

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 24062-130039/A		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 24062-130039		<b>Date</b> 2013-04-25
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-619-25971		
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 619el.24062-130039	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-05-14</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Perkins, Deborah		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 619el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-8656 ( )		<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>		

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

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

---

**This amendment No. 1 to Request for Proposal 24062-130039/A is drawn up to change the bid closing date and to address the following Questions and Answers:**

**Delete the bid closing date from:**

May 7, 2013 Eastern Daylight Time (EST) and

**Replaced with the new bid closing date of:**

May 14, 2013 Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) at 2:00 pm.

**Question 1**

With regards to Rated Corporate Criteria R1 on page 93 of RFP 24062-13009/A: In restricting the ability to score full points on the Client References to Federal and Provincial Government entities, TBS will severely limit the number of proposal responses from the vendor community. We believe that it would be in TBS best interest to allow bidders to submit Corporate Project References from Municipal Government clients because the contracting processes of Municipal entities is extremely similar to the Task Authorization processes of Federal and Provincial Government entities. For example, Municipal Government Procurement is conducted through Task Authorizations to existing Standing Offers held by Vendors, which include a Statement of Work in which qualification and experience requirements must be met by the Vendor's proposed resources. The evaluation of proposed resources at the Municipal Government level is similar to that of the Federal or Provincial Government and once awarded a contract the Municipal entity will issue a Purchase Order (the Call-Up against the Standing Offer) in order to proceed with the delivery of services. In an effort to promote fair and competitive procurement (which the TBS is a strong proponent of based on your mandate) would TBS please consider amending Rated Corporate Criteria R1 to include Municipal Government entities in order to score full points?

**Answer 1**

TBS has considered the request and will not change the requirement to include Municipal Government. Federal and Provincial Governments are subject to complex policies and legislation that do not apply to Municipal Government entities. TBS requires bidders that have conducted projects in organizations that are subject to these policies and legislation and have experience conducting projects in this environment.

**Question 2**

With the large number of resources required in the proposal in response to RFP 24062-13009/A, in addition to the Corporate requirements, we respectfully request an extension of two (2) weeks so that vendors may propose the highest quality of resources possible to aid the TBS IMTD Project Delivery Office in the successful delivery of projects.

**Answer 2**

TBS will grant a one (1) week extension as requested.

**Question 3**

Ref: ANNEX D BID/CONTRACT EVALUATION CRITERIA Page 67 of 94 (Part 2 of 2)

Technical proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the following evaluation criteria (Mandatory and Rated Requirements). Instructions

When completing the resource grids, the specific information, which demonstrates the requested criteria and reference to the page number of the resume, should be incorporated so that the evaluator can verify this information. It is not acceptable that the tables should contain all the project information from the resume. Only the specific answer should be provided.

DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDER TO INSERT DATA)	INSERT PAGE # OF RESUME
--	-------------------------

Would TBC consider removing cross-reference to the resume as long as the substantiation is clearly marked and at least as easily found in the resume?

### Answer 3

TBS has consider the request and will not change the requirement, the cross-reference to the resume remains.

### Question 4

On Pages 81-83, Business Analyst – Level 3 Rated Criteria, Rated Criteria R2-R4 list the Business Analyst as Level II. Can you confirm that the requirements are indeed for a Level III (3) Business Analyst.

### Answer 4

Yes the requirements are for a Level III (3) Business Analyst.

### Question 5

Is there currently, or has there been in the 12 months, a vendor performing these services as outlined in the RFP Statement of Work? If so, please provide the vendor name, contract duration and dollar value.

### Answer 5

While currently there are resources in some similar capacities, this RFP is designated to satisfy future requirements. The vendors that are in similar capacity are Cistel and Veritaaq, contract values vary approximately \$25K to \$80K based on a Task Authorization requirement.

### Question 6

Under M1 for the Business Analyst - Level 3, please confirm that the total of 120 months experience means for the sum total of business requirements PLUS business cases. For example, if the proposed resource has 120 months experience in writing business requirements but 0 months experience writing business cases, will this resource be deemed complaint for this criterion?

### Answer 6

It is the sum total of business requirements plus business cases. Therefore, the resource would not be deemed compliant as in the example above-mentioned.

**Question 7**

Under M1 for the Project Coordinator - Level 3, please confirm if this requirement seeks experience in any PDO that meets the definition contained therein, or if it must be a PDO specifically within TBS.

**Answer 7**

Any PDO will do.

**Question 8**

For the Business Process Re-engineering Consultant - to score full points in R2, they would have had to worked on 4 projects, all of which lasted more than 60 months (5 years). This is a very limiting restriction - to ask a consultant to have 20+ years of experience working on a total of just 4 projects. The nature of the work performed by consultants, rarely have them working on projects that last for 5+ years. Would the Crown alter the scoring system to read "The bidder should provide up to four (4) written project summaries, with each project lasting at least 6 months." 4 projects=20 points, 3 projects=15 points, 2 projects=10 points, 1 project=5 points."

**Answer 8**

The Business Process Re-engineering Consultant - R2 - point rating is changed as follows:

5 points: Over 24 months

4 points: 19 months to 24 months

3 points: 13 months to 18 months

2 points: 6 months to 12 months

0 points: 5 months experience or less

**Question 9**

For the Business Analyst - to score full points in R2 and R3, the consultant would have had to work on 5 projects, each of which lasted more than 24 months (2 years). Again by focusing points on the length of the project alone, this is very limiting. Many BA's have them working on various projects for various lengths of time. Would the Crown alter the scoring system to read "The bidder should provide up to five (5) written project summaries, with each project lasting at least 6 months." 5 projects = 50 points, 4 projects=40 points, 3 projects=30 points, 2 projects =20 points, 1 project=10 points."

**Answer 9**

These ratings remain unchanged. As-IS

**Question 10**

Further on the Business Analyst - to score full points in R4 the consultant would have had to work on 5 projects, each of which lasted more than 60 months (5 years). This restriction requires a consultant to have worked on a total of 5 projects for over 25 years. Would the Crown alter the scoring system to read "The bidder should provide up to five (5) written project summaries, with each project lasting at least 6 months." 5 projects = 25 points, 4 projects=20 points, 3 projects=15 points, 2 projects =10 points, 1 project=5 points."

**Answer 10**

The Business Analyst - R4 - point rating is changed as follows:

5 points: Over 24 months  
 4 points: 19 months to 24 months  
 3 points: 13 months to 18 months  
 2 points: 6 months to 12 months  
 0 points: 5 months experience or less

**Question 11**

For the Technical Writer - to score full points on R1 and R2 the consultant would have had to work on 4 projects, each of which lasted more than 24 months (2 years). By focusing points on the length of the project alone, this is very limiting. Many Technical Writers work on various projects for various lengths of time - depending on specific requirements - in many cases Technical Writers are brought in on projects after development is underway or even finished. Would the Crown alter the scoring system to read "The bidder should provide up to four (4) written project summaries, with each project lasting at least 6 months." 4 projects=20 points, 3 projects=15 points, 2 projects =10 points, 1 project=5 points."

**Answer 11**

These ratings remain unchanged. As-IS

**Question 12**

For the Project Executive - to score full points in R3, they would have had to worked on 5 projects, all of which lasted more than 60 months (5 years). This is a very limiting restriction - to ask a consultant to have 25+ years of experience working on a total of just 5 projects. The nature of the work performed by consultants, rarely have them working on projects that last for 5+ years. Would the Crown alter the scoring system to read "The bidder should provide up to five (5) written project summaries, with each project lasting at least 6 months." 5 projects = 50 points, 4 projects=40 points, 3 projects=30 points, 2 projects =20 points, 1 project=10 points."

**Answer 12**

The Project Executive - R3 - point rating is changed as follows:

5 points: Over 24 months  
 4 points: 19 months to 24 months  
 3 points: 13 months to 18 months  
 2 points: 6 months to 12 months  
 0 points: 5 months experience or less

### Question 13

For the Project Coordinator - to score full points in R1 and R2, they would have had to worked on 4 projects, all of which lasted more than 60 months (5 years). This is a very limiting restriction - to ask a consultant to have 20+ years of experience working on a total of just 4 projects. The nature of the work performed by consultants, rarely have them working on projects that last for 5+ years. "The bidder should provide up to four (4) written project summaries, with each project lasting at least 6 months." 4 projects=20 points, 3 projects=15 points, 2 projects =10 points, 1 project=5 points."

### Answer 13

The Project Coordinator - R1 and R2 - point rating is changed as follows:

5 points: Over 24 months  
 4 points: 19 months to 24 months  
 3 points: 13 months to 18 months  
 2 points: 6 months to 12 months  
 0 points: 5 months experience or less

### Question 14

For both the Project Manager Level 2 and Project Manager Level 3 the rated criteria points system does not add up to be correct. For Project Manager Level 2, R2, it states a maximum of 50 points can be obtained using a total of 5 projects. Yet the scoring indicates that 5 projects = 10 points. Written this way, indicates that the maximum point total any consultant could achieve on the criteria is 10 points - not 50. The same holds true for Project Manager Level 3, questions R2 and R3. Would Canada please clarify the rated requirements in both of this grids?

### Answer 14

The Project Manager Level 2 - R2 point rating is changed as follows:

10 points (maximum points)  
 Up to 10 points in accordance with the scales below  
 Demonstrates **skills on** .... for all of the rated points

### Question 15

The Project Manager Level 3 - R2 and R3 point rating is changed as follows:

10 points (maximum points)  
 Up to 10 points in accordance with the scales below  
 Demonstrates **skills on** .... for all of the rated points

### Question 16

Page 45 of the bid document indicates Canada will require 2 Business Analysts and 3 Project Managers (level 2). Does Canada require bidders to present 2 BAs and 3 PMs at the time of bid submission? Or are bidders required to only provide 1 of each at bid submission?

---

**Answer 16**

As per the RFP Section 1.2 Summary (g) "The following resource in the Category of Personnel described below is required on an "as and when requested basis" in accordance with the TBIPS SA Annex "B". Bidders should note that **seven resources** (one from each category) will be evaluated as part of this bid solicitation."

**Question 17**

Regarding Corporate Rated Criteria R1, would the Crown accept clients who were/are US Federal or State departments or agencies, as well as clients from private industry?

**Answer 17**

No US or private industry is not acceptable.

**Question 18**

In Annex B, for the Initial Contract Period, the Project Coordinator is identified as Level 2, but on page 74 the role is referred to as Level 3. There are other such level-related discrepancies in the RFP.

**Answer 18**

The appropriate roles and levels for the resources throughout the RFP and Contract should read as follows:

BPR – Level 2

BA – Level 3

Technical Writer – Level 2

Project Executive – Level 3

Project Coordinator – Level 3

Project Manager – Level 2

Project Manager – Level 3