

**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> IT SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN PROJECT	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 47060-136911/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 47060-136911	<b>Date</b> 2013-01-31
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$SEL-615-25342	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 615el.47060-136911	<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 2013-02-19</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<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> Ghaddab Nabil	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 615el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-5419 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-5925
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> See herein	

**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 solicitation amendment is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and to amend the Solicitation.

## **QUESTION 9**

**9.1.** Please advise which companies have been providing these services in the recent past and the dollar value and/or number of days services provided.

**ANSWER 9.1** – “ Currently, CBSA contracts for this work through individual, one-off RFPs and contracts; as such there are many incumbents. They include:

Aerotek ULC o/a TEKsystems Canada, Ajilon Canada, Alcea technologies Inc., Amita Corporation, AQR Management Services Inc., BiR Consulting Inc., Brainhunter, Calian Ltd., Chippewa, CompuAids Inc., Coradix Technology Consulting Inc., Dalian Enterprises, Design Group Staffing Inc. o/a The People Bank, Donna Cona Inc., DWP Solutions Inc., Eagle Professional Resources Inc., Emerion, Excel Human Resources Inc., Global Interfaces, IBISKA Telecom Inc., IMP Group Ltd. o/a IMP Solutions, IT/NET - Ottawa Inc., IT Solutions Inc., Lumina IT Inc., Manpower Services Canada Ltd., Modis Canada Inc., Night Hawk Technologies Inc., Nisha Technologies Inc., Promaxis Systems Ltd., Perspektiva Inc., Randstad Interim Inc., Robert Half Canada Inc., S.i. Systems Ltd., Sapphire, Semantic Consulting Inc., Sinapse Interventions Stratégiques Inc., Spearhead Management Canada Ltd., Strategic Relationships Solutions Inc., Team WEI Forward, Teksystems Canada Inc., The KTL Group Inc., TPG Technology Consulting Ltd., TRM Technologies Inc., Veritaaq Technology House Inc., Watershed Information Technology Inc., Zylog Systems (Ottawa) Ltd.

**9.2.** Ref: M2 and R1. The requirement to demonstrate extensive experience within only five contracts within only 36 months within only the past five years is very restrictive and will severely constrain the number of qualified Bidders. In the interest of receiving bids from other well-qualified Bidders, we respectfully request CBSA to relax any or all of those constraints, as follows:

- 9.2.a. Up to ten contracts
- 9.2.b. Within a 60 month period
- 9.2.c. Within the past ten years.

**ANSWER 9.2** – Canada has reviewed the question and the RFP will remain unchanged.

**9.3.** Ref: Resource Reference Form. 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 the associated SOW, 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 CBSA expects under Section 3 Resource Details is, for each

Category/Level, a listing of the tasks detailed in the associated SOW and an indication of which of those tasks were performed for that client, to a minimum of 50% of the tasks.

**ANSWER 9.3** – For section 3 - Resource Details of Appendix B of Attachment B, the Bidders are asked to provide the following:

- Category of Personnel and Level
- Tasks performed under the reference Contract with a cross reference to each specific SOW associated task

In addition, all requirement under M2 must be met.

### **QUESTION 10**

From Bid Evaluation Criteria: 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 \$1M and have been awarded within the past five years.

- 10.1.** can a bidder use the same 5 contracts to respond to M1 for all 7 streams?
- 10.2.** can the bidder use the CBSA as a reference?
- 10.3.** can the bidder use contract references from the USA?

### **ANSWER 10**

- 10.1.** Yes
- 10.2.** Yes
- 10.3.** Yes. Furthermore, all the requirement for M1 applies.

### **QUESTION 11**

In relation to M2 in all streams, we understand the purpose to be to demonstrate the vendor's capability and recent experience in supplying resources in each specific resource category. Given that clients do not typically award contracts within the same concurrent timeframe, the requirement for each of the 5 contracts to span a concurrent 36-month window is severely limiting. We do not believe it was the intention of the crown to preclude qualified and experienced vendors from bidding on this requirement; however, the result will be that many vendors will not be able to bid. We respectfully request that "over the same 36-month period" be removed.

**ANSWER 11** – Bidders are to refer to Answer 2 of the RFP Amendment 002 of this solicitation.

**QUESTION 12**

**12.1.** In regards to Corporate Technical Mandatory Evaluation Criteria M.1, can the Crown confirm that CJV members can pool their project references in its substantiation of technical compliance ? For example, CJV member 1 provides 3 project references while member 2 provides 2 references for a total of 5 project references?

**12.2.** With regards to Part 3, Bid Preparation Instructions, item e) "Joint Venture Bids", on page 14 of 89 of this solicitation, we understand that JV members can combine their experience to substantiate a requirement under the same Stream, as described in the example below:

For Corporate Technical Mandatory Evaluation Criteria M.2, JV members can jointly demonstrate the experience required for each Stream by combining their experience in supplying resource categories under the Stream.

For instance, under Stream 1, Project Architecture, CJV member 1 demonstrates experience providing the following resources under three separate contracts over the same 36 month period within the past five years:

1 Application/Software Architect (Level 3), 2640 billable days

2 Systems Analyst (Level 3), 1320 billable days

3 Web Architect (Level 3), 1854 billable days

4 Business Architect (Level 3), 786 billable days

5 IM Architect (Level 3), 786 billable days

CJV member 2 demonstrates experience providing the following resources under two separate contracts over the same 36 month period within the past five years:

6 Technology Architect (Level 3), 786 billable days

7 Enterprise Architect (Level 3), 1320 billable days

8 Technical Writer (Level 3), 534 billable days

Would the Crown consider such a response compliant with Corporate Technical Mandatory Evaluation Criteria M.2?

**ANSWER 12 -**

**12.1.** No, one member of the joint venture must meet M1.

**12.2.** 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. Furthermore, refer to the above answer 12.1.

### **QUESTION 13**

We are intending to respond to this TBIPS solicitation in a joint venture with a supplier, which does not hold a TBIPS SA. That being said, is it possible to use corporate references belonging to the company, which doesn't hold the TBIPS SA in order to substantiate certain mandatory corporate criteria?

**ANSWER 13** - No. Bidders are to refer to article "f" of clause 1.2 - Summary of part 1 of the Solicitation.

### **QUESTION 14**

For M1 of all streams

**14.1.** Can the contract value we reference include option periods?

**14.2.** Is it necessary that a supplier has already invoiced the customer for the \$1 million? What if we were awarded a contract for over \$1 million but to date has billed a few hundred thousand?

**ANSWER 14** -

**14.1.** Yes

**14.2.** As per M1 of all streams, 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 a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1M;

### **QUESTION 15**

In regards to Amendment #2 for the subject solicitation, Q&A #8 cites two different closing dates. Please confirm if the new closing date is February 18<sup>th</sup> or February 19<sup>th</sup>?

**ANSWER 15** -

The actual closing date is February 19, 2013 at 2pm

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**