

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 2013-03-01
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-055605		Amendment No. - N° modif. 009
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 2013-03-25		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 #9

This Solicitation Amendment is raised to make the following:

A: Modification #9 and #10

B: Questions and Answers

THE DEADLINE TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS IS MARCH 8, 2013

A: Modification #9

Delete the closing date: March 15, 2013

Insert the closing date: March 25, 2013

A: Modification #10

Delete the following under Part 1, Article 2.4 in it's entirety:

2.4 The Period of the Instruments

The Standing Offer and the Supply Arrangement have no defined end-dates and will remain valid until such time as Canada no longer considers them to be advantageous to use them. The period for awarding Call-ups against the Standing offer and contracts under the Supply Arrangement begins on the start date of the Standing Offer and the Supply Arrangement.

Insert the following under Part 1, Article 2.4

2.4 The Period of the Instruments

The Standing Offer and the Supply Arrangement will remain valid for a period of 18 months or until such time as Canada no longer considers them to be advantageous to use them. The period for awarding Call-ups against the Standing offer and contracts under the Supply Arrangement begins on the start date of the Standing Offer and the Supply Arrangement.

B: Questions and Answers**Q 116**

Can the crown please explain what it deems acceptable as a “duly authorized representative” of the CFO or CEO of the firm to sign the financial certification?

A.116

A “duly authorized representative” is someone who has the authority to sign corporate documentation on behalf of the CEO or CFO

Q 117

Question: Reference Attachment C - M6 - Security Clearance of the Bidder, paragraph 2.

Would PWGSC consider this requirement satisfied where one party of the bidding joint venture is a US company registered with the Directorate of Defence Trade Controls through the US Department of State and maintains Facility Security Clearances, (FCL) issued by the Defense Security Services, (DSS), DoD and the Canadian party to the joint venture holds a valid DOS issued by CISD, PWGSC?

A.117

If and when a foreign JV supplier is involved, CISD will verify with the Bidder's country for the relevant clearance equivalency if it exists. For further information, contact CISD: ssi-iss@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca

Q 118

In reviewing the latest sets of Q&A's for the TBIPS refresh, it is still unclear to us how the rates submitted for the SO will affect the SA.

You have stated in A44 that the provision of rates under the SA has been discontinued, but in A13, you agreed with the assumption that rates entered to the SO will be copied to the SA.

- 1. Can you please clarify, without referencing A44, what relation the rates entered for the SO will have on the SA if any?**
- 2. Do the rates entered for the SO copy over to the SA and therefore dictate our SA ceiling rates? OR**
- 3. Do the rates entered for the SO have no bearing on the SA?**
- 4. Will the resulting SA's have any kind of financial ceiling rates associated with them as they currently do?**

A.118

1. None
2. No. There is no financial evaluation associated to the categories for the SA.
3. Correct
4. No

Q 119 (received #161)

We are current holders are both the TBIPS SA and SO Tier 1. We are intending to change the rates and add some unsubstantiated and substantiated categories in Streams where we are technically compliant. We are not changing tiers nor adding any new streams. We are also a Joint venture. Given this information, with respect to the DCC, can you answer Yes or No to the Following:

- 1. Question with respect to the DCC Yes/or No**
 - (a) Must we complete the financial certification in the DCC**
 - (b) Must we complete number of years in business section in the DCC**
 - (c) Must we complete the insurance requirements section in the DCC**
 - (d) Must we complete the stream information section in the DCC (including categories)**
 - (e) Must we complete the Total Cumulative Value Billed SO and SA sections in the DCC**
 - (f) Must we complete the Security Clearance Information in the DCC**
 - (g) Must we complete the Service Offering Section in the DCC**
- 2. The DCC only has rates for the SO.**
 - (i) Am I understanding correctly that we will only supply rates for the SO and**
 - (ii) these rates will be used for both the SO and SA.**
 - (iii) If this is not correct can you please describe what is required in the financial bid for the RFSA.**

A.119

- 1.(a) No
- 1.(b) No
- 1.(c) No
- 1.(d) Yes. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #4, A19 2.
- 1.(e) No

1.(f) No. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #7, Clarification #10

1.(g) The "Services Offering for Supply Arrangement" link is where suppliers can see every Level of Expertise associated with each category under the SA. When a supplier identifies which Stream/Category they wish to offer in the "Mandatory Criteria / Steam Information" section, the system defaults all associated levels of expertise for the identified categories to a "YES" in the "Services Offering for Supply Arrangement" link. If a supplier wishes to offer all associated levels of expertise for the identified categories, then the supplier can simply verify that all information is correct as there is no need for any data input. If a supplier wishes, for example, to not offer the "Senior" level of expertise, the supplier would need to click on the "Services Offering for Supply Arrangement" link and change the "Yes" for each "Senior" level of expertise for each category to a "No".

2.(i) Yes

2.(ii) No

2.(iii) Nothing

Q 120

1a) In this case, the process for award of contract is competitive and has an evaluation methodology that establishes a competitive financial outcome. As a result, the Most Favoured Customer clause should not be required.

This solicitation includes Page 58 of 108 – Section 7.8 (i) Price Protection – Most Favoured Customer. As this is a TBIPS requirement all pre-qualified bidders must adhere to the competitive RFP process, resulting in a comparison of rates by multiple Bidders at the same time, allowing Canada to determine the lowest price and best value. Additionally, it is our understanding that current policy in the Canadian Government for competitive RFPs indicates that clauses such as this Most Favoured Customer clause are only required for non-competitive procurement process for goods and/or services over \$50,000.

Would the Crown please remove this clause.

1b) It is extremely difficult for large IT firms to agree to “Most Favoured Customer” language pursuant to which they are committed to always provide a particular customer with the best price offered for a product or service. Contracts and the services and/or products associated with the contracts are never truly alike and therefore direct price comparisons are not always possible. In addition, due to the vast size and complexity of operations of most large service providers, it is not possible to adequately monitor compliance with such a provision. Inclusion of this clause will prohibit large SI vendors from participating in this competitive process.

In keeping with Treasury Board’s Contracting Policy regarding the competitive process being the best way for Canada to receive the best value and the best prices from industry, and with PWGSC’s Supply Manual and Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions

with respect to price protection/certification provisions being applicable to non-competitive solicitations or to where only one compliant bid was received in response to the RFP – we respectfully request the Crown please delete this Clause and all references to Most Favoured Customer price protection in their entirety from the RFP as it is not applicable given contract award will be the direct result of PWGSC's competitive solicitation and bid selection process from among compliant suppliers with the supplier who offers the best value to Canada being selected for contract award.

2. Can a firm be awarded a Supply Arrangement without being on the Standing Offer?

A.120

1a) No. This Part 6C serves to provide suppliers with a list of sample clauses which could be part of a contract. Although the Supply Manual defines the use of such a clause for non-competitive procurement with an estimated value in excess of \$50,000, it may still be required when clause 14 of SACC 2003 is applied in a competitive process.

1b) Request denied. Please see rationale in 1a) above.

2) Yes

Q121

Re. 7.28 TRANSITION SERVICES AT END OF CONTRACT PERIOD

The Contractor agrees that, in the period leading up to the end of the Contract Period and for up to three months afterwards, it will make all reasonable efforts to assist Canada in the transition from the Contract to a new contract with another supplier. The Contractor agrees that there will be no additional charge for these services

Please confirm the intention of the above clause. Is it correct that the Crown expects the Contractor to help transition a new Contractor/Supplier after their own contract has expired, for up to a three month period and without remuneration? If this is the intent, with all due respect, we must question if this is a fair expectation of the Contractor from the Crown. Is it possible to remove this clause?

A.121

That is correct, the clause remains as stated.

Q122

Ref.: Page 58 of the English-language bid solicitation

In order to comply with the government's price protection clause so that we can offer discounts to the government in the case of opportunities that are more lucrative (less administrative effort required for us) and in order to avoid subsequent penalties, we would like to offer a flexible pricing policy with discounts based on the volume of business awarded.

For example:

Tiers (the following is merely for illustrative purposes)

0-50 days: Levels 1, 2 and 3, as submitted to the government, with no discounts.

50-100 days: Discount X

100-200 days: Discount Y

200+ days: Discount Z

Further discounts might also be possible, provided they can be taken into account in the TBIPS SO in order to improve our ranking or guarantee us access to more opportunities. Note also that the SO will be much more competitive (because once awarded, it will involve less effort for us) than the SA. Consequently, the pricing policy cannot be applied by comparing the prices proposed for the SA and the SO. For example, if JV wins a contract worth \$50,000 in monthly billings (not including the taxes for 5 resources), it might be possible to offer an additional discount of \$XXXX/month, etc. These discounts would enable us to comply with the price protection clause without lowering our prices. However, if the government does not take these discounts into account when evaluating the TBIPS SO, we will not be offering any discounts.

1- QUESTION: How then can we offer discounts based on the volume of business awarded without being penalized by the price protection clause?

2- QUESTION: Will the government be evaluating our effort in wanting to provide these discounts? If so, how will it do so?

NOTE: Since the deadline for questions is today, please excuse the fact that I have not had the time to review all the other amendments before asking these questions. In my opinion, you should give us more time to respond, as other bidders have also said.

A 122

1- No discount scale is available under TBIPS.

2- Clients can use SAs to obtain potentially more advantageous rates.

Q123

The DCC component “Code of Conduct” instructs bidders as follows:

“Code of Conduct Certifications - Consent to a Criminal Record Verification Pursuant to Section 01 of 2003 (2012-11-19), Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, the following must be submitted with the bid by the date, time and place indicated on page 1 of the bid solicitation:

- **a complete list of names of all individuals who at the date the submission is signed by the Bidder, are on the Bidder’s Board of Directors; and**
- **a properly completed and signed form Consent to a Criminal Record Verification (PWGSC-TPSGC 229) included in Attachment 2 to Part 5, for each individual named in the aforementioned list.”**

This instruction doesn’t appear to be mentioned in the RFSA. Can you please:

- **Confirm the following link is the criminal record verification form you wish filled out for each Board of Director?**

<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/forms/documents/229.pdf>

- **Clarify where Attachment 2 to Part 5 can be found in the RFSA, as it appears to be missing.**

A.123

Your observations are correct. The statement in the Data Collection Module is incorrect (based on previous text version) and has been rectified as of March 28, 2013.

Although a list of the Directors will be required (updated), the information is not required with the bid.

Q124

Solicitation Amendment #5 states "Delete the following information under: Part 3, Section I: Technical Bid, second paragraph" but contains no explanation of what should be removed. Please clarify.

A.124

Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #8, A98 A

Q125

a) Could the Crown please provide the rationalization behind the migration process that is allowing current TEMS SA holders to migrate all their technically compliant categories from Solicitation No E60ZH-070002 to the TBIPS refresh (EN578-055605/E) but limits current CPSA holders to 6 migrated categories? The process is effectively making current CPSA holders in good standing re-qualify for categories they were awarded under the current CPSA.

We request that to be consistent with the treatment of the TEMS categories migration, that all current technically compliant CPSA categories be migrated without another qualification process.

b) Considering the large number of questions regarding the new TBIPS refresh methodology (currently over 75 questions and answers to date), and the misunderstandings in the vendor community of various key pieces of the required response, we respectfully ask the Crown to extend the due date by 10 working days to March 18, 2013 in order for vendors to understand the impact of the answers provided by the Crown, and to ensure they have a clear understanding of what is required for a successful response.

A.125

a) The request is denied.

First, TEMS suppliers were issued their SAs only for categories of service against which they qualified and no supplier was awarded all categories. The qualification criteria were also similar to TBIPS (years in business, TCVB, reference for experience, Etc.).

On the other hand, CPSA suppliers identified resources to perform the work, number of projects to demonstrate experience, had different values or number of projects or resources between streams, some information could be dated up to 3 years where other could go as far as 8 years, etc. For streams where the suppliers were deemed qualified under a minimum number of the overall categories, they were awarded the entire stream. To migrate the CPSA to TBIPS, we rationalized the 4 streams and the aboriginal stream into 1. In respect of the TBIPS qualification process, which TEMS provided as well, CPSA suppliers are granted the minimum number of substantiated categories (6 of their choice) and the maximum number of unsubstantiated categories (first 3 priority of their choice) against those first 6 to maintain the minimum qualification level of those suppliers.

The migration strategy was communicated through different means, including MERX, since November 2012.

b) Please refer to this solicitation amendment, Modification #9.

Q126

We currently have a J/V standing for the SO and SA Tier 1. We are applying, in this renewal, for the SO, Tier 1 and also SA Tier 2. When we qualified for the Tier 1 Level we submitted a Total Cumulative Value Billed (TVB) amount of over \$12 million.

As this amount is over the threshold to qualify for Tier 2 can we use the Grandfather Certification as substantiation for the TVB and tick of under the TIERS form in the DCC SO, Tier 1 and Tier 2 and not provide any further substantiation.

A.126

No

Q127

We registered under CPSS, to enter our TBIPS Refresh and the CPSA 'grandfathered' data collection information – then noticed that the Corporation pre-populated PBN was one that we use for CPSA while we had in the past used a slightly different number for TBIPS SA.

Is it the case that we need to re-use the same PBN in the Refresh that we had used in TBIPS, now that CPSA is part of TBIPS?.

We see the PBN (registered to “Company Name” on CPSS for us is our CPSA PBN and says “#####”

But we use the following PBN for many years on some standing offers like TBIPS, TSPS: “#####”

Our 'migration' email shows us that “Company Name” CPSA will be grandfathered/merged into our existing TBIPS, can you confirm which PBN we use in the refresh submission?

A.127

It is the Bidder's decision which PBN to use. If you use the CPSA PBN, then you would need to qualify for all mandatorys as detailed in Attachments B and/or C. Since this is a TBIPS refresh, we expect the suppliers will use their TBIPS PBN because, if you use the TBIPS PBN, the Grandfather Certification could be used where applicable.

Q128

For the modification part it states

"A: Modification #5 - Delete the following information under: Part 3, Section I: Technical Bid, second paragraph"

When I go into the document the second paragraph (page 14/108) is as follows:

"Section I Technical Bid: To the PWGSC Bid Receiving Unit, one Print copy of the Technical Bid as detailed in Attachment B and Attachment C, except where identified in the Submission Grid (below) as being required to be submitted through the Data Collection Component (DCC) of the Supplier's Module of the CPSS."

1. Can you please confirm if this is correct that this paragraph is the one that is to be deleted?

If yes, what does PWGSC want submitted to the bid receiving unit then?

A.128

1. That is incorrect. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #8, A98 A.

Q129

Section 6B: Bid Solicitation Page 42 de 108 (English PDF)

(a) Para. 2.3 (ii): Initially, IT requirements under the NAFTA threshold were all supposed to go through Pro-Services, whereas all requirements above the NAFTA threshold were supposed to be sent to TBIPS. Can you clarify the advantage of the overlap in access as I seem to understand it from paragraph 2.3 (i)? It gives larger firms preferential access while limiting competition from self-employed workers above the NAFTA threshold. In that regard, there is no fairness to the overlap, unless a self-employed worker can prove that he or she has revenue of at least \$500,000 per year.

(b) Para. 2.3 (iii): If the solicitation rules are being followed (minimum of 15 suppliers), why is the government sending solicitations by email rather than posting all of them on MERX (complete, as opposed to selective, transparency. I don't understand...)?

(c) Para. 2.4 Tier 2 (iii): With TSPS, there was a Subject Matter Expert (SME) category, which does not seem to have been used at all, judging from the bid solicitations that my company has received, even though we were in a position to receive such offers. The SME category is very important for being able to decide on government program priorities. Furthermore, this designation is often used in government during strategic planning for IT programs for government clients.

Why is this category (SME) not included in the TBIPS? SMEs can assist with developing program content, provided they do not subsequently evaluate it. Kindly tell me where this SME (IT expert) category is, because I can't find it. Who will do this IT strategic planning work? What category of consultant could help the CIO decide where investment should go (external consultant - CIO), etc.?

(d) More specifically, with regard to paragraph 2.4 Tier 2 Requirements (open only to firms doing a significant volume of business), para. (iii) states that consultant categories are not offered under Tier 1. Why? Also, what categories of consultants are excluded from Tier1?

A.129

(a) Following the many consultations in 2011 and the establishment of the National Procurement Strategy for Professional Services, it was determined that the supply method for "Pro-Services" would be a supply arrangement, which would be used to issue RFPs for competitive requirements below the NAFTA threshold.

One of the objectives of Pro-Services is to provide greater access to SMEs where professional services requirements in the federal government are concerned. For more information about the Pro-Services supply method, see the letter of interest published on MERX under Solicitation No.E60ZT-120001/C. Nonetheless, clients may always use the Standing Offer component of TBIPS or TSPS.

Since procurement of services below the NAFTA threshold is exempt from international agreements, the Government Contracts Regulations apply. Accordingly, paragraph 2.3 (i) serves to formalize a particular scenario under this rule.

(b) Changes to the TBIPS supply method are based on the National Procurement Strategy for Professional Services. Accordingly, contracts whose estimated value is above the NAFTA threshold will be published on MERX. Even if suppliers are invited to bid by email, industries will nonetheless be able to view business opportunities and find out the names of companies eligible to submit proposals. Transparency remains intact.

(c) This resource category is not included in the TBIPS. We believe that this kind of work is done under one or more existing TBIPS categories.

(d) No category is excluded from Tier 1. This article merely specifies that if no suppliers are available (no supply arrangement) for a given category under Tier 1, Canada reserves the right to call upon one or more Tier 2 suppliers if one or more qualified suppliers are available under Tier2.

Q130

1. We would like to request an extension of at least 4 weeks, ideally 6. We posed a question on eligibility on February 4 (Q 47) and it took 10 valuable calendar days to receive Amendment 5 on February 14 to receive a response (with some interim prompting on our part). While the response indicates that grandfathering on M 4 is possible, this only relates to not having to submit documented evidence of revenues over the past three years. In fact it still requires us to attest that we still meet M 4, which we do not. This means we are either now ineligible or must seek to establish a joint venture. The latter will require research and negotiation with other small companies in the same position of having been effectively shut out of the TBIPS process. Added to that, key resources required to do this research and negotiation will not be fully available during the month of March.

2. We would like to re-iterate, that while we have met these requirements in the past, given the current economy and the reduced level of public sector business available over the past three years, it is increasingly difficult for small and medium-sized businesses to meet them. We suggest these limits be reduced significantly (by at least 60%) or eliminated; otherwise PWGSC is discriminating against smaller businesses and excluding them from competing for work for which they are fully qualified and, more importantly, providing services they have been providing to the federal public service for decades. We do not offer IT services exclusively - we have other revenues from other types of service offerings - thus the arbitrary financial limitations you have set do not in any way determine a company's capacity to meet your needs.

If we do not form a joint venture we will be forced to contract through other SA holders, who will charge the public service higher fees in order to allow for sub-contracting margins/mark ups. Were we to remain on the SA, our rates would continue to be lower than the larger firms for equally qualified resources. If this is what was referred to as "the way forward" several years back, it has failed miserably in regard to its impact on small and medium-sized businesses.

In light of the delay in responding to our question, and the fact that we are no longer eligible and must seek a joint venture, to be completely clear and with all due respect and apologies up front, if we do not receive the requested extension we will escalate this to the Deputy Minister,

A.130

1) Please refer to this solicitation amendment, modification #9.

2. The TBIPS Method of Supply (MoS) has evolved over time to be as inclusive as possible while ensuring that qualified suppliers are able to satisfy the requirements of client departments. For example, M1 was modified to be more clear, and the requirements of M4 were reduced for the Standing Offer (SO) level. In 2012, PWGSC consulted with the professional services industry on the Professional Services National Procurement Strategy. The qualification requirements for TBIPS were supported by industry.

In establishing its methods of supply, PWGSC aims to ensure that qualified suppliers are capable of fulfilling the resulting contracts. This is in the interests of both TBIPS clients who depend on these services and of TBIPS suppliers who are contractually obligated to deliver services. Therefore, TBIPS includes a combination of financial, technical and experience requirements for qualification.

In addition to forming a joint venture, please note that the Professional Services On-Line (soon to be competed under Pro-Services) MoS is available to suppliers in order for them to generate business and experience which can be used when qualifying for TBIPS in the future.

Q131

Please provide the following clarification regarding the "M.2 Minimum Years in Business" requirement and related "Number of Months in Business" page of the Data Collection Component of the Supplier's Module of CPSS for EN578-055605/E.

What information has to be supplied under category "Supplier Information" in "established on" and "page reference" fields for a Joint Venture bidder?

We do understand that for each member of a Joint Venture we have to provide data in all fields under "Joint Venture Member Information". Our understanding was that "Supplier Information" is for non a Joint Venture bidders only. However, these fields are mandatory and we can't leave these values blank/empty during submission our Joint Venture members information.

A.131

In the field titled "established on", the Bidder inputs the date that the joint venture member was incorporated or started in business.

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.

Q132

Can you please advise if we may operate under the Supply Arrangement using our Operating Name – such as a numbered company using XYZ associates?

A.132

Both operating and legal name could be provided and listed in our system but any resulting contracts will be awarded to the legal name of that supplier.

Q133

1. To substantiate each category, a reference project is required. Does the project have to be completed, prior to bid closing? For example, if a project was started in September but ends March 31, would it qualify as a reference. Also, is there a limitation as to the duration of the project in order for it to count?

2. If two companies holds a CPSA contract in Joint Venture, are both companies grandfathered in to the Security Stream of TBIPS.

3. Initially to qualify for a TBIPS contract, substantiate invoices could be supplied to augment the reference information required. For this refresh, only references can be used to substantiate information for a category. There are some reference contacts that are no longer available to act as references as they have moved positions and in some cases, out of

the NCR. Would the Crown consider other sources to confirm the substantiation of a category?

A133

1. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #8, A95 b.
2. No. Only the Joint Venture.
3. No, Bidders must provide a reference from an outside client that can substantiate that the work performed is in accordance with the tasks identified in the category description.

Q 134:

Regarding mandatory requirement M.5 Identification of Categories in both Attachments B and C:

- (a) **Can we submit more than one reference per category for which an offer is offered?**
- (b) **Will PWGSC only seek to substantiate the first reference provided per category?**
- (c) **Can we submit the same reference for multiple categories with the same stream and across streams?**

A 134:

- (a) No. The e-mail address of a reference provided by the Bidder in the field titled "E-Mail" (in the Data Collection Component) will be the only email address considered for evaluation purposes. Bidders are requested to leave the field titled "E-Mail 2" blank.
- (b) Yes
- (c) Yes