

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 Division / Division
des services professionnels en informatique
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet IM / IT SERVICES	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8485-11IMTG/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 010
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8485-11IMTG	Date 2012-11-22
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-610-25002	
File No. - N° de dossier 610zm.W8485-11IMTG	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-11-30	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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: Henderson, George	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 610zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6148 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207
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

Question 1: Due to the complexity of the required response and the quantity of resumes required for this RFP, we request a 3 week extension to the closing date.

Answer 1: The solicitation closing date will not be extended as sufficient time must be allowed for evaluation purposes, to overlap with the existing contract if a transition from the incumbent to the winning Bidder is required, and to avoid a break in the services currently provided through the existing contract.

Question 2:

Part A: How will PWGSC be able to ensure that resources brought on contract at a later date will meet the security requirement?

Answer Part A: It is a requirement of the resulting contract that the resources provided by the Contractor meet the security requirements of the contract. It is therefore the Contractor's responsibility to provide resources with the appropriate level of security clearance. The individual's security clearance will be verified with the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate.

Part B: For some resource categories, price is determined by using the full number of resources that may be required as identified in the Statement of Work. However, the technical evaluation requires that in some cases only one resource be evaluated per category. In this way, the evaluation criteria unfairly favours an inexperienced team with only one strong resource. It does not accurately reflect the best value for money.

Answer Part B: The winning Bidder is contractually obligated to provide resources that meet the qualifications specified at Appendix 1 to Annex A, Resource Requirements, of the resulting contract. The financial evaluation does not favour any specific Supplier as it is applied equally to all Bidders. The estimated costs are used to aid in determining the overall value of the contract. We are evaluating a minimal number of resources in an effort to maximise the potential for competition.

Part C: By asking for too few resumes to evaluate, we think the crown has no defense against bait and switch tactics if a Supplier chooses to do so. We request that the solicitation be modified so that a greater number of resources per category must be evaluated.

Answer Part C: The number of resources evaluated are sufficient given the number of resource categories being evaluated. Any resource replaced must score equal or better against the evaluation criteria. Increasing the number of resources required for evaluation at this late stage of the solicitation poses an undue restriction to competition.

Part D: We request that the bid submission not require or evaluate resumes for the non-core Intermediate Project Manager position.

Answer Part D: The number of resources evaluated for this category will be reduced from three to one.

At attachment 1 to Annex D: Mandatory and Point Rated Evaluation Criteria, Corporate Evaluation Criteria M3:

DELETE:

The Bidder must propose a minimum of three (3) resources for the non-core category listed in the Statement of Work.

INSERT:

The Bidder must propose a minimum of one (1) resource for the non-core category listed in the Statement of Work.

Part E: Our firm has a contract with a client to provide IM/IT services. The client tasks our firm to execute several individual projects (each one with separate scope, deliverables, schedule and budget). These are individual projects, all executed under the umbrella of one overall contract. For the purposes of this bid submission, can each of these separate projects be considered individual projects?

Answer Part E: Individual projects completed under the scope of one overarching contract will be accepted as long as it is demonstrated by the Bidder that they are distinctly separate projects.

Question 3:

Part A: For the Intermediate Data Architect Category - M2 requires a ABAP 2000 certification, and M3 requires a BW certification. Given the uniqueness of the combination of these two skill sets, can the Crown change the mandatory to require only one of the two certifications and add additional points in the rated if an individual has both certifications?

Answer Part A: There will be no change to the criteria. Please refer to the answer for Part B of solicitation amendment 004.

Part B: It is our assumption that DND will have supporting resources that clearly understand military aircraft maintenance on the team and they will work jointly with the contractor who would have the SAP expertise. Therefore can the Crown remove the M1 requirement related to

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8485-11IMTG/B

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

010

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

610zm

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

W8485-11IMTG

File No. - N° du dossier

610zmW8485-11IMTG

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

60 months of aircraft maintenance experience from the Senior Requirements Analyst, Intermediate Requirements Analyst, and the Intermediate Requirements Analyst (logistics) categories? If these requirements are not adjusted, the Crown runs the risk of receiving limited to no compliant bids beyond the incumbent firm.

Answer Part B: The resources are required to have the background described in the evaluation criteria in order to perform their job function and as such the evaluation criteria will not be modified. A minimal number of resources have been requested for evaluation purposes in an effort to increase the number of responses to this solicitation.