

**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> JAVA APPLICATIONS PROF SERVICES	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 01B68-100049/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 01B68-100049	<b>Date</b> 2013-03-07
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-609-25292	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 609el.01B68-100049	<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 2013-03-25</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> Josée Bastien	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 609el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6770 ( )	<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 number 005 is raised to respond to the following Vendor's questions:**

#### **QUESTION 1**

In section M.4 - Application Development Methodology and Tool Set

a) The Bidder must identify by name and provide an overview of the formal application development methodology and tool set that it proposes to use to plan, design and develop the Java-based applications under the resulting contract in accordance with SOW article 2.4.4.

Would the Crown please provide clarification on what is meant by “application development methodology and tool set”. Specifically, by “tool set” are you asking for:

- i) the tool used for managing the application development process (such as PPMC), or
- ii) the tool used to manage the project schedule (such as Microsoft Project), or
- iii) the tool used during the application development process (such as for: requirements management, Java development, testing) or
- iv) something else?

#### **ANSWER 1**

At **Attachment 1, Bid Evaluation Criteria**, of the RFP, amend as follows:

**DELETE :**

**1.1 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS, M.4 Application Development Methodology and Tool Set**, in its entirety.

**INSERT:**

<b>Experience and Expertise of the Bidder</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Mandatory Requirement</b>	<b>Bidder's Response</b>
		<b>Demonstrated experience (Bidders to insert data)</b>
<b>M.4</b>	<b>Application Development Methodology and Tool Set</b>  The Bidder must identify by name the formal application development methodology and tool set that it proposes to use to plan, design and develop the Java-based applications under the resulting contract in accordance with SOW article 4.3. The Bidder must include a description of its formal Application Development	

Methodology as well as a list of any software products or tools that it proposes to utilize and an explanation of how each phase of the development framework (i.e. application development process) is supported by each proposed software product / tool.	
b) The Bidder must also identify how the application development methodology and tool set adheres, or is adaptable, to the Rational Unified Process (RUP). The bidder must also identify how the proposed application methodology and tool does this.	

## QUESTION 2

Rated requirements R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5 require the bidder to provide a project reference in support of the methodologies described in response to mandatory requirements M.3 to M.6. Each of these rated requirements have a portion of the total points awarded for technologies/frameworks, grouped under the title "Tools and Technologies". It is unclear how this list of tools and technologies pertains to the application of the methodologies documented in per R.2, R.3, R.4, and R.5. Methodologies are typically tool/technology independent, as such it is unclear how the inclusion of specific tools and technologies as part of the methodology requirements adds value to the evaluation of the methodologies used in the project references. Further, rated requirement R.1.2 already requires that Bidders demonstrate their experience with tools and technologies using reference projects, making this a duplicate request and would essentially award Bidders 'double points' for a given tool or technology (i.e., the bidder is awarded points for R.1.2 as well as requirements R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5). Given this overlap and lack of clarity on its contribution to evaluating methodologies, we respectfully request that the "Tools and Technologies" aspect of the R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5 requirements be removed.

## ANSWER 2

At **Attachment 1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 2. Point Rated Requirement**, of the RFP, amend as follows:

### DELETE :

Minimum pass marks have been assigned to each area of the technical evaluation criteria as specified in the table below.

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Technical Scoring Formula	Min. Pass Marks (70%)
<b>Corporate Experience:</b>			
•R-1 Corporate Experience (Reference Projects 1 -3)	300		
<b>Sub-total 1</b>	<b>300</b>	[Bidders Score for R-1 (out of 300) / 300] x 30 points	<b>21 points</b>
<b>Proposed Approach:</b>			

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Technical Scoring Formula	Min. Pass Marks (70%)
<b>Corporate Experience:</b>			
•R-2 Project Management Methodology	50		
•R-3 Application Development Methodology and Tool Set	50		
•R-4 Quality Management Program	50		
•R-5 Documentation of Deliverables	50		
•R-6 Experience Negotiating Application Development Projects Using A Phased Approach	50		
<b>Sub-total 2</b>	<b>250</b>	[Bidders Score for R-2 to R-6 (out of 250) / 250] x 30 points	<b>21 points</b>
<b>Final Technical Score = Sub-total 1 + Sub-total 2</b>		<b>60 points</b>	<b>42 points</b>

**INSERT:**

Minimum pass marks have been assigned to each area of the technical evaluation criteria as specified in the table below.

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Technical Scoring Formula	Min. Pass Marks (70%)
<b>Corporate Experience:</b>			
• R-1 Corporate Experience (Reference Projects 1 -3)	300		
<b>Sub-total 1</b>	<b>300</b>	[Bidders Score for R-1 (out of 300) / 300] x 30 points	<b>21 points</b>
<b>Proposed Approach:</b>			
• R-2 Project Management Methodology	40		
• R-3 Application Development Methodology and Tool Set	40		
• R-4 Quality Management Program	40		
• R-5 Documentation of Deliverables	40		
• R-6 Experience Negotiating Application Development Projects Using A Phased Approach	50		
<b>Sub-total 2</b>	<b>210</b>	[Bidders Score for R-2 to R-6 (out of 210) / 210] x 30 points	<b>21 points</b>

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Technical Scoring Formula	Min. Pass Marks (70%)
<b>Corporate Experience:</b>			
<b>Final Technical Score =</b>		<b>60 points</b>	<b>42 points</b>

**QUESTION 3**

Rated requirement R.1.1 awards full points for projects that meet all 7 of the requirements. Many clients may have performed the "Planning and Analysis" activities in advance of the issuance of an RFP, or similarly many clients have opted to perform "Application Enhancement, Support and Maintenance" activities in-house. As such, it is requested that the requirement be modified to allow the maximum score be achieved by meeting 6 out of 7 of the activities listed in Section 5 of the SOW.

**ANSWER 3**

At **ATTACHMENT 1 - BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, 2. POINT RATED REQUIREMENTS, R-1 CORPORATE EXPERIENCE (REFERENCE PROJECTS)**, of the RFP, amend as follows:

**DELETE: R.1.1, Scope of Work**, in it's entirety.

**INSERT:**

<b>Corporate Reference Project # _____</b>			
<b>Client Organization Name: _____</b>			
			<b>BIDDER'S RESPONSE</b>
<b>#</b>	<b>RATED CRITERIA</b>	<b>POINTS MAX</b>	<b>DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE</b>
			<b>(Bidders to insert data)</b>
<b>R.1.1</b>	<b>Scope of Work</b>  The Bidder should demonstrate that its work on the reference project included:  a) Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 3 out of 5 of the tasks and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 i;  b) Project Initiation - Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 3 out of 5 of the tasks	<b>30</b>	The Bidder will receive up to 30 points as follows:  <b>5 points</b> - for each criterion (a to g) demonstrated.

Corporate Reference Project # _____			
Client Organization Name: _____			
			BIDDER'S RESPONSE
#	RATED CRITERIA	POINTS MAX	DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (Bidders to insert data)
	<p>and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 ii;</p> <p>c) Application Planning - Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 4 out of 6 of the tasks and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 iii;</p> <p>d) Application &amp; Database Design - Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 7 out of 9 of the tasks and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 iv;</p> <p>e) Application Build - Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 9 out of 11 of the tasks and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 v;</p> <p>f) Testing - Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 6 out of 8 of the tasks and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 vi; and</p> <p>g) Application Enhancement, Support and Maintenance - Where the completed deliverables included a minimum of 4 out of 5 of the tasks and activities described in Annex A, SOW, section 5 vii.</p>		

**QUESTION 4**

Rated requirement R.1.3 will award each project a bonus of 5 points for R.1.3a) if the ERP application integrated was either SAP or PeopleSoft and a bonus of 5 points for R.1.3b) in the BI Tool integrated was IBM/Cognos BI Suite. It is understood that the rationale for awarding the bonus is the specific ERP applications and BI tools are most relevant to the AAFC environment. Given the size, scope and complexity of the projects requirements, Bidders may have experience with the integration of SAP/PeopleSoft and/or IBM/Cognos BI suite; however, as Bidders have no control over various clients'

technical environments, the projects used to meet the Corporate project requirements may not have used these specific applications/tools. It is requested that Bidders be allowed to provide supplemental project references, that can specifically demonstrate their experience with the integration of with SAP/PeopleSoft and/or IBM/Cognos BI suite in support of the bonus criteria.

#### ANSWER 4

The RFP remains unchanged.

#### QUESTION 5

Rated Requirement R.1.2 - In order to receive maximum points, Bidders need to propose projects that have technical environments that meet 10 out of 11 of the Tools & Technologies listed (a to k). Given the size, scope and complexity of the projects requirements and given the fact that Bidders have no control over various clients' technical environments, it is requested that the scoring be adjusted so that Bidders can obtain the maximum points should they be able to demonstrate they used 8 or 9 of the listed tools and technologies.

#### ANSWER 5

At **ATTACHMENT 1 - BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, 2. POINT RATED REQUIREMENTS, R-1 CORPORATE EXPERIENCE (REFERENCE PROJECTS)** of the RFP, amend as follows:

**DELETE:** R.1.2, in it's entirety.

#### INSERT:

<b>R.1.2</b>	<b>Tools &amp; Technologies</b>  The Bidder should demonstrate that it utilized any of the following tools, technologies or methods to develop the referenced Java enterprise application:  a) Workflow or business process management capabilities using a COTS or open source workflow/BPM solution incorporating open standards (e.g., BPMN, WS-BPEL);  b) Apache Axis 2 framework to implement web services;  c) Oracle (version 10g or higher) for persistent data storage;  d) Industry-dominant visual modeling tools that support Unified Modeling Language (UML) diagramming and code generation	<b>30</b>	The Bidder will receive up to 30 points as follows:  <b>3.75 points</b> - for each criterion (a to k) demonstrated to a maximum of 30 points.
--------------	---	-----------	---

<p>or round-trip engineering (e.g. Rational Software Architect, Sparx Enterprise Architect, Eclipse-based UML tools such as Eclipse UML2, MyEclipse UML or Apollo for Eclipse, No Magic MagicDraw, Gentleware Poseidon for UML);</p> <p>e) Use of an automated testing tool, such as Rational or Selenium, to support the testing of the application;</p> <p>f) Java application build automation tools such as Apache Ant or Apache Maven;</p> <p>g) Eclipse or an Eclipse-based tool (i.e. Rational Software Architect, CodeGear JBuilder, MyEclipse) as an Integrated Development Environment;</p> <p>h) Integration technologies that utilize SOAP or REST as an open standard;</p> <p>i) Iterative and incremental application development methodology based on the Unified Software Development Process;</p> <p>j) Subversion (SVN) as a source code version control system;</p> <p>k) Atlassian JIRA as a bug and issue tracking system.</p>		
---	--	--

**QUESTION 6**

We would like to request a high level copy of AAFC's Enterprise Technical Architecture Framework (ETAF) This would assist the vendors in understanding how their Application Development and Project Management methodologies would align to the ETAF.

**ANSWER 6**

The information contained in Appendix A to Annex A, AAFC Technical Background Information, of the RFP provides sufficient information for Bidder's to develop their proposal.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**