

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
Informatics Professional Services - EL
Division/Services professionnels en informatique -
division EL
4C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

| | |
|--|--|
| Title - Sujet IT SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN PROJECT | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 47060-136911/A | Amendment No. - N° modif. 007 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 47060-136911 | Date 2013-03-01 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$SEL-615-25342 | |
| File No. - N° de dossier 615el.47060-136911 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-03-08 | Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT |
| F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Ghaddab Nabil | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 615el |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5419 () | FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-5925 |
| Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: See herein | |

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

| | |
|--|--|
| Delivery Required - Livraison exigée | Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée |
| Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur | |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur | |
| Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie) | |
| Signature | Date |

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

47060-136911/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

615e1

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

47060-136911

File No. - N° du dossier

615e147060-136911

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

SEE ATTACHED HERETO

This solicitation amendment is raised to answer questions received from a Bidder and to amend the Solicitation.

QUESTION 53

For M1, all streams, “The Bidder must submit for each contract: (1) invoices (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1M.” Due to client confidentiality, can the Crown confirm that Bidders, at their discretion, may redact any information other than client organization name, contract serial number or other unique contract identifier, invoice date, and invoice dollar total?

ANSWER 53

Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 54

The bidder must submit for each contract:

Invoices (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the bidder has provided and invoiced the customer for services in the amount of \$1M

Questions:

1. Some of our contracts do not have a serial number, they say "Contract agreement for Company ABC and Company XYZ". Is this sufficient as a unique contract identifier?
2. We invoice each client separately on a weekly basis, this means for 1 client we would have thousands of invoices. Does CBSA want us to provide thousands of invoices per client to demonstrate the total amount billed is over \$1 million or can we include a letter or summary of the account?

ANSWER 54

1. Yes, as long as it is a unique contract identifier.
2. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 55

1. In regards to Corporate Evaluation Criteria M1 (for all streams), Item 1 - Invoicing requirement, given the sheer volume of invoices requested, would it be acceptable to the Crown for Bidders to provide a single set +\$1M of invoices for each of the five contracts, instead of four (4) sets (one per Technical Bid), in consideration of Canada's Policy on Green Procurement?
2. In regards to Corporate Evaluation Criteria M1 (for all streams), Item 1 - Invoicing requirement, would the Crown accept a summary report of Contract Number, T.A. Number (if applicable), Start/End Date, Category of Personnel, Days Available, Days Used, Contract Dollar Value (Consumption - Days Used * Rate), Certified by the Bidder, with PWGSC reserving the right to request hard copies of individual invoices?
3. In regards to Corporate Evaluation Criteria M1 (for all streams), Item 2 - Contact Person, would the Crown accept the Name and Contact Information of the Contracting Authority for each of the five required Contracts, as a single point of contact to verify the information provided by the Bidder in lieu of individual Contact Persons for each individual invoice?
4. Would the Crown please confirm, with a yes or no answer, that for the available contracts used to substantiate Corporate Mandatory and Rated Criteria M2 & R1, that the 36 month window may not necessarily be the same for each contract.
5. We have been a major supplier of professional services to the Federal Government for the last ten years and have successfully obtained representation on all major Supply Arrangements and Standing Offers issued by PWGSC, and our annual business volume with the Federal Government consistently ranks us as one of your Top 10 Suppliers. However, having done a preliminary analysis of CBSA's required billable days in various streams, we find ourselves unable to qualify against the overly stringent parameters of M2/R1. In the interest of CBSA receiving bids that pass the mandatory and rated requirements of M2 and R1 we respectfully request that you allow contracts to be used that were awarded in the last seven (7) years.

ANSWER 55

1. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
2. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
3. As detailed in M1, any contact from the Bidder's client can sign the subject letter (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00

4. As previously stated, the Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category.

The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts. It is not necessary for each contract to demonstrate all categories of personnel.

The experience must occur within the past five years prior to the solicitation's closing date. The number of Billable Days demonstrated must be proven over no greater than 36 months, but such 36 months need not be consecutive. The experience may occur at any time during the five-year period, so long as the total number of Billable Days when added together meets the Minimum Billable Days requirement.

5. No, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 56

1. Re: 4.3 e) Price Justification

The solicitation already addresses the practice of "low-balling" by assigning a score of 0 if the rate falls outside the median. We ask that the extra requirement for price justification be removed.

2. RE: Bid Evaluation Criteria M1 (all streams)

M1 asks for copies of invoices to be provided to support \$1Million in billings for each of 5 contracts constitutes a great deal of paperwork for bidders and lengthy responses (for example: 24 months x 5 contracts =120 pages). Would the Crown consider using the reference only for bid submission and putting the invoice on request?

3. RE: Stream 7 M2

The combination of limited time window and COBOL with JAVA resources unfairly limits this Stream to companies that have been providing services to the few departments/companies that still hold a COBOL environment (CBSA, CRA or DND for example). It also does not reflect the fact that many COBOL applications have been retired in recent years, and in many cases, replaced by JAVA, which makes it more difficult to work with a small window. We ask that the Crown consider a) expanding the 36 month Window for this Stream or b) for the COBOL category alone or c) reduce the minimum billable days for this category to reflect the market realities of this technology.

4. This is a significant effort of proof, especially for those companies that are bidding more than one Stream. We ask for an extension of 3 weeks.

ANSWER 56

1. No, the proposed request is not accepted.
2. No, furthermore Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
3. No, the proposed changes are not accepted.
4. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 57

A number of answers provided to recent Q&As for CBSA TBIPS #47060-136911/A are still unclear to us. Could the Crown please further clarify our questions below:

Question 1A & 1B

Re: Amd. No. 002; Q&A2

1. Is M2 also amended to “within the past seven years”?
2. In M2 and R1, If the Bidder can demonstrate the required # of billable days (all within the last seven years) in less than 36 months would this be acceptable?

Question 2A & 2B

Re: Amd. No. 002; Q&A3 & 6

3. If a contract was awarded more than seven years ago but remained on-going for several years, would the billable days that were provided within the last seven years still be acceptable?
4. Would the crown please consider removing the 36-month window from R1. In some cases the billable days required under a single category could be more than 10,000 days, this in combination with the other required categories represents a significant number of resources billing concurrently. Given the extremely high volume of business this would require, would the crown please accept all Billable Days provided in the resources categories within the past seven years across all 5 contracts?

5. Re: Attachment B; M1(1)

This requirement asks Bidder's to submit invoices for each contract. Must Bidder's supply a copy of all invoices issued under each of the five contracts within the past seven

years? This request represents a significant volume of invoices of archived records. In addition, the invoices represent a very large number of pages (1,000+) and with the requirement of four hard copies this will have a negative environmental impact.

Would the crown remove the requirement for the provision of invoices, or accept a copy of one invoice PLUS billings reports (for the specified timeframe within the last seven years) from the Bidder's financial system which details the:

- client & contract number;
- resource name(s);
- billing period; and
- total days billed & total amount billed?

ANSWER 57

1. No, as detailed in M2 and R1, the experience must be demonstrated within the past five years.
2. No, Bidders are to refer to the answer above and also to the answer given to question # 55 (4) of this RFP amendment.
3. No, the contract references for M1 must have been awarded within the past seven years.
4. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
5. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 58

1. For M1 the Crown is looking for evidence of contracts that have a minimum contract value of \$1M and have been awarded in the last seven years. Would the Crown accept a contract which was awarded more than seven years ago but we have delivered over \$1M in the last 7 years?
2. For M1 the Crown is looking for bidders to provide copies of invoices that exceed \$1M. Some private sector clients do not allow their professional services firms to provide copies of invoices since they feel they are confidential to their business. Since the bidder will be providing contact information for M1 can the Crown remove the requirement to provide invoices and the Crown can validate that the bidder provided services over \$1M when they perform the reference checks?

ANSWER 58

1. No, the contract references for M1 must have been awarded within the past seven years.
2. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 59

In order to accurately portray the most competitive rates, would the client please provide the locations (or regions) where work as a result of this RFP will be performed?

ANSWER 59

The work is predominantly expected to take place in the National Capital Region (NCR).

QUESTION 60

1. M2 and R1

M1 requires that 3 of 5 references be for government clients. That language does not present in M2 or R1. Please confirm that the M2 and R1 references may or may not be for governmental clients.

2. 7.8 (f) Price Protection

We request deletion of the clause titled "Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer" from this RFP (item 7.8 (f) page 62 of 402). A competitive RFP process, which results in a comparison of rates by multiple Bidders at the same time, is the most fair, efficient, and effective means of determining the lowest price and best value to Canada, as the Bidder has to bid against competitors. 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 a non-competitive procurement process for goods and/or services over \$50,000.

In this case, the RFP 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.

ANSWER 60

1. M2 and R1 contract references may or may not be for Government clients. It's a Bidder's decision, as long as the demonstration being provided meet the mandatory requirements described at M2.

For clarity purposes, Canada is amending Attachment B to include minor revisions made only to M1 and M2 of all streams as follows:

Attachment B deleted and replaced as follows (see next page):

**ATTACHMENT B
BID EVALUATION CRITERIA**

STREAM 1: PROJECT ARCHITECTURE

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | BIDDER'S RESPONSE DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
|---------------|--|---|
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="371 728 943 1413"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Application/Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>2640</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Systems Analyst (Level 3)</td><td>1320</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3)</td><td>927</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3)</td><td>927</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>Business Architect (Level 3)</td><td>786</td></tr> <tr> <td>6</td><td>IM Architect (Level 3)</td><td>786</td></tr> <tr> <td>7</td><td>Technology Architect (Level 3)</td><td>786</td></tr> <tr> <td>8</td><td>Enterprise Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1320</td></tr> <tr> <td>9</td><td>Technical Writer (Level 3)</td><td>534</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 2640 | 2 | Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 1320 | 3 | Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3) | 927 | 4 | Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3) | 927 | 5 | Business Architect (Level 3) | 786 | 6 | IM Architect (Level 3) | 786 | 7 | Technology Architect (Level 3) | 786 | 8 | Enterprise Architect (Level 3) | 1320 | 9 | Technical Writer (Level 3) | 534 | |
|----|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|------|---|---------------------------|------|---|--|-----|---|--|-----|---|------------------------------|-----|---|------------------------|-----|---|--------------------------------|-----|---|--------------------------------|------|---|----------------------------|-----|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 2640 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3) | 927 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3) | 927 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Business Architect (Level 3) | 786 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | IM Architect (Level 3) | 786 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Technology Architect (Level 3) | 786 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Enterprise Architect (Level 3) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Technical Writer (Level 3) | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.0 CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|--|------|-------|-----|----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|-------|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|----|------------------------|-----|-----|---|---|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Category</th><th>(A)</th><th>(B)</th><th>(C)</th><th>(D)</th></tr> <tr> <th>Bidder Total</th><th>Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr> <tr> <th>AppA/AttchB</th><th></th><th>(C) = (A) - (B)</th><th>(D) = (C) / (B) *100</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Application/Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1500</td><td>1,000</td><td>500</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr> <td>Systems Analyst (Level 3)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3)</td><td>1,000</td><td>400</td><td>600</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Business Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>200</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr> <td>IM Architect (Level 3)</td><td>900</td><td>900</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Technology Architect (Level 3)</td><td>900</td><td>400</td><td>500</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Enterprise Architect (Level 3)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Technical Writer (Level 3)</td><td>2,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>1,200</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 9 CATEGORIES / 9</td><td>74</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | Business Architect (Level 3) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | IM Architect (Level 3) | 900 | 900 | 0 | 0 | Technology Architect (Level 3) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | Enterprise Architect (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Technical Writer (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 9 CATEGORIES / 9 | | | | 74 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 74 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business Architect (Level 3) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IM Architect (Level 3) | 900 | 900 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect (Level 3) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Enterprise Architect (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technical Writer (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 9 CATEGORIES / 9 | | | | 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

STREAM 2: SAP

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | BIDDER'S RESPONSE DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
|--------|--|--|
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="373 655 1003 1245"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Application/Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>786</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2)</td><td>1854</td></tr> <tr> <td>6</td><td>ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 786 | 2 | ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2) | 251 | 3 | ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2) | 251 | 4 | ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2) | 251 | 5 | ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2) | 1854 | 6 | ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3) | 251 | |
|----|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|-----|---|---|-----|---|---|-----|---|---|-----|---|----------------------------------|------|---|---|-----|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 786 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2) | 1854 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.0 CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|--|------|-------|-----|----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-------|-------|-----|----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-------|-------|-------|-----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Category</th><th>(A)</th><th>(B)</th><th>(C)</th><th>(D)</th></tr> <tr> <th>Bidder Total</th><th>Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr> <tr> <th>AppA/AttchB</th><th></th><th>(C) = (A) - (B)</th><th>(D) = (C) / (B) *100</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Application/Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1500</td><td>1,000</td><td>500</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr> <td>ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2)</td><td>1,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>200</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr> <td>ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2)</td><td>900</td><td>400</td><td>500</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3)</td><td>2,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>1,200</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 6 CATEGORIES / 6</td><td>78</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 6 CATEGORIES / 6 | | | | 78 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 78 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 6 CATEGORIES / 6 | | | | 78 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

STREAM 3: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | BIDDER'S RESPONSE |
|--------|--|---|
| | | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="376 655 1005 936"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Project Manager (Level 2)</td><td>534</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Project Manager (Level 3)</td><td>1320</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Project Coordinator (Level 3)</td><td>534</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | Project Manager (Level 2) | 534 | 2 | Project Manager (Level 3) | 1320 | 3 | Project Coordinator (Level 3) | 534 | |
|----|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|---|---------------------------|------|---|-------------------------------|-----|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Project Manager (Level 2) | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Project Manager (Level 3) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Project Coordinator (Level 3) | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.0 CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|----------|---------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------|-------|-----|----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|-------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr> <tr> <th>Category</th><th>(A) Bidder Total</th><th>(B) Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>(C) Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>(D) Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>AppA/AttchB</td><td></td><td>(C) = (A) - (B)</td><td>(D) = (C) / (B) *100</td></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Project Manager (Level 2)</td><td>1350</td><td>1,000</td><td>350</td><td>35</td></tr> <tr> <td>Project Manager (Level 3)</td><td>700</td><td>400</td><td>300</td><td>75</td></tr> <tr> <td>Project Coordinator (Level 3)</td><td>1025</td><td>400</td><td>625</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 3 CATEGORIES / 3</td><td>70</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | Category | (A) Bidder Total | (B) Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | (C) Billable days in excess of M2 | (D) Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | Project Manager (Level 2) | 1350 | 1,000 | 350 | 35 | Project Manager (Level 3) | 700 | 400 | 300 | 75 | Project Coordinator (Level 3) | 1025 | 400 | 625 | 100 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 3 CATEGORIES / 3 | | | | 70 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 70 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | (A) Bidder Total | (B) Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | (C) Billable days in excess of M2 | (D) Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Manager (Level 2) | 1350 | 1,000 | 350 | 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Manager (Level 3) | 700 | 400 | 300 | 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Coordinator (Level 3) | 1025 | 400 | 625 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 3 CATEGORIES / 3 | | | | 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

STREAM 4: NETWORK

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | BIDDER'S RESPONSE DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
|--------|--|--|
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 726 924 1134"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Help Desk Specialist (Level 1)</td><td>534</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Help Desk Specialist (Level 2)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Operations Support Specialist (Level 1)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Operations Support Specialist (Level 2)</td><td>534</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>Network Analyst (Level 2)</td><td>251</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | Help Desk Specialist (Level 1) | 534 | 2 | Help Desk Specialist (Level 2) | 251 | 3 | Operations Support Specialist (Level 1) | 251 | 4 | Operations Support Specialist (Level 2) | 534 | 5 | Network Analyst (Level 2) | 251 | |
|----|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----|---|--------------------------------|-----|---|---|-----|---|---|-----|---|---------------------------|-----|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Help Desk Specialist (Level 1) | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Help Desk Specialist (Level 2) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Operations Support Specialist (Level 1) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Operations Support Specialist (Level 2) | 534 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Network Analyst (Level 2) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.0 CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------|-------|-----|----|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-------|-----|-----|-----|---|-------|-------|-----|----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>(A)</th><th>(B)</th><th>(C)</th><th>(D)</th></tr> <tr> <th>Category</th><th>Bidder Total</th><th>Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>AppA/AttchB</td><td></td><td>(C) = (A) - (B)</td><td>(D) = (C) / (B) *100</td></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Help Desk Specialist (Level 1)</td><td>1500</td><td>1,000</td><td>500</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr> <td>Help Desk Specialist (Level 2)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Operations Support Specialist (Level 1)</td><td>1,000</td><td>400</td><td>600</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Operations Support Specialist (Level 2)</td><td>1,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>200</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr> <td>Network Analyst (Level 2)</td><td>900</td><td>400</td><td>500</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 5 CATEGORIES / 5</td><td>74</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | Category | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | Help Desk Specialist (Level 1) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | Help Desk Specialist (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Operations Support Specialist (Level 1) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | Operations Support Specialist (Level 2) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | Network Analyst (Level 2) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 5 CATEGORIES / 5 | | | | 74 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 74 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Help Desk Specialist (Level 1) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Help Desk Specialist (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operations Support Specialist (Level 1) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operations Support Specialist (Level 2) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Network Analyst (Level 2) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 5 CATEGORIES / 5 | | | | 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

STREAM 5: BUSINESS

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | BIDDER'S RESPONSE DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
|--------|--|--|
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 730 924 1102"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Business Analyst (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Business Consultant (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Change Management Consultant (Level 3)</td><td>1069</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | Business Analyst (Level 3) | 251 | 2 | Business Consultant (Level 3) | 251 | 3 | Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3) | 251 | 4 | Change Management Consultant (Level 3) | 1069 | |
|----|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|-----|---|-------------------------------|-----|---|---|-----|---|--|------|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Business Analyst (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Business Consultant (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Change Management Consultant (Level 3) | 1069 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.0 CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|------|-----|----|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|------|-----|-----|-----|--|------|------|-----|----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Category</th><th>(A)</th><th>(B)</th><th>(C)</th><th>(D)</th></tr> <tr> <th>Bidder Total</th><th>Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr> <tr> <th>AppA/AttchB</th><th></th><th>(C) = (A) - (B)</th><th>(D) = (C) / (B) * 100</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Business Analyst (Level 3)</td><td>1500</td><td>1000</td><td>500</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr> <td>Business Consultant (Level 3)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3)</td><td>1000</td><td>400</td><td>600</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Change Management Consultant (Level 3)</td><td>1400</td><td>1000</td><td>400</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 4 CATEGORIES / 4</td><td>73</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) * 100 | Business Analyst (Level 3) | 1500 | 1000 | 500 | 50 | Business Consultant (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3) | 1000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | Change Management Consultant (Level 3) | 1400 | 1000 | 400 | 40 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 4 CATEGORIES / 4 | | | | 73 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 73 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) * 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business Analyst (Level 3) | 1500 | 1000 | 500 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business Consultant (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3) | 1000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Change Management Consultant (Level 3) | 1400 | 1000 | 400 | 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 4 CATEGORIES / 4 | | | | 73 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

STREAM 6: INFRASTRUCTURE

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | BIDDER'S RESPONSE DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
|--------|--|--|
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 726 928 1566"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>IM Architect (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Database Administrator (Level 3)</td><td>1069</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Technology Architect –(Terminal Services) (Level 2)</td><td>126</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>Technology Architect – (Integrator) (Level 3)</td><td>251</td></tr> <tr> <td>6</td><td>Technology Architect –(Engineering) (Level 2)</td><td>786</td></tr> <tr> <td>7</td><td>Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 3)</td><td>126</td></tr> <tr> <td>8</td><td>Tester (Level 2)</td><td>1320</td></tr> <tr> <td>9</td><td>Tester (Level 3)</td><td>786</td></tr> <tr> <td>10</td><td>Application Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>660</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | IM Architect (Level 3) | 251 | 2 | Database Administrator (Level 3) | 1069 | 3 | Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3) | 251 | 4 | Technology Architect –(Terminal Services) (Level 2) | 126 | 5 | Technology Architect – (Integrator) (Level 3) | 251 | 6 | Technology Architect –(Engineering) (Level 2) | 786 | 7 | Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 3) | 126 | 8 | Tester (Level 2) | 1320 | 9 | Tester (Level 3) | 786 | 10 | Application Software Architect (Level 3) | 660 | |
|----|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|-----|---|----------------------------------|------|---|---------------------------------------|-----|---|---|-----|---|---|-----|---|---|-----|---|--|-----|---|------------------|------|---|------------------|-----|----|--|-----|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | IM Architect (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Database Administrator (Level 3) | 1069 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Technology Architect –(Terminal Services) (Level 2) | 126 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Technology Architect – (Integrator) (Level 3) | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Technology Architect –(Engineering) (Level 2) | 786 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 3) | 126 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Tester (Level 2) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Tester (Level 3) | 786 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Application Software Architect (Level 3) | 660 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.0 CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|------|-------|-----|----|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|--|-------|-------|-----|----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|-------|-------|-------|-----|------------------|------|-----|-----|----|------------------|------|------|----|---|--|------|-----|-----|----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | | | | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2. <div><table><tr><th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr><tr><th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr><tr><th rowspan="3">Category</th><th>(A)</th><th>(B)</th><th>(C)</th><th>(D)</th></tr><tr><th>Bidder Total</th><th>Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr><tr><th>AppA/AtchB</th><th></th><th>(C) = (A) - (B)</th><th>(D) = (C) / (B) *100</th></tr><tr><td>IM Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1500</td><td>1,000</td><td>500</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Database Administrator (Level 3)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3)</td><td>1,000</td><td>400</td><td>600</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Technology Architect – (Terminal Services) (Level 2)</td><td>1,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>200</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Technology Architect – (Integrator) (Level 3)</td><td>900</td><td>400</td><td>500</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 2)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 3)</td><td>2,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>1,200</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Tester (Level 2)</td><td>1250</td><td>800</td><td>450</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Tester (Level 3)</td><td>1050</td><td>1000</td><td>50</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Application Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1350</td><td>750</td><td>600</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 10 CATEGORIES / 10</td><td>71</td></tr></table></div> | | | | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | AppA/AtchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | IM Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | Database Administrator (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | Technology Architect – (Terminal Services) (Level 2) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | Technology Architect – (Integrator) (Level 3) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | Tester (Level 2) | 1250 | 800 | 450 | 56 | Tester (Level 3) | 1050 | 1000 | 50 | 5 | Application Software Architect (Level 3) | 1350 | 750 | 600 | 80 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 10 CATEGORIES / 10 | | | | 71 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 95 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bidder Total | Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | Billable days in excess of M2 | Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AtchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IM Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Database Administrator (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect – (Terminal Services) (Level 2) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect – (Integrator) (Level 3) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect – (Engineering) (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tester (Level 2) | 1250 | 800 | 450 | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tester (Level 3) | 1050 | 1000 | 50 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Application Software Architect (Level 3) | 1350 | 750 | 600 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 10 CATEGORIES / 10 | | | | 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | | | | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

STREAM 7: ENTERPRISE AND COMMON SERVICES

1. CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

| | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE |
|--------|--|---|
| ITEM # | MANDATORY REQUIREMENT | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) |
| M1 | <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years prior to the solicitation closing date.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p> | |

| M2 | <p>The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.</p> <p>* Bidders must complete both Appendix A and Appendix B of Attachment B that includes all resource categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 730 932 1205"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>Resource Category</th><th>Minimum Billable Days per Category</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Application/Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1854</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3)</td><td>1320</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2)</td><td>5280</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3)</td><td>3960</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>Systems Analyst (Level 3)</td><td>1320</td></tr> <tr> <td>6</td><td>Systems Analyst (Level 2)</td><td>2389</td></tr> <tr> <td>7</td><td>Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3)</td><td>1320</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that all provided resources have completed, for each resource category, at least 50% of the tasks for such category detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW).</p> | # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | 1 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1854 | 2 | Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3) | 1320 | 3 | Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2) | 5280 | 4 | Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 3960 | 5 | Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 1320 | 6 | Systems Analyst (Level 2) | 2389 | 7 | Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 1320 | |
|----|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|------|---|-------------------------------------|------|---|-------------------------------------|------|---|--------------------------------------|------|---|---------------------------|------|---|---------------------------|------|---|-----------------------------------|------|--|
| # | Resource Category | Minimum Billable Days per Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1854 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2) | 5280 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 3960 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Systems Analyst (Level 2) | 2389 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 1320 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2. CORPORATE RATED REQUIREMENTS

| | | | BIDDER'S RESPONSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|----------|---------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|--|------|-------|-----|----|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|--|--|--|--|----|-----|--|--|
| ITEM # | POINT RATED CRITERIA | MAX PTS. | EVAL. CRITERIA | DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R1 | <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the Minimum Billable Days per category under M2.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">BILLABLE DAYS</th></tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Category</th><th>(A) Bidder Total</th><th>(B) Minimum Billable days identified under M2</th><th>(C) Billable days in excess of M2</th><th>(D) Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100</th></tr> <tr> <th>AppA/AttchB</th><th></th><th>(C) = (A) - (B)</th><th>(D) = (C) / (B) *100</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Application/Software Architect (Level 3)</td><td>1500</td><td>1,000</td><td>500</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr> <td>Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2)</td><td>1,000</td><td>400</td><td>600</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3)</td><td>1,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>200</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr> <td>Systems Analyst (Level 3)</td><td>900</td><td>400</td><td>500</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Systems Analyst (Level 2)</td><td>800</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3)</td><td>2,200</td><td>1,000</td><td>1,200</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 7 CATEGORIES / 7</td><td>81</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | Category | (A) Bidder Total | (B) Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | (C) Billable days in excess of M2 | (D) Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | Systems Analyst (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 7 CATEGORIES / 7 | | | | 81 | 100 | <p>The bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.</p> <p>The bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.</p> <p>In this example, the bidder would score 81 out of a possible 100 points.</p> | |
| EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | (A) Bidder Total | (B) Minimum Billable days identified under M2 | (C) Billable days in excess of M2 | (D) Bidder % increase to a maximum of 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | AppA/AttchB | | (C) = (A) - (B) | (D) = (C) / (B) *100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | 1500 | 1,000 | 500 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2) | 1,000 | 400 | 600 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 1,200 | 1,000 | 200 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (Level 3) | 900 | 400 | 500 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (Level 2) | 800 | 400 | 400 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | 2,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL 7 CATEGORIES / 7 | | | | 81 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MAX. TECHNICAL POINTS | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MIN. POINTS REQUIRED | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE ACHIEVED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TO BE RESPONSIVE, THE BIDDER MUST OBTAIN A MINIMUM OF 60 POINTS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX A OF Attachment B

RFP BILLABLE DAYS RESPONSE TABLE

By providing a response, the bidder certifies that billable days provided occurred during the billing period indicated above for all of the resource categories listed.

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 1 – PROJECT ARCHITECTURE

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Total |
| Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Web Architect – Usability Researcher (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Web Architect – Usability Designer (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Business Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| IM Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Enterprise Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Technical Writer (Level 3) | | | | | | |

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 2 - SAP

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Total |
| Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| ERP Functional Analyst (Solution Manager Analyst) (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| ERP Programmer Analyst (ABAP) (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| ERP Functional Analyst (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| ERP Programmer Analyst (SAP Security) (Level 3) | | | | | | |

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 3 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Total |
| Project Coordinator (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Project Manager (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Project Manager (Level 2) | | | | | | |

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 4 – NETWORK

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Total |
| | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | |
| Help Desk Specialist (Level 1) | | | | | | |
| Help Desk Specialist (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Operations Support Specialist (Level 1) | | | | | | |
| Operations Support Specialist (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Network Analyst (Level 2) | | | | | | |

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 5 – BUSINESS

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Total |
| Business Analyst (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Business Consultant (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Business Process Reengineering Consultant (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Change Management Consultant (Level 3) | | | | | | |

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 6 – INFRASTRUCTURE

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ | Total |
| | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | Billing Period: ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) to ____/____/____ (dd/mm/yy) | |
| IM Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Database Administrator (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect (Terminal Services) (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect (Integrator) (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect (Engineering) (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Technology Architect (Engineering) (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Tester (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Tester (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Application Software Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |

Bidder's Name: _____

STREAM 7 – ENTERPRISE AND COMMON SERVICES

| RESOURCE CATEGORY | NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) to __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) to __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) to __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) to __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) | Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____ Billing Period: __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) to __/__/__ (dd/mm/yy) | Total |
| Application/Software Architect (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Programmer/Analyst (JAVA) (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Programmer/Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (JAVA) (Level 3) | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (Level 2) | | | | | | |
| Systems Analyst (COBOL) (Level 3) | | | | | | |

Appendix B of Attachment b RESOURCE REFERENCE FORM

To meet 1.0 M2 of Attachment B for each Stream, the Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories or similar resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts. All resources provided must have completed at least 50% of the tasks detailed in section 5.3 of Annex B (SOW), for the resource category for which they were provided.

Bidder Name: _____

Bidder Contract Reference #: _____

SECTION 1: CLIENT INFORMATION

Government client (Yes/No)

Client Organization Name

Address

Client Reference Contact Name

Telephone

Fax

E-mail

SECTION 2: CONTRACT INFORMATION

Contract Value

Award Date

Expiry Date

Contract Title and description:

SECTION 3: RESOURCE DETAILS

Category of Personnel and Level

Tasks performed under the contract with a cross reference to each specific SOW associated task

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Furthermore, Canada is also amending the RFP to include the following under article 4.1 (b):

INSERT:

(iii) **Requests for Further Information:** If Canada requires additional information in order to do any of the following pursuant to the Section entitled “Conduct of Evaluation” in 2003, Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements:

- (A) verify any or all information provided by the Bidder in its bid; or
- (B) contact any or all references supplied by the Bidder (e.g., references named in the résumés of individual resources) to verify and validate any information submitted by the Bidder,

the Bidder must provide the information requested by Canada within 2 working days of a request by the Contracting Authority.

2. The RFP was amended as follows:

DELETE: Clause 7.8 (f) - Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer

QUESTION 61

Regarding question 10 and particularly question 10.3, ‘Can the bidder use contract references from the USA?’ Canada responded that ‘Yes. Furthermore, all the requirements for M1 applies.’ We respectfully ask for clarification as to whether Canada is allowing references from the USA or if the requirement for Canadian Government (Federal, Provincial, Municipal) still applies.

ANSWER 61

Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 62

1. This solicitation appears to be an incorrect use of TBIPS. The requirements as stated include a whole series of potential initiatives that may or may not fall within the mandate of the statement of work. The fact the RFP is for such a long period of time it is unrealistic to think anybody can accurately predict resource needs. Additionally, its award will essentially exclude all unsuccessful vendors from being able to conduct direct business with CBSA for a period of up to seven years. This does not fit the definition of task-based and is more indicative of an as-and-when-required supply arrangement. We

request that this solicitation be cancelled in its current form and re-published under Merx (non TBIPS) as a Supply Arrangement or re-issued under the TBIPS framework to address initiative-specific solicitations at the appropriate time and for the appropriate scope of services.

2. Despite this being limited to Tier 2 suppliers, there is no specific requirement for a respondent to have a proven/capable supply presence in Ottawa. This RFP favours large national system integrators and national staffing firms because of the sheer volume of billable days that must be demonstrated. They will use their large preferred supplier contracts to satisfy the volume of billable days that must be demonstrated. As further supported by one of the questions in Amendment 3, references from the USA can be used to substantiate billable days. This suggests there is even a chance that CBSA will select suppliers who will rely on references from outside the National Capital Region, which does not prove they will be able to meet the staffing needs of CBSA. Therefore:

- a. We request that the corporate requirements be amended so that respondents must provide proof that they currently have a staffed office in the National Capital Region and that it has existed for a period of at least three years.
- b. We also request that no less than 60% of the billable days used to substantiate requirements must have been for resources placed in the National Capital Region with Government of Canada clients.

3. The limitation of 5 projects per stream is excessively restrictive. The combination of resources and amount of billable days needed per resource rarely occurs in these types of groupings, even amongst five large projects. Furthermore, TBIPS has been the primary contracting vehicle for the last 4-5 years. Most TBIPS requirements result in the issuance of contracts for very small numbers of resources. This means that the evaluation criteria actually penalizes the very types of suppliers which might be most suited, those being successful TBIPS suppliers. Instead, it favours companies that will use client references from outside the National Capital Region to satisfy the billable days requirements. A recent amendment does not allow TBIPS to be considered one contract. However, large national staffing firms will be allowed to count their “preferred supplier contracts” to large clients such as the banks and oil & gas companies that engage hundreds of resources outside Ottawa via one contract. This is an unfair restriction against successful TBIPS suppliers who have invested in the local marketplace.

We request that TBIPS be allowed to be counted as one project so that companies that have focused on the Federal Government can be evaluated on the same footing as respondents that will use their large private sector preferred supplier contracts.

4. Please confirm that the great majority of services resulting from the RFP process will be provided in the NCR region. Please also provide if services are to be provided in other regions, and if so, provide an estimated breakdown per region by stream.

5. Quoting section “2.5 *Improvement of Requirement During Bid Solicitation Period*

“If bidders consider that the specifications or Statement of Work contained in the bid solicitation could be improved technically or technologically, bidders are invited to make suggestions ... Suggestions that do not restrict the level of competition nor favour a particular bidder will be given consideration ...”

As per section 2.5 of this RFP, we are submitting this suggestion for improvement. The billable days requirements for M2 and R1 will limit the ability for suppliers currently providing the services listed in this RFP to CBSA to respond. This is particularly true for medium size suppliers with a well-established local (NCR) presence that are not part of a larger IM/IT staffing organization who can use references from elsewhere in North America. In order to allow local NCR firms with a sizeable and proven IT staffing experience to compete with national and US-based staffing firms, we request that the solicitation be amended to allow Streams where M2 requires in excess of 4000 billable days to increase the time window of M2 and R1 from 36 months to 60 months and allow for up to 10 projects to be used to substantiate the billable days.

Did your Client thoroughly review this one? Have they provided you sufficient proof that many companies can meet their requirements? Do they wish to open some of the streams to allow more contracts??? They need to let us know now!

ANSWER 62

1. Canada does not agree with the statements made under question 62.1. This RFP is in accordance with the TBIPS supply arrangement. Therefore, the proposed change is not accepted.
2. In an effort to foster competition, Canada does not want to include such restrictions. Therefore, the proposed changes are not accepted.
3. Canada does not agree with the statements made under question 62.3, there have been contracts awarded in the past five years that include many different resource categories. Furthermore, rather than restrict competition to Bidders present in Ottawa only, Canada has opted for criteria that will foster competition. As previously indicated, TBIPS is not a contract. Therefore, proposed changes are not accepted.
4. The work is expected to take place in the National Capital Region (NCR).
5. As explained in the answers above, Canada does not accept the proposed change. It should be noted that minimum billable days represent a small portion of the total requirement.

QUESTION 63

CBSA has issued this RFP within the framework of Tier 2 TBIPS. There are a large number of billable days that must be proven and companies that could form JVs to capably respond are prevented from doing so. We respectfully request that this solicitation be cancelled and issued outside the framework of TBIPS (i.e. MERX non TBIPS) so that local vendors with a proven history of meeting the needs of CBSA and the federal government can form joint ventures to provide a compliant response.

ANSWER 63

No, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 64

The Government of Canada's Industry Canada website on SME's states that according to Statistics Canada's *Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours* (SEPH) data, on average in 2011, just over 5.1 million employees on payroll, or 48 percent of the total private sector labour force, worked for small enterprises (those with fewer than 100 employees) as shown in Table 5. More than 1.7 million, or 16 percent, worked for medium-sized enterprises (those with 100 to 499 employees). In total, therefore, SMEs employed about 6.9 million, or 64 percent, of private sector employees covered by SEPH.

CBSA has indicated via this RFP that their intent is to secure viable suppliers to supplement their IT consulting requirements. The bulk of the IT work for CBSA is understood to be centered in the National Capital Region. It is assumed that means CBSA is interested in securing the services of suppliers that have a proven history of supplying IT resources to the Federal Government. However, the nature of evaluation criteria established may in fact preclude that type of supplier from responding by virtue of the massive volume of billable days that must be proven and because of the excessive burden of proof that must be provided.

The question has two parts:

1. Why has the Government not forewarned the industry by issuing a relevant LOI or RFI reflecting your intent to issue a 'billable days' format RFP, therefore providing qualified suppliers the opportunity to comment on this approach.
2. Why has the Government of Canada not issued this RFP as a non-TBIPS solicitation, therefore giving SME's and other respected firms the opportunity to collaborate and form a winning team and proposal submission?

ANSWER 64

1. A Letter of Interest (LOI) was published on January 13, 2012 to provide suppliers with a first glance at the upcoming procurement requirements for the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA). In addition, the approach taken for this type of procurement is a common approach for high dollars value requirements.
2. The Task-Based Informatics Professional Services (TBIPS) is being used, as it is a federal government-wide mandatory procurement tool utilized to procure services to address specific Information Technology needs of government departments and organizations.

QUESTION 65

1. There is merit in having suppliers prove their capabilities to provide a sufficient volume of IT consultants. However, there is no weighting for Federal Government experience. Also a recent answer to a question suggests that a respondent could satisfy the billable days requirements using totally non Federal Government of Canada projects. This does not prove that a vendor will be able to deliver IT resources successfully to CBSA. We request that requirements be amended so that a respondent must:
 - a. Have a staffed office in Ottawa that has been operational for no less than five (5) years;
 - b. At least 70% of all billable days must come from Federal Government of Canada client references where the work was conducted in the National Capital Region.

ANSWER 65

- 1.a. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
- 1.b. No, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 66

1. The RFP requires copies of invoices to be provided to substantiate M1, M2 and R1 for each Stream. Some of the streams require proof of upwards of 20,000 billable days. This could amount to 1,000's of invoices which in turn will mean many more 1000's of printed pages. Multiply that by 4 hard-copies per stream and the numbers become unrealistic. They also do not support CBSA's stated desired of a "green" solicitation. We request that the RFP be amended to allow the invoices to be provided in ONLY the soft copies of the response. In other words, providing hard copies of the invoices would be at the sole option of the respondent. Alternatively, make it soft-copy only for invoice proof.

2. The burden of having to pull together many hundreds/thousands of invoices and of mapping hundreds of resources against statements of work is a very logistically demanding requirement. For respondents interested in pursuing multiple streams – some requiring tens of thousands of billable days of proof - this is coming down to a matter of pure time available. Additionally, the timing of this effort is overlapping with financial month-end and the need for our Accounting department – who is responsible for providing much of this information – to focus on their primary responsibilities. As a result, we request an extension of no less than two weeks to the current due date.

ANSWER 66

1. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
2. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 67

For 2.0 Corporate Rated Requirements, R1, all streams, Example Evaluation Scenario, Column (D), for the Bidder % increase, please confirm the example given is correct in that categories can exceed 100% and this excess percentage points beyond 100 are attributed to the Bidder overall score and total technical score achieved?

ANSWER 67

Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 68

1. With respect to solicitation 47060-136911/A, we note that several of the rated and mandatory criteria require invoices to be submitted as part of our technical proposal to substantiate the values claimed and billable days referenced.

Given the Government's well publicized Green initiatives, we respectfully request that the Crown accept that such invoices be provided in soft copy only, and be exempted from inclusion in the four hard copy technical proposals required for each stream.

We estimate that providing hard copy invoices to meet the thresholds identified will require between 3000 and 5000 pages of written material for each stream. When considered over all seven proposal streams and multiple vendors responding to the solicitation, there is tremendous potential for this procurement to have a significant environmental impact. We also note that any invoices submitted will likely be briefly reviewed and then discarded by the Crown, making a requirement for hard copy demonstration invoices an unnecessary and wasteful component of the solicitation.

2. We also respectfully request an extension to the solicitation period in order to draw this material together. Securing permission from our Clients to use them as a reference, identifying the appropriate Client contract to reference, and then compiling the requested invoicing material is proving to be a very time consuming endeavor. We further note that there are multiple tier two bids currently in competition that target vendors with a high number of billable days and take a similar procurement approach, thereby limiting our ability to dedicate all of our resources on a single response.

ANSWER 68

1. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
2. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 69

Appendix B Resource Reference Form - Section 3: Resource Details .

It is our understanding that the form is designed to support the Bidder's claim to have provided the services of resources who performed at least 50% of the tasks detailed in Annex B - Statement of Work - Section 5.3 Resource Categories and Tasks, and that CBSA intends (or at least reserves the right) to contact the named Client Reference Contact to verify that claim.

Please confirm our understanding that the response expected under Section 3 Resource Details is, for each Category/Level, a listing of the tasks detailed in Section 5.3 and an indication of which of those tasks were performed for that client, to a minimum of 50% of the tasks.

ANSWER 69

The Bidder must provide, for each category of personnel and Level, a list of the tasks performed under the contract reference with a cross reference to each specific SOW associated task. For clarity purposes, Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 70

Given the number of outstanding questions to date that affect Bidders' ability to prepare and complete a compliant proposal, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the current closing date in order to allow for adequate time to address the Crown's answers in our response.

ANSWER 70

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 71

Will CBSA/PWGSC provide the RFP in Doc format so that suppliers may complete the Evaluation Criteria? If not the whole RFP, could you provide the Evaluation Criteria in DOC format?

ANSWER 71

As per the Notice of Proposed Procurement, the RFP is available in a PDF format only.

QUESTION 72**Re: Stream 6 – Infrastructure**

The inclusion of 3 Technology Architects categories in this Stream makes it extraordinarily difficult for any otherwise qualified company to bid.

These categories are:

Technology Architect (Terminal Services) Level 2

Technology Architect (Integrator) Level 3 and

Technology Architect (Engineer) Level 3

The problem exists in that the SOWs are so tightly specific to the CBSA technical environment that any company (aside from one that may have one of the 4 on site) would have a problem meeting 50% of the SOW tasks. These 3 categories alone make up only 10% of the estimated resources required per year (16 total/161 resources) and yet their inclusion will determine who can bid and win this Stream. We suggest that CBSA either separate these out into a Technology Specialist Stream or keep them as is, including the submission of pricing, but make them non-core.

ANSWER 72

No, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 73

1. Would the Crown consider expanding the list of skill sets under the Functional Solutions Manager Category under Stream 2 for SAP? We would recommend adding Functional SAP Change Management and Functional Project Management, considering today, the role of the Solution Manager consultant is not just technical; it brings in technical, functional, project management skills along with change management.

2. Would the crown consider open up the Architect role to make it an ERP architect vs. an SAP architect? There are other integrated technologies that are ERP related that require the work of an architect and therefore could contribute to the number of days needed for the Mandatory and Point-rated.

ANSWER 73

1. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
2. No, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 74

Given the extensive list of roles and billable days necessary to document proof points on our RFP submission, we respectfully request a 2-week extension to complete the process. The added time should result in higher quality and lower priced bids for Canada.

ANSWER 74

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 75

for mandatory criterion M1 where bidders must demonstrate 5 contracts with \$1Million or more invoiced to the customer against each contract. It is stated that the bidder must submit: “ *invoices that show that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1M;...* ”

For bidders to print and provide invoices for professional services (normally billed monthly) demonstrating a total value of \$5Million (5 contracts), could add 500 or more pages to each proposal document x number of copies required. We suggest the following to save paper; to make the proposals more manageable; and to facilitate evaluation for M1: instead of printing all the invoices, bidders be allowed to prepare a list of invoices for each contract claimed, using an excel spreadsheet, showing all required details such as the contract number, invoice date, invoice number, invoice amount and number of days billed. This type of report can generally be obtained directly from financial systems and as such is detailed and accurate. Please indicate if this will be acceptable for M1 in all streams?

ANSWER 75

Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 76

Please refer to Part 5 – Certifications (Page 46) where it states that all certifications are to be responded to within the Bid Submission Form, which according to Part 3.2 (Page 14) is to be included as part of Section I: Technical Bid. Could the client please clarify what should be included in Section III: Certifications?

ANSWER 76

Article 3.1 (a) and 3.4 are amended as follows:

- Article 3.1 (a) is deleted and replaced with the following:

3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions

(a) **Copies of Bid:** Canada requests that Bidders provide their bid, for each stream, in separately

bound sections as follows:

- (i) Section I: Technical Bid (4 hard copies and two soft copies on CD or DVD)
- (ii) Section II: Financial Bid (1 hard copy and one soft copy on CD or DVD)
- (iii) Section III: Certifications not included in the technical bid (1 hard copy and one soft copy on CD or DVD)

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of the soft copy and the hard copy, the wording of the hard copy will have priority over the wording of the soft copy.

Prices must appear in the financial bid only. No prices must be indicated in any other section of the bid.

- Article 3.4 is deleted and replaced with the following:

3.4 Section III: Certifications

Bidders must submit the certifications required under Part 5 that have not been included in the Technical bid.

QUESTION 77

1. Q&A Amendment 3

The response to Question 10 states that US References may be used. Please confirm:

- a. That the Definition of Bidder clause incorporated into the RFP in Section 2.1 by reference to the terms and conditions of 2003 (2012-11-19) Standard Instructions
 - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements of the SACC manual, therefore

does not apply to references? US references are normally contracted with, and billed to the client by the Bidder's US parent or subsidiary company.

- b. That the following in M1 will be amended to include reference to US accounts?

"The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:

*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.

*Government Client is a client within a federal, provincial, territorial or municipal government of Canada; and is a department, departmental corporation, agency, Crown Corporation or any Crown entity described in the Financial Administration Act."

ANSWER 77

1.a. It is the Bidder's responsibility to meet the mandatory requirement. Standard Instructions 2003 (2012-11-19) applies and remains unchanged. In addition, Bidders are also to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

1.b. The mandatory reference to a Government client was deleted from the RFP. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 78

Please refer to Corporate Mandatory Requirement M1 regarding the definition of what constitutes a "Government Client".

Can the client please confirm if the following institutions would be considered as a Government Client for the purposes of this requirement?

- Innovapost
- Canadian Blood Services

ANSWER 78

The reference to a Government client was deleted from the RFP. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 79

1. M1 Award Date

M1 states : "The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts, of which three were for a Government Client**". Each of these

contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1M and have been awarded within the past five years."

Many of our reference accounts under which we provide significant numbers of resources and roles are long standing contracts which have gone through numerous renewals. The renewal periods may be for as long as 7-10 years.

Please confirm that your objective is have Bidders demonstrate that they have provided such resources over the last 5 years, and that award date may be older than 5 years.

2. 36 month window

M2 states: "The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over the same 36 month period within the past five years. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts."

Bidders may use up to 5 different contracts to demonstrate the required number of billable hours by role. Please confirm that the 5 contracts must each demonstrate the roles and hours were provided in a 36-month window within the last 5 years, but that each of the 5 contracts used to do so within a stream may use a different 36-month window.

ANSWER 79

1. The contract references for M1 must have been awarded within the past seven years. Furthermore, Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
2. Bidders are to refer to the answer given to question # 55 (4) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 80

Please confirm, for M1, that the in lieu of invoices for federal government contracts the crown would accept a signed contract amendment showing the contract value that has been billed at the time of amendment, or upon contract completion?

(Please see the attached example)

ANSWER 80

No, as detailed in M1, Canada will only accept copies of invoices or a letter from the Bidder's client. Furthermore, Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 81

Given that the amendment released to day still does not include questions asked on Feb 1st by our company (see e-mail below), and the delay in getting QA out (our questions

asked on Jan 24th were only answered in the QA released Feb 13th – 21 days to get an answer), we request a minimum 2-week extension to March 11th.

ANSWER 81

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 82

In light of CBSA's most recent amendment allowing bidder's to provide reference letters from clients to demonstrate hours and monetary totals billed over the course of contracts - we respectfully request an extension of the bid delivery date to March 11, 2013 to enable a sufficient amount of time for clients to create and provide the required reference letters. This will also allow bidder's with the ability to ensure environmentally responsible bid submissions - as bidders will be able to provide reference letters in place of up to several thousand individual printed invoices.

ANSWER 82

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 83

Due to the delay in answering questions as well as changes to the requirements, we would ask if the client would consider an amendment to the solicitation date to March 11, 2013.

ANSWER 83

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 84

Given the number of outstanding questions to date that affect Bidders' ability to prepare and complete a compliant proposal, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the current closing date in order to allow for adequate time to address the Crown's answers in our response.

ANSWER 84

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 85

It is the practice of the Province of Ontario to use a set of standardized contracts termed the 'Vendor of Record' contracts to manage all of its procurements for IM/IT services. The VOR contract is legal document used to support contracting, and specific engagements are managed using purchase orders. Could the Crown please confirm that it will recognize the Province of Ontario VOR contract as a valid contract for the purpose of M1?

Refusing to recognize the VOR contracts would effectively prevent the usage of Province of Ontario references, as individual purchase order engagements do not approach the \$1 million range.

ANSWER 85

Canada will not provide a response to a hypothetical set of facts. All bid evaluation will occur after bid closing. Please rephrase your question indicating what portion of the mandatory is unclear.

QUESTION 86

In view of the unfortunate delay in receiving responses to our questions, which are fundamental to all Bidders formulating their proposals, we are forced to respectfully request an extension to the closing date of at least 14 days beyond the date of receiving those responses.

ANSWER 86

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 87

With regard to the clarifications and amendments made to M1 for all streams as issued in Amendment 5, please confirm that vendors who choose to submit a letter from a client in response to M1 item 1 are not required to answer M1 item 2, as the requirement for the reference letter makes M1 item 2 redundant.

ANSWER 87

No, Item 2 of M1 still applies.

QUESTION 88

The question we submitted at the beginning of February was not answered with the last amendment. The answer to our question determines the strategy for meeting M1 on multiple streams. It is a very big level of effort to pull together the information for M1 and because our question was not answered, we have fallen behind schedule. We respectfully request an extension in order to allow us to prepare the necessary information in response to the answer of our question.

ANSWER 88

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 89

“In response to Question 3 the crown extended the time in which experience can be counted in relation to M1 to within the last 7 years. M2, and therefore R1, is still restrict to within the last 5 years. Will the crown modify M2 to be 7 years also?”

ANSWER 89

No, as detailed in M2 and R1, the experience must be demonstrated within the past five years.

QUESTION 90

Since we had posed our question over two weeks ago and have yet to receive a response, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the current closing date.

ANSWER 90

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 91

1. Given that project management type activities typically represent a small fraction of a given project / contract, we are having difficulty meeting the mandatory requirements for this stream. We therefore request that Canada allow mandatory requirements (M1 and M2) references for Stream 3 to read "within the last 10 years".

2. Furthermore, for M1 in Stream 3, we request that Canada accept individual Task Authorizations where we invoiced over \$1 million and which were awarded within the last 10 years?
3. Ref R1 for Stream 3 - There are several labour categories listed in R1 that are not listed in M2 . Given R1 is to demonstrate the number of billable days in excess of the minimum required in M2 would you please remove from R1 those labour categories that are not listed in M2.
4. We request a 2 week extension to bid submission date.

ANSWER 91

1. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
2. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
3. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
4. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 92

1. With regard to Stream 1, there are two separate roles identified for Web Architects under 5.3.3 and 5.3.9. However, in the billable days table there is only one Web Architect role identified. Please clarify which one of the Web Architect roles need to be validated with SOW.
2. We respectfully request an extension to the RFP closing date due to discrepancy and possible need to reset.

ANSWER 92

1. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
2. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 93

We have reviewed the Q&A's that were posted on Wednesday the 13th but I see no reference to the question we submitted on Tuesday the 5th. On RFP Amendment #5 you

have changed M1 for all categories but will you have removed the word 'Canadian' government but have left the phrase:

****Government Client is a client within a federal, provincial, territorial or municipal government.**

This still has no clarified this enough that we feel confident we can or cannot use State references from the USA or other countries. Can you please clarify your position on this?

ANSWER 93

The mandatory reference to a Government client was deleted from the RFP. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 94

Re: Part 1, Page 7 of 89

The table for Stream 1 - Project Architecture lists only Web Architect (Level 3). This is the case throughout the RFP. Yet, ANNEX B - Statement of Work describes two different types of Web Architect (Level 3), one being 5.3.3 Usability Researcher, and the other 5.3.9 Usability Designer. Please confirm that we can use either definition to prove tasks performed under a given contract.

ANSWER 94

Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 95

1. Under stream 7 the SOW doesn't lists any tasks for the following roles:

- Tester (Level 2)
- Tester (Level 3)

Are there no tasks required to be demonstrated in this area or can the crown please provide the associated list of tasks?

2. Given the complexity and volume of information requested by the crown and the fact that there are multiple questions still outstanding that will alter bidders approaches to the response we respectfully request a 1-week extension be granted. Given the holiday Monday in Ontario bidders currently only have 5 working days left to complete up to 7 separate bids for CBSA. It is our hope that you will find this request reasonable and in the best interest of the crown as it will help ensure higher quality bids and a strong competitive process.

3. Can you please confirm that with respect to M2 and R1 bidders are to reference a 36 month period, within the 5 years allowed for each contract, but that the 5 contracts do not all have to reference the same 36 month period within the 5 years?

ANSWER 95

1. Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.
2. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.
3. Bidders are to refer to answer given to question # 55 (4) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 96

As currently structured, this RFP has the potential to prevent a notable majority of the vendors presently providing these services to the CBSA to qualify, let alone submit a competitive response to these requirements.

Will the Crown consider re-issuing this RFP as a non-TBIPS solicitation? This would allow for a more inclusive and competitive process, offering better value to the Crown; and give the vendors who are currently providing these services to the CBSA (with a proven track record of delivering value) a fair and equitable chance to establish credible, compliant partnerships that will allow them the opportunity to at least compete for the ability to continue to provide the services they have been delivering quite satisfactorily.

ANSWER 96

No, the proposed request is not accepted.

QUESTION 97

As there are a lot of questions outstanding and the Crown can't for now provide an estimated date of when the remaining questions will be answered, would the Crown please extend the closing date of the RFP to at least two weeks after the date that the Crown does answer all of the outstanding questions?

ANSWER 97

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 98

1. Stream 2 SAP: M1, M2 and R1

We have a situation where a resource has provided services continuously for a number of months, doing the same work for the same client without interruption. The work has been provided under two contract numbers but the work has been continuous. Please confirm that this is acceptable to meet the above-referenced criteria.

2. Stream 2 SAP: M1, M2 and R1

We submitted a detailed question on January 31st yet it remains unanswered. (included below for your reference). Respectfully we request a two-week extension from the time of your answer to allow us time to provide CBSA with a proposal of reasonable quality.

ANSWER 98

1. Canada will not provide a response to a hypothetical set of facts. All bid evaluation will occur after bid closing. Please rephrase your question indicating what portion of the mandatory is unclear.
2. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 99

Given that answers to our questions, posed on February 4 and February 11, have yet to be received and the potential responses are pertinent to our bid submission, which is currently due in two business days, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the submission date to March 11, 2013.

ANSWER 99

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 100

1. M2/R2

In Answer 18.2, CBSA stated, "The experience must occur within the past five years prior to the solicitation's closing date. The number of Billable Days demonstrated must be proven over no greater than 36 months, but such 36 months need not be consecutive. The experience may occur at any time during the five-year period, so long as the total number of Billable Days when added together meets the Minimum Billable Days requirement."

This is the first mention in the RFP that the window is based on RFP close date (a moving target). Our analysis has been based on the RFP release date for that very reason. We note that other recent RFPs from PWGSC have adopted the practice of standardizing on the RFP release date. In addition RFP AMENDMENT # 06 that followed Answer 18.2 did not contain the words "prior to the solicitation's closing date". We request that this be clarified to confirm that the RFP release date applies in order to avoid the need for bidders to rework all of their data.

ANSWER 100

As previously mentioned for M2 and R1, the experience must occur within the past five years prior to the solicitation's closing date.

Furthermore, for M1, the experience must occur within the past seven years prior to the solicitation's closing date.

Bidders are to refer to the latest changes made under answer to question #60 (1) of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION 101

For all corporate requirements that require suppliers to reference a contract:

M1 - The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts, of which three were for a Government Client**. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years.

M2 - To meet 1.0 M2 of Attachment B for each Stream, the Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the resource categories described in M2 for each Stream, over a total of 36-month period within the past 5 years.

Would the client accept an agreement (aka Master Services Agreement [MSA]) between the supplier and its client, which has, multiple call-ups as separate sub-contract AS AN EQUIVALENT to a contract in the traditional sense (for example a TBIPS Contract which has TA call ups)?

ANSWER 101

Canada will not provide a response to a hypothetical set of facts. All bid evaluation will occur after bid closing. Please rephrase your question indicating what portion of the mandatory is unclear.

QUESTION 102

re: Stream 2 SAP: M1, M2 and R1

For the past five years much of the Government's SAP requirements have been met through TBIPS – very often with no more than 3 resources per tasking or contract. There are a limited number of instances where a single contract was used to address SAP project requirements. In keeping with Government contracting practices, please allow the use of five SAP projects or contracts in order to substantiate SAP experience. Otherwise, this criteria favours the large, multinational firms and limits competition.

ANSWER 102

No, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 103

There have been numerous requests asking for M2 and R1 to be changed to “Accept Billable Days provided within the past 7 (seven) years”, all of the requests around the change to the requirement in M2 and R1 have been denied by the crown. The rationale behind the requests to change M2 and R1 is that the change will create more competition and allow small to medium size companies to submit compliant proposals under various streams.

What is the rationale behind the crown's acceptance of the change to M1 and its refusal to make the same change to M2 and R1? An answer beyond a “No, the proposed change is not acceptable” would help small to medium size IT consulting companies understand the logic behind CBSA position in dealing with such a request.

1. Would the crown please change the current requirement for M2 and R1 from 5 to 7 years?
2. Question #35 b, in the amendment # 006 was not answered, you just repeated the answer for #35 a. Could you please answer question #35 b.
3. Based on the last 48 page amendment, we ask the crown for a 2 week extension to clarify all the changes.

ANSWER 103

1. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
2. The answer to question #35 (b) of the RFP Amendment is deleted and replaced as follows:

The 5 contract references for M2 of all streams apply to the stream as a whole.
3. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 104

In regards to the following portion of M1:

Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years.

1. Could you please clarify 'Have been awarded within the past seven years'? Do you mean that we have billed under a contract over a million with the last seven year? I would like to determine if the date of award is important or only the period when the 1 million has been obtained.
2. Would a long contract awarded in 2005 be accepted if the 1 million has been invoiced with the last 7 years?
3. Based on the last 48-page amendment, we ask the crown for a 2-week extension to clarify all the changes.

ANSWER 104

1. The contract references for M1 of all streams must have been awarded within the past seven years.
2. No, the contract references for M1 of all streams must have been awarded within the past seven years.
3. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 105

1. Contract references in the Private Sector (i.e. banking sector, Insurance industry, etc.), are often competed and awarded under Master Service Agreements (MSAs). These MSAs are much like TBIPS and TSPS where sub contracts are executed under an MSA. Will the Crown accept the treatment of MSAs as a single contract for the purposes of this bid solicitation for requirements M2 and R1?
2. In many Government sectors, departments and agencies contracts are awarded as Individual Standing Offers (ISOs). Unlike TBIPS and TSPS these ISOs are a single contract for a single client and the ISP acts as a blanket vehicle for identifying terms and conditions and categories and rates. Please confirm that CBSA will accept ISOs as a single contract to meet the requirements of M2 and R1.

ANSWER 105

1. Canada will not provide a response to a hypothetical set of facts. All bid evaluation will occur after bid closing. Please rephrase your question indicating what portion of the mandatory is unclear.
2. Canada will not provide a response to a hypothetical set of facts. All bid evaluation will occur after bid closing. Please rephrase your question indicating what portion of the mandatory is unclear.

QUESTION 106

1. We regards to answer 52, we are still unsure on how the Crown would like the streams submitted. Please confirm which option is correct:
One bid containing: 1 separately bound technical bid (for 1-7 streams), 1 separately bound financial bid (for 1-7 streams), and 1 separately bound certification document.
or
A separate bid for each stream the vendor wishes to compete for.
2. The amount of billable days required for the Project Manager Stream 3 is very low in relation to the estimated number of resources which CBSA has stated they have estimated that they will require (47 PM Level 3, 17 PM Level 2 & 17 Project Coordinator). Bidders that have provided only a very small number (1 to 2 resources over 7 years) of PM L3s, PML2s and Project Coordinators can fully satisfy the mandatory and rated requirements for this stream. Given the importance of Project Management in relation to project success and the high importance of the Beyond Borders projects we believe it would be in the Crown's best interest to increase the billable days for the PM categories to allow the crown to evaluate the bidders ability and experience with providing the required number of resources that CBSA has estimated. We respectfully request that the crown increase the mandatory and rated billable days for both PM levels to at least 2000 days.
3. The amount of billable days required for the Business Stream 5 is very low in relation to the estimated number of resources, which CBSA has stated they have estimated that they will require (total of 58 resources). Bidders that have provided only a very small number (1 to 2 resources over 7 years) of across each category can fully satisfy the mandatory and rated requirements for this stream. Given the importance of Business related consultants in relation to project success and the high importance of the Beyond Borders projects we believe it would be in the Crown's best interest to increase the billable days for the Stream 5 Business categories to allow the crown to evaluate the bidders ability and experience with providing the required number of resources that CBSA has estimated. We respectfully request that the crown increase the mandatory and rated billable days for the business categories to at least 2000 days.

4. The most recent extension crosses over into a new month and thus changes the time period vendors can use to determine the 5-year and 7-year periods used for M1, M2, and R1. To allow the vendors to leverage all of the work done to date, and ensure that teams do not need to recalculate billable days and revenue, would the Crown please lock down the time periods as per the original closing date?

- = Feb 2008 to Jan 2013
- = Feb 2006 to Jan 2013

5. Given the fact that the last amendment had significant changes including all new forms which will take a significant amount of time to change and given that there are still a number of questions unanswered which have the potential of drastically changing our approach; we request a 10 day extension bringing the closing date to March 15th 2013?

ANSWER 106

1. One bid could contain more than one stream. If bidding three streams for example, the Bidder can submit one bid that contains those three streams in separate bound sections. In addition, the Bidder must provide, for each stream, the subject three sections (I; II and III) in separate bound sections.

2. No, the proposed change is not accepted.

3. No, the proposed change is not accepted.

4. No, the proposed change is not accepted.

5. The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 107

Suppliers with experience providing resources to the Federal Government of Canada during the timeframe limits of the RFP are likely to have provided most of these resources via TBIPS. However, TBIPS has tended to result in contracts that only have small volumes of resources associated with them. The evaluation criteria requires proof for billable days that are in some cases quite extensive, across multiple resource categories, further constrained by the limited number of projects and timeframes, which is at odds to typical TBIPS contracts. As a result, it greatly reduces potential suppliers down to a select few, or ones that can use contracts from outside Ottawa.

1. We request that the evaluation criteria be amended to allow any combination of contracts to be used to substantiate billable day requirements.

2. If not, please explain the rationale under which so many current TBIPS suppliers are being precluded from being able to respond.

ANSWER 107

1. No, the proposed change is not accepted.
2. The approach taken for this type of requirement is a common approach for high dollar value requirements.

QUESTION 108

As we are still awaiting a response on a number of outstanding questions, we are requesting a one-week extension to the close date on the above noted solicitation to provide adequate time to address any changes.

ANSWER 108

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

QUESTION 109

We are VERY concerned as there have been such long delays in responding to our questions yet the bid extension was only modest. Indeed we have been trying to get this issue clearly addressed since January 31st. Any advice would be greatly appreciated.

ANSWER 109

The new closing date of this RFP is March 08, 2013 at 2:00 pm.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED