financial Rates for Standing Offer" section , you can enter, either 1080.00 or 1080 in the system. If you enter the rate in the following format: 1080 - the system will automatically add the .00 for you.

2) Yes the supplier can leave the field blank if they wish to not offer a rate against that level of expertise for a particular category under the Standing Offer for each Region/Metropolitan area. If the supplier is also submitting under SA Tier 1 and/or SA Tier 2 and wishes to not offer that level of expertise under one or both Tiers, they will have to identify this under the "Services Offering for Supply Arrangement" section for each region/metropolitan area they have offering against by changing the default selection of "YES" to "NO" for the particular level of expertise.

3) If you do not wish to qualify under the Supply Arrangement, you would answer no but, if you wish to qualify for the SA, the answer should be yes.

Q 240

1. Could please clarify how to capture the information related to the security under the Certifications / Security page of the online component for a joint venture? The page seems to be expecting information in the upper section?

2. Do we need a security clearance for the Joint venture or it is required only for the members of the joint venture?

A 240

1) The top portion is the security for the JV legal entity itself and the section under "Joint Venture Members" are where the security of each member can be entered.

2) Please refer to M.6, article 2 of Attachment B and/or C.

Q 241

1. For a joint venture, what information are you expecting in the online component in regards to the Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity?

a. Does a joint venture need to have a specific number?

b. If one member of the joint venture has a number but not the second member, how do we enter the information online?

A 241

1 a) No.

1 b) Only provide information for the members to whom it applies.