

**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**

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Linguistic Services Division / Division des services  
linguistiques  
PSBID, PWGSC / DIASP,TPSGC  
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier  
10C1/Place du Portage, Phase III  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Third Party Assistance	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-140028/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20140028	<b>Date</b> 2013-05-08
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZF-519-25961	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 519zf.EN578-140028	<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 2013-05-31</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 type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Souleiman, Mohamed	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 519zf
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-8348 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**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 3 is raised to provide answers to questions received with regards to the Request for Proposals (RFP).**

**Question 1:** MTC5 (page 19) - Please confirm that the reference to 6.4.3 should be 6.3.3 Senior Procurement Specialist.

✓ Response: Please refer to the latest amendment provided on April 30, 2013.

**Question 2:** Please confirm that the reference to 6,4,3 should be 6.2.3 Senior Project Management Specialist.

✓ Response: Please refer to the latest amendment provided on April 30, 2013.

**Question 3:** PRTC1 (page 21) - the technical criteria refers to 3 sub-criteria, but 2 sub-criteria are listed. Please confirm that we should be addressing 2 sub-criteria 1) HR back-up plan and 2) KnowledgeTransfer plan.

✓ Response: Please refer to the latest amendment provided on April 30, 2013.

**Question 4:** PRTC 2.1,2.2 and 2.3 please confirm that we can address these rated requirements by providing a cross-reference to projects in the resource's resume, making sure that all of the details requested in the requirements are presented in the resume.

✓ Response: It is the bidders responsibility to provide a detailed response to each requirement that is clear, complete and demonstrates compliance to the stated requirements. In doing so the bidder may refer to the resource's resume. Please also refer to the latest amendment provided on April 30, 2013.

**Question 5:** Regarding Resulting Contract Clauses section 15.Conflict of Interest Management Requirements, the RFP requires bidders to list any Type B relationships (as defined in 15.2.1.2) with the Listed Entities in 15.4. Can PWGSC please clarify how they will treat Type B relationships during the proposal evaluation period?

As an example, will the external auditor of any of the Listed Parties be excluded from bidding/being successful?

✓ Response: It is the Bidder's responsibility to determine if a Type B relationship exists, and identify it to Canada using the certification at Annex E. In so doing, the Bidder represents and warrants that it agrees with and will adhere to the Conflict of Interest Management Requirements. This information and certification will be reviewed during the proposal evaluation period. All Type B relationships are subject to the Relationship-Containment Restrictions provision described in paragraph 15.3.

**Question 6:** Can PWGSC please clarify how they will maintain and uphold the COI Management Requirements for bidders, including the Relationship-Containment Restrictions listed in section 15.3?

✓ Response: In accordance with paragraph 15.2.5, the successful bidder will be required to resubmit the Annex E declaration certification if any relationship changes. As with any obligation under the RFP (or, resulting Contract), should the Bidder (or, Contractor) be found in violation of Article 15,

repercussions could include a determination that the bid is not responsive (or, Termination of Contract for Contractor Default).

**Question 7:** Can PWGSC please confirm that all Listed Entities will be treated equally amongst each other with respect to bidders' having Type B relationships, and that one Listed Entity does not represent a more severe conflict of interest than another?

- ✓ Response: Yes, all type B relationships will be treated equally. Please refer to the answer to Question 5 for further information.

**Question 8:** Given that many of the qualified bidders maintain Type B relationships with the Listed Entities, PWGSC should consider having multiple third-party advisors that can provide services in the case that the first-ranked bidder is conflicted with any particular Listed Entity. Would PWGSC consider issuing a contract with more than one supplier?

- ✓ Response: The procurement strategy was established by taking into account various options, including having multiple third-party advisors. The strategy adopted is reflected in the RFP.

**Question 9:** The RFP appears to reference and to contemplate the concept of Relationships Management as defined in MTC 3, "LONG-TERM STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIPS" (I.E.: STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN VARIOUS PARTIES INVOLVED IN A LONG-TERM TRANSACTION)", and in Annex A, Section 3.2.1.3 "Assistance building and maintaining strategic relationships". In light of these statements, we have the following three-part question:

**Part A:** Is Canada, by way of this RFP seeking assistance in developing and implementing best practice collaborative relationships management frameworks for:

- managing all stakeholders relationships, (including shipyards relationships, Canada supply chain relationships and inter-departmental/agency relationships), and
- deliverables & commitments alignment management, in ways that achieve the overall shipbuilding initiative outcomes including the delivery of the products and support services required?

Please confirm if these requirements are in the scope or out of the scope of this RFP.

- ✓ Response to Part A: In accordance with paragraphs 3.2.1.3 and 6.2 of the SOW, Canada is looking to engage a Project Management Expert(s) to provide relationship management advice, incidental to the management of a series of projects with a strategic source of supply. As stated at paragraph 3.2.1 of the SOW, specific work descriptions and deliverables will be described in the individual tasks as they are called-up.

**Part B:** If the answer to Part A is Yes, (meaning the work in Part A above is in scope of this RFP), then is it correct to conclude that NSPS is seeking assistance from a firm who has experience in designing, implementing and operationalizing complex, multi-stakeholder relationships within and above and beyond the PMO of one particular project or transaction? If Yes, would Canada consider amending MTC 3 to read as follows:

"The bidder must demonstrate experience in designing and implementing a minimum of 3 collaborative relationships management frameworks for complex, multi-stakeholder relationships in the public sector within the last 10 years. At least one of these relationships must be in the defence industry".

- ✓ Response to Part B: Canada has deemed MTC3, as outlined within RFP amendment 002, as sufficient to meet our needs.

**Part C:** Again, if the answer to Part A is yes (meaning the work in Part A above is in scope of this RFP):

- a. We request that Annex A be amended to include the scope of "Relationship Management" work as outlined in Part A above, and

- ✓ Response: Please refer to Canada's response to Question "Part A".

- b. Since this type of work does not naturally fit into the traditional "PMO" categories of resources described in the RFP, we request the addition of a new resource category to address the "Relationships Management" requirements similar to how other categories are presented?

- ✓ Response: Please refer to Canada's response to Question "Part A".

**Question 10:** MTC 2 indicates "Bidder must demonstrate experience in having sourced subject matter experts (SMEs), on three (3) separate occasions in the last ten (10) years, to advise on specific issues on a minimum of two (2) large, complex, Government or private sector acquisition, design, construction or infrastructure programs. Different SME must have been sourced for each of the three (3) or more sourcing experiences claimed by the Bidder. There must not be any overlap in the three (3) or more sourcing experiences demonstrated by the Bidders".

- a. We assume that PWGSC requires experience where the advisor was working under contract to a client and assisted the client to identify and retain subject matter experts that would advise the client in the capacity of subject matter expert. An alternate interpretation of the criterion might be that the advisor has identified subject matter experts to join its advisory team, either as a subcontractor or as the lead contractor. Please confirm that this alternate interpretation is not PWGSC's intent.

- ✓ Response: MTC2 is a required experience of the Bidder (i.e.: the Firm/Company/Organization), not necessarily of the advisor(s). The intent of this evaluation criterion is to ensure that the Bidder has experience hiring outside specialists to assist the 3PEA team, should the 3PEA team require additional subject matter expertise to complete a specific task.

- b. We note that the above quotation makes reference to a program, whereas elsewhere in the criterion and in the RFP, references are made to either a project or program. Please confirm that two unrelated projects, which were not part of a larger program of work, may be used to meet this criterion, rather than requiring that the subject matter experts were identified for acquisition, design, construction or infrastructure of a program.

- ✓ Response: Yes, confirmed.

- c. We are unclear on what the intent is of the language "...there must not be any overlap in the three (3) or more sourcing experiences demonstrated by the Bidders". We assume that if the advisor identified two separate large complex projects, where three separate procurements were undertaken for subject matter experts that this would be acceptable. Can PWGSC confirm if this is an accurate interpretation of the criterion and if not, please clarify its intent?

- ✓ Response: The intent of this aspect of the criterion is to ensure that the sourcing experiences occurred at different points over the past 10 years. If all three procurements were conducted at the same time, this would not be acceptable.

**Question 11:** MTC 4 indicates "The Bidder must propose a Senior Financial Specialist, in accordance with paragraph 6.4.3 of SOW in Annex A, with a recognized professional designation in Finance and/or Accounting, and with a minimum of ten (10) years work experience in the last 15 years in cost analysis for large and complex Government or private sector programs or projects, in which the Resource provided a combination of at least two (2) of the following types of work: cost and budget development; financial modeling; cost-benefit analysis; development of complex payment frameworks; and/or through-life cost planning".

We note that the examples of acceptable professional designations listed in section 6.4.3 mentions CA, CMA, CGA, CIA or CFE. Would a Corporate Finance designation from the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants be acceptable, assuming it is combined with other appropriate qualifications, such as a Masters in Business Administration and appropriate work experience?

- ✓ Response: Yes. The professional designations provided at section 6.4.3 are only examples; other, similarly recognized professional designations in this field are acceptable.

**Question 12:** MTC 6 indicates "Bidder must propose a Senior Project Management Specialist, in accordance with paragraph 6.2.3 of SOW in Annex A, with a minimum of ten (10) years work experience in the last 15 years providing project management for large, complex Government or private sector projects involving multiple stakeholders, both private and public, in which the Resource provided a combination of at least two (2) of the following types of work: relationship management; change management; schedule management; and/or risk management".

We note that the identified designations listed in section 6.4.3 mentions a degree/diploma in business administration and/or Project Management. Would a professional engineering designation be acceptable, assuming it is combined with other appropriate work experience?

- ✓ Response: The requirement has been revised to allow for an acceptable combination of education, training, and experience. Please refer to the revised SOW included with this Amendment.

**Question 13:** We note that in the technical rating criteria (PRTC 2.1, PRTC 2.2 and PRTC 2.3) required that the senior resource must have worked at least two years on each project submitted as a reference. We assume that the intent is for the resource's professional résumé to document a total of 24 months work experience on each of the reference projects. While our proposed resources have experience providing analysis and advice for large and complex Government or private sector projects, where the resources have advised over multiple years and the project extended for much longer than two years, rarely would these projects have required more than 24 working months from the resources. We respectfully request that the number of working months be reduced to a minimum of 12.

- ✓ Response: The minimum experience has been removed. Please refer to the revised Evaluation included with this Amendment.

**Question 14:** We note that a technical rating criterion (PRTC 2.1, PRTC 2.2 and PRTC 2.3) indicates that the maximum awardable points is 40. However, it would appear that if the resource has worked on three projects in shipbuilding of between \$350 million and \$500 million, they would only receive a maximum of 35 points (25 points for project size and 10 points for ship-related experience). Similarly, if

the resource submits two projects of greater than \$500 million, their maximum score would be 37 points (30 points for project size and 7 points for ship-related experience).

- a. Is this a correct interpretation of the rated criteria? It is unclear why three projects should be considered in the \$350-\$500M category, but only two in the other two categories.

✓ Response: Please refer to the answer to part b of this question.

- b We respectfully request that the rated criteria be amended to allow the respondent to submit separate projects to confirm experience with large, complex projects and experience with shipbuilding. We believe, for example, that a resource might have good and valuable experience in shipbuilding (as well as good and valuable experience in projects over \$500M), but that the shipbuilding experience might not necessarily relate to projects of sufficient size and/or duration of involvement to be scored appropriately in the 30-point large-project criteria and therefore would not be submitted.

✓ Response: The criteria have been revised to remove the link between the points for project experience, and the points for involvement in projects relating to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization, and/or offshore floating structure construction. Please refer to the revised Evaluation included with this Amendment.

**Question 15:** I have downloaded the two documents associated with the subject RfP from the MERX website. However, the documents are 'secured' .pdf documents, which restricts the documents from being printed. Would it be possible to obtain printable copies?

The two documents are:

1. Request for proposal
2. Solicitation amendment

✓ Response: No, It will not be possible to obtain printable copies. Public Works and Government Services Canada has verified the documents on MERX and they are printable. The bid package becomes printable only if the bid package was ordered by a bidder.

**Question 16:** We have been informed of your Request for Proposals for Third Party Expert Assistance for NSPS (n° PW-\$\$ZF-519-25961). However, on Merx some informations are missing, in particular Part 5 regarding the certifications to be provided. Can you inform us about this missing part ?

✓ Response: Public Works and Government Services Canada has verified the documents on MERX and Part 5, certifications, is shown in the RFP

**Question 17:**

Our Company is interested in submitting a bid for the RFP reference PW-\$\$ZF-519-25961 and it closes on May 22, 2013. I would like to apply for the document safeguarding at the protection level B however we require a sponsor to get this clearance from CISC. I was given your contact information as someone who could sponsor us. Can we still put in a submission for this RFP with the protection level B pending as it takes some time for the request to be processed once sponsored? We already have DOS clearance.

✓ Response: Yes, as being the Contracting Authority for this solicitation, I can sponsor a company for its security clearance. But, I will not be able to guarantee that the process will be completed at or

before bid closing as all Bidders must hold a valid organization security clearance as indicated in Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses. Please refer to Part 6 of the RFP, Security Requirements.

No, you cannot put in a submission for this RFP with the protection level B pending as your security clearance must be complete at bid closing, with all other conditions met. Please refer to Part 6 of the RFP, Security Requirements.

## **Revision to Part 4, Technical Criteria and to Annex A, Statement of Work of Amendment 2 to the RFP**

### **At Mandatory Technical Criteria 2 (MTC 2):**

Delete:

The Bidder must demonstrate experience in having sourced subject matter experts (SMEs), on three (3) separate occasions in the last ten (10) years, to advise on specific issues on a minimum of two (2) large, complex, Government or private sector acquisition, design, construction or infrastructure programs. Different SME must have been sourced for each of the three (3) or more sourcing experiences claimed by the Bidder. There must not be any overlap in the three (3) or more sourcing experiences demonstrated by the Bidder.

**Replace by:**

The Bidder must demonstrate experience in having sourced subject matter experts (SMEs), on three (3) separate occasions in the last ten (10) years, to advise on specific issues on a minimum of two (2) large, complex, Government or private sector acquisition, design, construction or infrastructure programs or projects. Different SME must have been sourced for each of the three (3) or more sourcing experiences claimed by the Bidder. There must not be any overlap in the three (3) or more sourcing experiences demonstrated by the Bidder.

### **At Point Rated Technical Criteria 2 (PRTC 2) - Bidder's proposed Core Team**

Delete: Each proposed Senior Specialist must have worked at least 2 years on each project.

### **At Point Rated Technical Criteria 2.1 (PRTC 2.1) - Bidder's proposed Senior Financial Specialist**

Delete:

Project experience claimed in PRTC 2.1 is related to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization and/or offshore floating structure construction.

**Replace by:**

Experience in projects, valued at a minimum of \$250 CAD each, relating to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization and/or offshore floating structure construction.

### **At Point Rated Technical Criteria 2.2 (PRTC 2.2) - Bidder's proposed Senior Procurement Specialist**

Delete:

Project experience claimed in PRTC 2.2 is related to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization and/or offshore floating structure construction.

**Replace by:**

Experience in projects, valued at a minimum of \$250 CAD each, relating to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization and/or offshore floating structure construction.

**At Point Rated Technical Criteria 2.3 (PRTC 2.2) - Bidder's proposed Senior Project Management Specialist**

Delete:

Project experience claimed in PRTC 2.3 is related to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization and/or offshore floating structure construction.

**Replace by:**

Experience in projects, valued at a minimum of \$250 CAD each, relating to shipbuilding, ship refit, conversion, modernization and/or offshore floating structure construction.

**At Annex A, Statement of Work, Section 6.2.2 - Intermediate Project Management Specialist**

Delete:

Education: Must have either a Degree/Diploma in Business Administration and/or Project Management.

**Replace by:**

Education: Must have either a Degree/Diploma in Business Administration and/or Project Management, or an acceptable combination of education, training and experience is required.

**At Annex A, Statement of Work, Section 6.2.3 Senior Project Management Specialist**

Delete:

Education: Must have either a Degree/Diploma in Business Administration and/or Project Management.

**Replace by:**

Education: Must have either a Degree/Diploma in Business Administration and/or Project Management, or an acceptable combination of education, training and experience is required.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**