



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 DP - DPDA	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation M7594-125928/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client M7594-125928	Date 2013-02-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-602-25449	
File No. - N° de dossier 602el.M7594-125928	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-04-02	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
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: Ouellet, Monique	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 602el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1775 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-5925
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

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

This amendment is issued to amend the RFP.

1) At Attachment 3.2, Mandatory Requirement M1 Article 2) for all Sub-Requirements:

Delete: 5 years

Insert: 8 years

2) At Attachment 3.2, Mandatory Requirement M2 for all Sub-Requirements:

Delete: \$5 million

Insert: \$1 million

QUESTION 1:

Given the extent of the forensic accounting to prepare a response to the Corporate-based mandatory and rated requirements, would the Crown please grant a two week extension. There are also Easter holidays within the solicitation period and a significant amount of large-scale GoC RFSO/RFSAs due within this timeframe, including the TBIPS Master Agreement Refresh and THS, which will affect all prospective Bidders.

ANSWER 1:

Canada is not willing to grant an extension to the solicitation closing date at this time.

QUESTION 2:

Re: Attachment 3.2, M1 & M2 for all Sub-Requirements

The Corporate Mandatory requirements M1 & M2 require that substantiating corporate references be for professional services provided and contract experience within the last five years. There are a limited number of large-scale professional services contracts within the NCR which could support this requirement and those that would qualify are typically longer-term multi-year contracts. Given the high value required (\$5M) and high number of billable days being sought, would the crown please expand this window to the past eight years to promote more competition and allow similar and relevant contracts, such as the previous iteration of this RCMP supply arrangement, to be used?

ANSWER 2:

The requested change is accepted as per Article 1) above. The requested change for M2 is not accepted.

QUESTION 3:

Re: Attachment 3.2, M2 for all Sub-Requirements

This requirement assumes that most of the large-scale supply arrangements with contract values in excess of \$5M are renewals where a losing vendor's resources would have to be transitioned to a new vendor. Many of the recent supply arrangement contracts within the NCR, using the technologies identified within this RFP, have been net new contracts and therefore little to no transition required making this mandatory requirement unfairly strict. Would the Crown please consider reducing this requirement from a minimum of 3 contracts to a minimum of 1 contract?

ANSWER 3:

In light of the decreased contract value at Article 2) above, the requested change is not accepted.

QUESTION 4:

Re: Attachment 3.2, Sub-Requirement 5 M1 & R1

The minimum Billable Days for this sub-requirement is excessively high. For a company to meet this mandatory and achieve maximum points they must have provided more than 20 Java resources billing every day for a period of 5 years within the National Capital Region. There are only a couple of companies in Canada that could achieve these numbers, making this requirement incredibly restrictive, excluding even most of the top 5 staffing providers on TBIPS T2 from consideration. Would the Crown please consider reducing the minimum billable days to 5,550 days which would result in 11,100 billable days to score maximum points? This number would be in line with recent TBIPS T2 RFSA's for Shared Services (2B0KB-13-2175) and CBSA (47060-136911/A).

ANSWER 4:

On the basis of the increased timeframe at Article 1) above, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 5:

Re: Attachment 3.2, Sub-Requirement 6 M1 & R1

The combination of technologies and resource categories being sought in this stream are not found on many of the recent large-scale supply arrangements within the NCR. Therefore achieving the number of billable days required to meet the mandatory requirement and score maximum points is excessively restrictive within the timeframe and the number of contracts permitted. Would the Crown please consider reducing the minimum billable days for the Windows Application Software architect, ETL Programmer Analyst and the Rational Testers by at least 50%?

ANSWER 5:

On the basis of the increased timeframe at Article 1) above, the proposed change is not accepted.

QUESTION 6:

Re: Attachment 3.2, Sub-Requirement 6 M1 & R1

The resource category of ERP Technical Analyst is a niche category not held by all TBIPS T2 suppliers. Considering two of the six streams already have ERP resources categories, by including the ERP Technical Analyst category in this stream, now 50% of the streams provide an unfair advantage to vendors who specialize in the provision of ERP professional services. To promote more competition, would the Crown please consider changing this resource category to a System Analyst, Database Analyst or Technology/Technical Architect?

ANSWER 6:

The proposed change has been considered and is not accepted.

QUESTION 7:

As per Section 7.8 Payment Credits e (i) Failure to Provide Resource: "If the Contractor does not provide a required professional services resource that has all the required qualifications within the time prescribed by this contract including its Task Authorizations, the Contractor must credit to Canada an amount equal to the per diem rate (based on a 7.5-hour workday) of the required resource for each day (or partial day) of delay in providing the resource, up to a maximum of 10 days."

Has the RCMP ever invoked this clause? If so, might you provide more details surrounding the circumstances?

ANSWER 7:

The RCMP does not recollect receiving such a credit.

QUESTION 8:

As per Section 7.8 Payment Credits e (ii) Corrective Measures: "Clarify the expectations on this Corrective Measures: If credits are payable under this Article for three consecutive Task Authorizations or for five Task Authorizations in any 12-month period, the Contractor must submit a written action plan describing measures it will implement or actions it will undertake to eliminate the recurrence of the problem. The Contractor will have five working days to deliver the action plan to the Client and the Contracting Authority and 20 working days to rectify the underlying problem."

Might the RCMP clarify or make suggestions as to "Corrective Measures" and the expectations of the "written action plan?"

ANSWER 8:

This question cannot be answered as it would be dependant on the actual circumstance.

QUESTION 9:

The RCMP has issued a previous instance of a very similar requirement (2011-07-22). Title - Sujet: PMADS IM/IT Professional Services. Solicitation No. - No. de l'invitation: M7594-112527/A. Please provide details as to the need to issue this current requirement?

ANSWER 9:

This bid solicitation represents the replacement of M7594-112527/A.

QUESTION 10:

With respect to M2 of all streams, the requirement for all contracts to have involved a "transition-in" will exclude large numbers of potential contracts from consideration. For example, for any supplier that re-secured their status as an incumbent on the last formally awarded iteration of the RCMP Application Development contract, it would not meet the requirement of a "transition-in" contract since they were not replacing any other supplier, but simply continuing the provision of a previously established service. This means that any contract of a repeating nature of sufficient length where the original award was outside the 5-year timeframe and subsequently the supplier re-secured their role as an incumbent supplier within the last 5 years, it cannot be used as proof of compliance. It also means that any contract for a new initiative will not qualify either, since there is no previous supplier and therefore no requirement to transition-in. There are few enough \$5m contracts awarded, so with the transition-in requirement it effectively eliminates a notable percent of any potential projects.

We therefore request that the requirement for projects to have involved transition-in be removed.

ANSWER 10:

The requested change is not accepted

QUESTION 11:

With respect to M2 of all streams, the requirement that all contracts be at least \$5m in value is very restrictive. There are relatively few contracts awarded of this value on a consistent basis. In fact, most contracts under TBIPS are issued via Tier 1 and tend to be for single resources and smaller numbers of

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

M7594-125928/A

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

M7594-125928

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

File No. - N° du dossier

602e1M7594-125928

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

602e1

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

resources. A successful TBIPS supplier could have \$20m-\$30m a year in provable resource service capability, but still not qualify because of the size of contracts that must be demonstrated. Recent RFPs for large professional services contracts requiring more resource capacity than RCMP have only required the projects to be a minimum of \$1M. A relevant example is the recent CBSA Supply Chain RFP, wherein contracts only needed to be a minimum of \$1m, but the overall potential resource need suggested as much as \$150m-\$200m of professional services per year would be contracted.

Given that a much larger initiative used smaller contract values, we request that the requirement be changed so that contracts need only have been a minimum of \$1m each.

ANSWER 11:

The requested change is accepted as per Article 2) above.

QUESTION 12:

With respect to M2 of all streams, the requirement to have billed a minimum number of resources within the first 60-days of the contract is restrictive. It is known that the RCMP's own security screening process takes upwards of 10 weeks, and sometimes longer, for clearing personnel. Any contract where VCR's are required imposes an immediate constraint since the VCR must be tied to a contract, so there is an inherent delay between award and any potential first billable day. Even in "regular" contracts, there is often a delay between initial contract award and the first initiation of Task Authorizations.

We request that the timeframe in which the resources must have been billed be increased to the first 180 days of contract award.

ANSWER 12:

In light of the decreased contract value at Article 2) above, the requested change is not accepted.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.