

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

**Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement**

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

Electronic Information Technology Professional Srv
Div/Div des srv professionnels en technologie de
l'information électronique

11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier

Portage III 0A1 - 1

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-055605/E		Date 2013-03-04
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-055605		Amendment No. - N° modif. 010
File No. - N° de dossier 003ei.EN578-055605	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EI-003-25338		
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale		2013-01-18
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-03-25		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Benoit(003ei), Real		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 003ei
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 934-4667 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-7827	
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée		
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:		
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.		

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

Solicitation Amendment #10

This solicitation amendment is raised to make the following:

A: Modifications #11 and #12

B: Questions and Answers

A: Modification # 11

In the Table of Contents:

Delete:

COMPONENT I: REQUEST FOR BIDS

PART 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Introduction
2. Summary
3. Security Requirement
4. Communications Notification
5. Debriefings
6. Key Terms

Insert:

COMPONENT I: REQUEST FOR BIDS

PART 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Introduction
2. Summary
3. Security Requirement
4. Debriefings
5. Key Terms

Delete:

COMPONENT I: REQUEST FOR BIDS

PART 5 - CERTIFICATIONS

1. Certifications Precedent to Issuance of an Instrument
2. Set-Aside for Aboriginal Business

Insert:**COMPONENT I: REQUEST FOR BIDS****PART 5 - CERTIFICATIONS**

1. Certifications to be submitted with the hard copy of the bid
2. Certifications Precedent to Issuance of a Standing Offer for Supply Arrangement

A: Modification # 12**Delete:****Under Amendment #9, Answer 123:**

Your observations are correct. The statement in the Data Collection Module is incorrect (based on previous text version) and has been rectified as of March 28, 2013.

Although a list of the Directors will be required (updated), the information is not required with the bid.

Insert:**Under Amendment #9, Answer 123:**

Your observations are correct. The statement in the Data Collection Module is incorrect (based on previous text version) and has been rectified as of March 01, 2013.

Although a list of the Directors will be required (updated), the information is not required with the bid.

B: Questions and Answers**Q 135:**

1. **Upon a detailed review of the Bid solicitation EN578-055605/E (English version) it was noted that a section of the bid solicitation may have been omitted or the table of contents may be in error.**
2. **Please note all page references are based on the page number from the Adobe PDF reader page referencing.**
3. **In Table of Contents, Page 3 of 108; Component I; Part 1 - General Information; Section 4. is titled Communications Notification.**
4. **When one goes to referenced location in table of contents on page 9 of 108; Section 4 is titled "Debriefings" and no section titled "Communications Notification" is provided.**
5. **Question: Is it the intent of Canada to remove the Section of the Bid Solicitation titled "Communications Notification", or are there particular instructions, requirements or directions related to the bid solicitation that have been inadvertently omitted?**
6. **Your attention regarding this matter would be greatly appreciated. Our apologies for not bringing this to your attention sooner. We look forward to PWGSCs response to properly address any requirements this section may contain. Feel free to contact myself via e-mail or at cell xxx-xxx-xxxx should you require any additional information.**

A 135:

Please refer to Modification #11 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Q 136:

- 1) **M4 Total Cumulative Value Billed asks for the Description of the Services Performed. Is it permissible to simply identify a resource type (i.e. a Resource Category but not necessarily one that lines up with the TBIPS ones (understanding that it must be for IPS))? If this is not acceptable can you please describe exactly what is required under this description.**
- 2) **M5 With respect to a project reference, is there any minimum term that the resource must have worked?**

A 136:

- 1) **No. The description of services rendered must explain how it is an IM/IT project or how the tasks performed were for informatics professional services.**

2) No

Q 137:

Here is my question:

Re: AMD 005, A39, 2b

In the case where billings from a wholly-owned subsidiary are being included as part of the TCVB:

- a) Please confirm that the 50% limit for value billed by a subsidiary applies to the TCVB and not to individual projects/contracts used as part of demonstrating TCVB.**
- b) For greater clarity on (a), please confirm that projects/contracts that were 100% billed/performed by a subsidiary are permitted, so long as the TCVB across all the projects does not exceed 50%**
- c) If the responses to (a) and (b) are yes, would it be acceptable to provide a statement in an introduction paragraph above the table confirming/warranting that the total amount to the subsidiary does not exceed 50% of the TCVB, while providing the name of the subsidiary in the right-hand column for those contracts/projects where the value billed is that of the subsidiary?**

A 137:

- a) Correct
- b) Correct
- c) Yes

Q 138:

Can you please indicate if there is a way for us to drop one of our current 'unsubstantiated categories' within TBIPS Stream 1 (A) Application Services and replace it with a different unsubstantiated category in the same stream?

A 138:

No. Please refer to M.5, 7 iii) of Attachment B and/or C.

Q 139:

Pg. 20 Financial Viability 4.2 States: "If the bidder is a joint venture, the financial Information required by the offer/arrangement Authority must be provided by each member of the Joint Venture."

Yet attachment B and C, Financial Certification M1 1.3 states: "If the bidder is a joint venture, the Financial Certification must be provided by at least one member of the Joint Venture."

Which is correct?

A 139:

The M.1 - Financial Certification is a mandatory criteria that must be met by bid closing.

The Financial Viability from section 4.2 is only required if and when requested by the SA/SO Authority.

Q 140:

Re: Part 2 – Bidder Instructions, 1.3 Bid Participation

- 1) **If we are an existing Tier 1 SA/SO Holder who is qualified under both under the SPAB and non-SPAB, is that considered as two submissions?**
- 2) **Would we still meet the requirements of 1.3 Bid Participation if we do the following:**
 - (a) **We would like to qualify for two additional streams in addition to refreshing our rates of existing streams. For one of the additional stream we can qualify on our own and will be a part of our refresh submission as a TBIPS SA/SO holder in both the SPAB and non-SPAB.**
 - (b) **For the 2nd additional stream, we would like to submit as a JV entity with another firm.**

A 140:

- 1) No
- 2) (a) Yes. As an existing TBIPS Holder, you can bid for additional streams.
- (b) The joint venture would be considered as a different legal entity. The JV would have to submit a bid as a new bidder. The grandfather certification would not apply.

Q 141:

We are a Canadian subsidiary of a US parent Company. We work jointly with our parent company to deliver services in Canada. We would like to use project references from our Canadian, as well as other global companies, in our proposal. We qualified for the last TBIPs award and in it were allowed to use US references. Please clarify if it is acceptable to use the same or other US references during this refresh.

A 141:

References are acceptable as long as the work referenced was provided by the Bidder or the subsidiary. A subsidiary cannot use the references of the parent company.

Q 142:

1.

(a) In regards to determining vendor compliance with the M4 Total Cumulative Value Billed requirement for both the SO and SA, would it not be more cost effective approach for both the Crown and perspective bidders to only require bidders to submit the required financial certifications accompanied by up to 3 years of financial statements to clearly establish the fact that bidders had indeed met the minimum TCVB values, which if my memory serves me correctly was the way compliance with these criteria were established in the past.

(b) If not, could you please explain what value asking vendors to provide the details of each contract in a hardcopy and electronic format, add to the process when a simple certification would establish that the revenues claimed in the Income Statement were for professional services.

2. The table that must be submitted M4 1.a) to demonstrate compliance with the Total Cumulative Value Billed requirement that the amounts provided in any Financial Statements or Certifications are for Informatics Professional Services only, requests a Description of Services Performed in one of the columns. In the spirit of the GOC Policy on Green Procurement would it be acceptable to only identify the categories of TBIPS, TSPS, THS or their functional equivalent resources provided for these contracts in order to satisfy this requirement, and reduce the paperwork required to demonstrate compliance.

A 142:

1. (a) No

1. (b) Project details to satisfy M.4, as outlined in Attachments B and/or C, have always been required in hard copy. The Data Collection Component does not currently have the ability to capture the necessary details necessary to satisfy M.4.

2. No. A description is required as explained in A136 1) of this Solicitation Amendment.

Q 143:

1. In the DCC vendors who have a current TBIPS SO and/ or SA in good standing can go the certifications section and select the Grandfather Certification and then provide a copy of the completed Attachment E from the RFP and submit with their hard copy to PWGSC.

How do these vendors respond in the DCC under the Mandatory Criteria to Financial, Certification, Number of Months in Business, Insurance Requirements, and other areas where the Grandfather Certification is in effect? For each of these sections the only option

is to select the check box that state “I agree to the statement above”. The concern is that, if this box is checked then PWGSC will expect updated information and on the flip side if something isn’t check in this area we might be deemed no-compliant for an incomplete bid.

2. M.5 Identification of Categories

As an existing supplier providing additional categories or as a new supplier trying to respond to this requirement, page 15 – 16 of the bid identifies that that information for this criteria is to be entered into the DCC. Under the SO and SA Technical Evaluation Criteria M.5 point 5 talks about an email going to clients for verification of a vendor providing these services. There is no place in the DCC for a vendor provide information to substantiate a newly offered category. It would appear that under mandatory criteria, stream information, vendors are able to “View categories” by stream and select one of “Newly Substantiated; Newly Unsubstantiated; Currently Substantiated; Currently Unsubstantiated; or Not Offered” No matter which of these fields selected no additional area is provided for vendors to substantiate their claim. At a minimum, the Crown requires a contact and email address in order to send out their confirmation emails.

- (a) Can the Crown please confirm where in the DCC this information is to be provided?
- (b) Or Was the Crown anticipating that that substantiation would be included in the hard copy response?
- (c) If this is the case how much information and in what format does the Crown wish the substantiation information to be provided?

A 143:

1. Current TBIPS Holders, must submit the signed hard copy of the Grandfather Certification from Attachment E with their bid. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 007, Clarification 10. In the DCC, you have the option of selecting “I agree” to the mandatory criteria or leaving these sections blank if the Grandfather Certification applies.

2.(a) Instructions are detailed in the “Supplier Easy Steps - for the Data Collection Component” and can be found at the following link. Scroll down to the section titled “Mandatory Criteria”. Find subsection “a. Stream Information” and then “Offering Categories”:

<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/spc-cps/espfcdd-sesdcc-eng.html>

- 2.(b) No
- 2.(c) Bidders must input all substantiation information in the DCC. Please refer to A 143, 2 (a) and (b) above.

Q 144:

a) How does an existing TBIPS Supplier apply for additional categories/streams/tiers as it is not clear? It keeps referencing Attachment B and C. Where do we find this?

b) What are the mandatory requirements to get on Tier 2 or on the new Streams 6 and 7 (TEMS and CPSA Categories)? Please advise.

c) Where can we get Attachments A to H?

d) How does a Supplier comply on Tier 2 and Stream 6 or 7?

e) Can you please provide an extension to March 25 allowing an extra weekend to prepare? March Break is week of March 11 – 15 therefore people have planned for vacation well in advance. We would appreciate your consideration on this matter.

A 144:

a) The downloaded Solicitation document was assembled in the following order: Components I, II, III followed by Annexes A through F, and finally Attachments A through H. To find Attachments B and C, look towards the end of the downloaded solicitation document.

b) Details provided in Attachments B and C outline the requirements to qualify for Tier 2 and Streams 6 and 7.

c) Refer to A144 a) above.

d) Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #3, A5.

e) Please refer to Modification #09 of Solicitation Amendment #9.

Q 145:

Under M.5 – Identification of Categories, it is noted that the basis for award for unsubstantiated categories is 50% of the number of substantiated categories. However, we have also noted for all past iterations of TBIPS, the Crown set a precedent for rounding up whenever the number of substantiated resources was an odd number. I.e.. Five substantiated categories would yield an additional 3 unsubstantiated. Can we assume that in the interest of fairness to companies who do not currently have the benefit of being grandfathered, the same method will be applied?

A 145:

The two previous TBIPS refreshes rounded down. The National Procurement Strategy for Professional Services has also established the rounding down methodology as a standard practice.

Q 146:

In the most recent amendment to this solicitation, the bid due date was extended to March 15th, 2013. While we are sure that this extension was well intended and appreciated by

some, it should be noted that the benefit of this extension is negligible to many given that March 15 falls at the end of the March break school holiday for Ontario schools. As such, many families will be away on holidays and many vendors will be operating with a diminished work force during this time. Likewise, management teams or signing authorities may not be available to finalize and sign off on bids. There is a distinct possibility that final Amendments (Q&As) will result in the need for last minute revisions before sign off. It is therefore requested that the bid due date be extended by one additional week.

A 146:

Please refer to Modification #09 from Solicitation Amendment #9.

Q 147:

For Q&A 87 (2.) there was a portion of the question that was not addressed as follows: "... Similarly, for projects that aren't complete, do we enter "on-going" in the end date...?"

Could you reply to that portion of the question as well please?

A 147:

The start and end dates of the projects are irrelevant. The start and end dates to satisfy M.4 refer to invoices. Therefore "ongoing" is not an option.

Q 148:

1. Question 79 in amendment 7 provides a populated table as an example to demonstrate compliance with M4. Within the 'Description of the Services Performed' column, the example contained:

A. Description of the contract/project and objectives/statement of work

B. List of categories of personnel supported/required within contract/project

C. List of categories of personnel that vendor has placed resources against, including count within each. Example: We have place 14 Programmer/Analysts, 3 Testers, and 23 Systems Analysts throughout the duration of this contract in support of the client.

Question: This example assumes that the informatics professional services project was procured under the TBIPS vehicle and have associated 'personnel categories' (B and C, above). For informatics professional service projects that were not procured under TBIPS, and thus do not have 'categories' of personnel, can the contracting authority confirm that B and C are optional information as applicable to the project, and that providing A would be sufficient to comply with M4?

2. In order to qualify for Tier 2 of TBIPS, M3 requires the bidder to "hold a minimum of \$2M Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage as of the date of bid

submission". Our insurance provider has issued a CGL certificate for \$1M per accident/occurrence and annual aggregate of \$10M, with an excess umbrella top-up (that can be applied to both individual accidents/occurrences and the annual aggregate) of \$1M, resulting in a CGL insurance coverage of \$2M per accident/occurrence and \$11M total aggregate.

Question: Can the contracting authority please confirm that this arrangement is compliant with the minimum CGL insurance requirement of M3?

A 148:

1. Yes. The description of services rendered must explain how it is an IM/IT project or how the tasks performed were for informatics professional services.
2. Yes

Q 149:

Could you please clarify if the Certifications (identified in Part 3, Section III, page 14) that need to be printed and included in our response are to be included as part of the printed Technical Bid or should they be left separate?

A 149:

Any required printed material must be submitted in hard copy with the bid by the closing date.

Q 150:

We currently hold our own CPSA and will be submitting our own TBIPS (Grandfathering) and adding Stream 6. We are also forming a new JV with another company, please confirm that our grandfathering clause is applicable to the new JV also.

A 150:

No. The new JV would be considered as a new bidder. The grandfather certification only applies to the TBIPS Holder.

Q 151:

In Section M5. Identification of Categories, 6. iii:

“In the event that no response is received from the reference by the due date stated in the original email: A second email will be sent to the reference requesting that they respond to the questions stated. If no response is received to the second request by the date indicated in the email, the evaluation team will follow-up with a telephone call to the

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EN578-055605/E

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

010

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

003ei

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

EN578-055605

File No. - N° du dossier

003eiEN578-055605

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

reference. If a response is not received by the time and date established by the evaluation team, that particular category will not be included in the Bidder's offer."

At present, the TBIPS Refresh is due March 4, 2013. The week of March 4, 2013 is the Quebec March break, and the week following, March 11, 2013 is the Ontario March break. Many clients take vacation at this time to coincide with their children's time off.

Because the process does not allow for re-engagement with the Bidder following a 'no response' from the reference we respectfully request that PWGSC confirm that no reference checks will be conducted between March 4th and March 18th inclusive.

A 151:

Confirmed