

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 2013-04-02
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EZ107-120003		Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
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 2013-05-07		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Pacific Daylight Saving Time PDT
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 Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <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 answer questions from bidders and to make slight changes to the English version of the RFSO.

Changes to the RFSO:

At Annex A under the sub-category specifications:

Sub-category 3.2

- insert: 9. be a desktop model (not floor standing)

Sub-category 3.3

- insert: 9. be a desktop model (not floor standing)

Sub-category 3.4

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 3.5

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 3.6

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 3.7

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 3.8

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 3.9

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 3.10

- insert: 13. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 4.2

- insert: 11. be a desktop model (not floor standing)

Sub-category 4.3

- insert: 15. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 4.4

- insert: 15. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 4.5

- insert: 15. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Sub-category 4.6

- insert: 15. be a floor standing model (not desktop)

Questions and Answers:

Q1) Given the new NMSO has much tighter rules of placing products in certain categories would the Government allow for product additions, in addition to substitutions as manufacturers may come out with new products in the future that would allow them to be compliant in a particular category. I would even go so far that if you submitted a product in a category before and it was rejected then you would not be allowed to resubmit another one. This would only allow for this scenario only. Currently there are categories with only one or two products because not all vendors had compliant products to submit at the time of closing. This limited competition and selection. This is magnified since the current NMSO is almost 5 years old! This would fix this issue.

A1) No. We have received guidance from our policy group that the allowing vendors to add new products into categories where no product was previously accepted may be inconsistent with our trade agreement obligations. This procurement is subject to the World Trade Organization – Agreement on Government Procurement, North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT), Canada – Peru Free Trade Agreement, and Canada – Colombia Free Trade Agreement. This is the reason that only substitution of products in existing categories have been allowed on our NMSOs dating back to 2008.

Q2) Processor speeds on colour units This requirement is not really required now as new products have increased memory and rely on the processing speed of the print server. We ask that processor speeds be removed to allow for more competition. Machines are tested for speed at Intertek so this will be shown in their test results. If, in fact, there is a difference, then units with higher processor speeds should test better.

A2) Processor speeds on colour categories will not be removed at this time.

Q3) Sub Category 4.2 This category is mentioned in some places (Page 52) but not in others (Page 44). Please clarify.

A3) Category 4.2 was accidentally omitted in certain parts of the NMSO but this has been corrected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q4) Mandatory Hard Drives Why is this mandatory in certain categories and not in others? (Sub Cat 3.1& 4.1) If a unit can provide the same functionality using RAM memory we ask that it be allowed. In particular the Letter/Legal Categories: 3.2, 3.3., 4.2, 4.3. Some federal clients would prefer a machine that does not have/need a Hard Drive given the sensitivity of the documents they deal with. Based on this NMSO their only avenue will be two small A4 units or outside of the NMSO. Thus we ask that the HD requirement be removed.

A4) The hard drive requirement will not be removed for the 40ppm and faster devices as there is benefit to the hard drive for workgroups with many users using these higher speed machines. For those clients who do not require the hard drive, the device can be deconfigured to meet their requirements.

Q5) Sub Category 3.1 & 4.1 The output requirement is 250 sheets but we ask that this be lowered to 150 sheets to allow for more competition.

A5) This change has been made for both categories 3.1 and 4.1.

Q6) Sub Category 4.1 The speed on this category is 30-39 PPM. For some manufacturers their A4 colour units are 25 PPM. Thus we ask that this speed be lowered to allow for more competition.

A6) No, smaller low speed categories will not be introduced into the RFSO. The Government of Canada is undertaking a fleet management approach to its acquisition of imaging devices. As a result, there will be a decreased need for small low volume devices and an increased need for larger higher volume devices required to achieve a higher employee to device ratio.

Q7) Reference: Category 3.1

6. have an output capacity of minimum 250 sheets, separated through either offset stacking or sorting; Would PWGSC reduce this requirement to 150 sheets as this is lower end MFP and larger jobs with higher input/output requirements would typically be produced at larger MFPs.

A7) This change has been accepted and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q8) Reference: Category 3.2

7. have an output capacity of minimum 500 sheets, separated through either offset stacking or sorting; and

Would PWGSC reduce this requirement to 250 sheets as these are workgroup MFPs and 250 sheets of output is reasonable given the requirements for input.

A8) This change has been accepted and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q9) Reference Category 3.4

9. have auto-stapling capability with a minimum 50 sheet capacity;

Would PWGSC reduce this requirement to 30 sheets as this is consistent with the originals document feeder requirement of a capacity of at least 30 sheets?

A9) This change has been accepted and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q10) Reference Category 4.1

7. have a combined minimum input capacity of 1000 sheets from a minimum of 3 paper sources, one of which can be the bypass with at least one offering letter size media;

Would PWGSC reduce this requirement to 850 sheets as these are desktop workgroup MFPs and 850 sheets of input is reasonable? In addition, Category 4.2 provides a 10 ppm increase and has 1,000 sheet input.

A10) This change has been accepted and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q11) Reference Category 4.4

3. include minimum 1GB RAM;

Would PWGSC reduce this requirement to minimum 768 MB RAM? This is a minimal difference and the Intertek benchmark is measuring the speed of the device.

A11) This change has been accepted and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q12) In previous NMSOs (EZ107-030001/A) PWGSC allowed Suppliers to add devices to the existing NMSO based on a percentage of initial products qualified on the NMSO. We request PWGSC include a similar provision as this NMSO will likely be in place for 36 months. Below is some recommended wording from a previous NMSO

Addition of New Printers

An Addition is defined as a newly released printer that would not have been available for submission or testing at the time of the initial RFSO close and benchmark testing. An Addition may be submitted into a category where the Offeror does or does not already have a printer, at any time during the period of the Standing Offer.

Offerors will be able to submit UP TO TWENTY PERCENT (20%) of the original number of printers accepted as part of their Standing Offer, as Additions. The number of Additions allowable for each Standing Offer will be determined before the issue of any resulting Standing Offer.

The Offeror agrees and understands that the proposed Addition shall meet or exceed the specification(s) and value factor of the sub-category into which it is being placed. The proposed addition shall be subject to benchmark evaluation and all applicable costs (e.g. transportation, benchmark fee, etc.) shall be at the Offeror's expense.

A12) No. We have received guidance from our policy group that the allowing vendors to add new products into categories where no product was previously accepted may be inconsistent with our trade agreement obligations. This procurement is subject to the World Trade Organization – Agreement on Government Agreement, North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT), Canada – Peru Free Trade Agreement, and Canada – Colombia Free Trade Agreement. This is the reason that only substitution of products in existing categories have been allowed on our NMSOs dating back to 2008.

Q13) Reference 8.4.1 Basis of Payment

(e) Payments Directed to Authorized Agent: If the Contract is being performed by an Authorized Agent on behalf of the Contractor, Canada is entitled to forward payment either to the Contractor or to its Authorized Agent that performed the work. Receipt by the Authorized Agent of payment will be deemed to be receipt by the Contractor of such payment.

Please confirm that based on the wording above the following would be acceptable: Department issued a 942 Call-Up to an authorized reseller for the lease of hardware with a CPP; the lease payment could be made directly to the manufacturer and the CPP payment could be made directly to the authorized reseller.

A13) No, this is not acceptable. For ease of administration, the client must receive only once invoice for both the lease and the cost per page plan. This invoice must be by the company to whom the call-up was placed. Payment will only be made to the company to whom the call-up was placed.

Q14) Reference B4.2 Hardware Training

Please modify the requirement for the Contractor to provide, at no extra cost, up to two (2) hours of user training with all Leased Hardware and all Purchased Hardware where Installation is included in the Call-up to for Category 3 and 4 devices only. Training for single function devices is typically not required by end users.

A14) Training has been removed from the NMSO configuration. Clients requiring training will have to indicate it as a separate item on the call-up.

Q15) RE: Page 49 – Sub Category 3.4 Monochrome Printer/Copier MFD's

Regarding #8 "have an output capacity of minimum 500 sheets, separated through either offset stacking or sorting" – Given that additional output capacity will be available as an option, will the crown accept a minimum output capacity of 300 sheets and permit a broader number of competitors being able to offer more cost effective base configurations?

A15) This change has been made and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q16) RE: Page 49 – Sub Category 3.4 Monochrome Printer/Copier MFD's

Is postscript mandatory?

A16) No, postscript is not mandatory.

Q17) RE: Page 55 Section A 3.1 Hardware Security.

This section refers to the newly introduced IEEE 2600.1 to qualify for a 3% evaluation reduction to be applied. Most, if not all, Government Departments such as the Department of National Defence are still mandating that vendors meet EAL 2 or EAL 3 as a security standard, and do not make the IEEE 2600.1 part of their assessment. Given this, will the Crown continue to accept a minimum of EAL 3 compliance to meet this security standard and qualify for the 3% evaluation reduction? Currently, only a very few vendors offer IEEE 2600.1 or IEEE 2600.2 certified equipment given a very few number of vendors a distinct 3% competitive advantage without any tangible security enhancement.

A17) This specification will not change. In order qualify for the 3% evaluation reduction, the product must meet the IEEE2600 standard as specified in the RFSO.

Q18) RE: Page 56 Section B1.2.1 The Principal Period of Maintenance (PPM)

Page 56 indicates the PPM is 08:00 to 16:00 (local time) Monday to Friday excluding statutory holidays however page 96 in definitions refers to the PPM as 09:00 hours and 17:00 hours. Please clarify.

A18) The PPM is from 08:00 to 16:00. It has been corrected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q19) Would the Crown extend the closing date to May 31, 2013?

A19) The closing date has been extended.

Q20) What is the turnaround time on the request for user ID and password for the secure website?

A20) The data entry site is now available. Bidders should request the username and password from Jon Drummond at jon.drummond@pwgsc.gc.ca and he will be able to provide the username and password within 2 business days.

Q21) Category 3.1 would the crown change the minimum output capacity to 150 sheets on these low end units?

A21) This change has been made and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q22) Category 3.2 same request as above.

A22) The output capacity for this category has been reduced to 250 pages.

Q23) Category 3.3 is for 50+ ppm yet in tabloid (Category 3.6) it is 50-59ppm. Would the Crown consider adding a category for 60ppm on the letter/legal MFD's?

A23) No new categories will be introduced at this time.

Q24) Category 4.1 would the crown change the minimum output capacity to 150 sheets on these low end units?

A24) This change has been made and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q25) Does the term "sorting" mean the print/copy job is completed as a complete document?

A25) Sorting means that all the pages of the document are printed in order as one complete set. For example, if two copies are made of a 3 page document, sorting means that it will print pages 1-2-3 and then 1-2-3 again.

Q26) Should the Proponent have product scheduled for introduction after the close date that will fulfill all requirements of an NMSO category, can this product (after testing) be added during a scheduled refresh period? ie...we have a product scheduled for 2013 Q3 that will fulfill all requirements of Category 4.2. as it is slated for Q3, it is currently unavailable for testing and is not GEN or CSA certified but will be prior to delivery. May we add this product at the next refresh date?

A26) No. We have received guidance from our policy group that the allowing vendors to add new products into categories where no product was previously accepted may be inconsistent with our trade agreement obligations. This procurement is subject to the World Trade Organization – Agreement on Government Agreement, North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT), Canada – Peru Free Trade Agreement, and Canada – Colombia Free Trade Agreement. This is the reason that only substitution of products in existing categories have been allowed on our NMSOs dating back to 2008.

Q27) Will GOC allow for a specific radius with respect to major centres as described in Zone A. For example, Abbotsford/Mission is designated as a Zone A major centre. May the Proponent list a service centre in the Lower Mainland to fulfill this requirement?

A27) Due to the proximity of Abbotsford/Mission to Vancouver, the proponent only needs to list a service centre in either Vancouver or Mission/Abbotsford.

Q28) Will GOC accept a letter from a GEN-certified member attesting that the proposed devices while not yet certified are in the process of being tested?

A28) No. The product must be fully certified prior to NMSO award.

Q29) Annex B5.8 Are "Hours" defined as "Business Hours"?

A29) Yes, hours are defined as "Business Hours" since hours mean hours within the Principal Period of Maintenance (PPM).

Q30) Annex I4 (a) (ii) Please advise when the Questionnaire will be available.

A30) The questionnaire is now available on the data entry website.

Q31) Please advise when the website templates will be available.

A31) The data entry website is now available.

Q32) Part 1 – General Information, 1.2 – Summary

This clause excludes the CLCA (Comprehensive Land Claims Areas) from any resulting standing offers. Our question is should the vendor be able to provide product and services to this area and wants to offer pricing at an uplift, can the vendor offer in its pricing, an uplift applicable to the NMSO pricing and then contract via this NMSO?

A32) No, this standing offer is not to be used for delivery to any CLCAs.

Q33) Part 1 – General Information, 1.2 – Summary

Paragraph 2 of this clause outlines the anticipated contract term and potential extension periods for any resulting NMSO. Given the cost to respond as well as the cost of testing devices, we would have anticipated a longer contract term. Can the Contracting Authority explain why the contract is only 12 months with 2 possible 12 month extensions?

A33) PWGSC's National Strategy for the procurement of office equipment indicates that our NMSOs, including the one for Imaging Hardware, will only be in place for 12 months with two possible 12 month extensions. The duration of the resulting NMSO cannot be changed at this time.

Q34) Part 8 – Resulting Contract Clauses, 8.3.5 – Discounts for Late Deliveries & Reimbursement of Reprocurement Costs

In the administration of the current contract we have had end-users looking to claim the discount for late deliveries years after the device was in place. The delay in reporting or claiming the discounts leads to many difficulties in determining the facts about the installation to validate the claim made by the end-user. Would the Contracting Authority consider including additional wording to this clause to limit the ability to claim discounts to a maximum of one calendar year from installation of the affected device(s)?

A34) No, this will not be changed.

Q35) Annex A2 – Category and Sub-Category Specific Technical Requirements, General Category 1 – Monochrome Single Function Printers Technical Requirements and General Category 2 – Colour Single Function Printers.

In the general configurations for these 2 categories there is a comment – “be configured as a single function page printer”. Will the Contracting Authority accept a printer that is scalable (field upgradeable) to a MFD, provided that the initial offering is offered as a single function device?

A35) Yes, an MFD that has been deconfigured to a single function page printer is acceptable in Category 1 and 2, as long as it meets all of the other specifications of its sub-category.

Q36) Annex A2 – Maximum print speeds by Category

There appears to be a gap in the PPM between 90 and 94 ppm. Our research shows that if the category 3.9- (80-89 pages per minute) were to remain as is, it would have minimum vendor participation in the NMSO. Many existing vendors are offering devices 90-95 pages per minute in this category currently. If the Contracting Authority were to proceed with the current structure it would potentially make products that are currently available would be ineligible in the new NMSO. Would the contract authority expand the page per minute range to be 80-94 PPM in category 3.9 and have the next band to be 95 PPM or greater?

A36) No, the category definitions will not be changed at this time. Products exceeding 90ppm must be bid into category 3.10.

Q37) Annex A2 – Output Tray Category – Sub Category 4.2

This represents a small format MFD containing similar specifications as the equivalent single function printer, however, in the single function print category there is no mention of the output capacity. Would the Contracting Authority consider removing the specification of the output capacity or reduce it to a minimum of 250 sheets, which is consistent with the industry?

A37) This change has been made and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q38) Annex A – Category 4, 4.1 through 4.5, bullet 2 on each

To the extent that the RFSO is asking for external or embedded print controllers as a mandatory specification. In the industry many of these devices have the possibility of a number of print controllers. Should a device have the capability to have a multiple array of print controllers, can the bidder propose all possible print controllers in its response and have them included in the NMSO (as possible optional accessories to the device)?

A38) No, only one print controller is allowed to be listed per device.

Q39) Annex B – B1.2.7 – Remedies Following Unacceptable Levels of Service, Sub-Section 2

Given this condition applies to the concept of unacceptable service, would the Contracting Authority limit the hold back, drawback, deduction, set-off against service and supply invoices only? Thus tying the penalty to the offending condition?

A39) No, this will not be changed.

Q40) Annex B – B1.2.7 – Excessive Equipment Failures

There can be a number of factors contributing or determining the performance of a device, that are not related to the device itself, causing excessive (3 or more) service calls. While we feel the bidder should be accountable for the availability of the device, an end-user could have a device that has no excessive service issues have a period where difficulties arise and then are resolved without the necessity of replacing the device. Would the Contracting Authority consider adding the following to this condition; "if directed to do so by the identified end-user"?

A40) This change has been made and is reflected in the re-issued RFSO.

Q41) Annex B – B4.1 – Hardware Installation and Systems Integration

The concept of installation is changing via automation. If a bidder is able to provide pre-staging activities that satisfy the outlined requirements and can deliver system integrations as outlined remotely, would this satisfy the Hardware Installation and systems integrations for the RFSO?

A41) Systems integration can be provided remotely if it is acceptable by the identified user.

Q42) Annex D – NMSO Listed Hardware – D1.2 Leased Hardware, hard drive removal and overwrite.

In D1.2, Leased Hardware, it states "the removal and surrender for Canada's ownership of the Hard Drive (if removable) or Hard Drive wiping to the End Users satisfaction (if not removable)"

Would the Contracting Authority consider the following:

The removal and surrender for Canada's ownership of the Hard Drive (if removable) or Hard Drive wiping if the device includes Hard Drive image overwrite capabilities that conform to the US Department of Defense Directives 5200.28.M or 5220.22.M the installed Hard Drive will be considered wiped clean of residual data (if not removable).

If the Hard Drive overwrite conforms to the Department of Defense Directives 5200.25.M or 5220.00 M and Canada still requires the surrender of the Hard Drive at contract end, can the vendor show the Hard Drive removal as a chargeable accessory?

A42) No, NMSO pricing must be inclusive of hard drive removal for leased equipment. Clients are increasingly choosing to have the hard drive removed at the end of the lease therefore including the hard drive removal in the lease rates reduces administrative effort and ensures that pricing is reasonable.

Q43) Annex I – Benchmark Testing Fees

Please provide a list of the fees associated with testing devices submitted for evaluation.

A43) The fees have now been included in the document.

Q44) Annex L – Management Offer – Item 5, Governance (including sub-sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

Can this numbering sequence be changed to 6. Governance, including sub-sections 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, to avoid confusion with the previous clause 5 and sub-sections 5.1 through 5.8, located on page 100 through 102.

A44) This has been corrected.

Q45) Annex L – Management Offer – sub-section 5.8, Service Response Time

The current standing agreements have differing response times, these response times are currently at industry levels; MFDs at 4 hours, and single function printers at 8 hours (Next Business day). Would the Contract Authority consider changing the response time offer to 8 hours for categories 1, 2 and sub categories 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1 and 4.2 in order to award the 40 points for this section?

A45) No, the same level of service must be provided for all categories of devices.

Q46) Request for Extension to the Closing Date

In consideration of:

- the Easter weekend (March 29 through April 1 inclusive) during which time the federal government is closed,
 - considering that we must await responses to our inquiries before being able to finalize our recommendations,
 - and in consideration of the fact that there are currently several active solicitations from PWGSC,
- would the Contracting Authority consider granting an extension to this solicitation closing date to change it from April 2, 2013 to April 17, 2013?

A46) The RFSO closing date has been extended.

Q47) Submission of RFSO Document

Given the documentation for the RFSO needs to be shipped to Vancouver and the current deadline is over the Easter Weekend, and the fact that the vendors are required to complete the majority of the response online, would the Contracting Authority accept a receipt or waybill from Canada Post as proof of submission of the response, provided it is before the closing date and time of the RFSO. Is delivery to a Canada Post outlet deemed delivered to Canada as it relates to the deadline of this RFSO?

A47) The RFSO has been extended. Delivery to a Canada Post outlet is not deemed delivered to Canada. The bid must be received at the bid receiving address by the closing date and time.

Q48) Website for Secure Technical and Financial Input Not Available

As this website has not yet been activated, will the Contracting Authority consider providing an Excel document containing the format and content of the technical specifications and the financial document to facilitate vendors' response preparation?

A48) The data entry website is now available.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EZ107-120003/C

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

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

Q49) Appendix A (table in A3 as well as table in Annex I, I9 and Annex J, J5)

Reference to Category 4.2 is missing

Can the Contracting Authority review and update these categories and related information in these tables. Category 4.2 appears to be missing. The categories jump from 4.1 to 4.3.

A49) Category 4.2 was accidentally omitted in certain parts of the NMSO but this has been corrected in the re-issued RFSO.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFSO REMAIN UNCHANGED.