

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 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN869-120601/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 010
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20120601	Date 2012-09-18
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-615-24680	
File No. - N° de dossier 615el.EN869-120601	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-09-21	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Ghaddab, Nabil	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 615el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5419 ()	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 Solicitation amendment is raised to answer questions received from Bidders.

A. QUESTIONS AND CORRESPONDENT ANSWERS:

QUESTION 1

As an IT industry wide recognized definition, Client/Server describes the relationship between two computer programs in which one program, the client (requestor), makes a service request from another program, the server (responder), which fulfills the request. When the client/server phrase was originally coined, that meant a fat client on a desktop requesting service from a server (e.g., application server, database). As pointed out in Question 4.2, client/server “applications built within the last 8 years are almost exclusively n-tier, thin client architectures”. This is now the industry generally accepted definition of client/server applications. Desktop fat clients connecting to a server is now a legacy client/server solution example. Furthermore, a fat client requirement has not been identified in the RFP. All the COTS products identified in the RFP fit the currently accepted definition of client/server, e.g., n-tier, web, etc.

Therefore, the answer to question 4.1 contains the scope of client/server to this very restrictive legacy definition which significantly restricts qualified bidders in presenting industry recognized and totally acceptable C/S system based project references for M1 and R1, and greatly favours the incumbent companies as they have been working in this environment.

Finally, we request that the crown adopt and accept the broader industry recognized definition of client/server and not the restrictive definition that only recognizes fat client client/server architectures.

ANSWER 1 - Canada has reviewed the question and the RFP will remain unchanged.

QUESTION 2

There is now some confusion about the definition of the 24 month period for requirement M1.

Question:

Would you please confirm that the answers provided in Amendment 5 for Question 3 are the correct definitions for the 24 month period in requirement M1 given the information provided to date.

ANSWER 2 - Canada has reviewed the question and Bidders are to refer to RFP amendment 009, which includes changes to the mandatory criteria.

QUESTION 3

With the additional changes to the requirements we request a 3 week extension to the due date.

ANSWER 3 - Canada has reviewed the question and the RFP will remain unchanged.

QUESTION 4

Given the change of M1 in Amend 006, which extended the period of time in which vendors could demonstrate the provision of services, will the crown please confirm that bidders should now provide in Appendix A clear details showing which billable days are associated with R1 (contracts within the last 5 years) and which billable days are associated with M1 (contracts within the last 8 years). This will aid in PWGSC's evaluation and clearly show evidence of a bidder's recent experience providing services in the required categories.

ANSWER 4 - Billable days for both M.1 and R.1 must be provided within the past eight years.

QUESTION 5

We are seeking clarification on the answer to our question and the resulting modification contained in AMD06 of EN869-120601/A.

Please clarify that, for Price substantiation purposes, every consultant used to support proposed rates (if requested) must meet the mandatory requirements identified within the grids modified in this amendment. Including, for all but Project Administrator, "a minimum of 5 years of experience for the specific Category of Personnel, specializing in client/server architecture, based on Sybase' PowerBuilder (using either an Oracle or Sybase database) or BI Tools Suite."

ANSWER 5 - Substantiation for professional services rates, if requested by Canada, will be done using the evaluation criteria as specified in Appendix C to Annex A of the RFP amendment 006.

QUESTION 6

6.1. Do MQ-1 and -2 define all the resource experience requirements, or does Canada reserve the right to define additional experience requirements in Task Authorizations? If the latter, how is the vendor to know at this stage how to price against undefined requirements?

6.2. Ref: Amendment 6, MQ-2 "Whenever experience in a specific category is requested, it will be assessed against the responsibilities enumerated at Annex A for the specific Category of Personnel. In order for a Resource Project Reference, Appendix D to Annex A, to be accepted, the Contractor must demonstrate that the proposed resource has performed at least 50% of the responsibilities enumerated at Annex A for the specific Category of Personnel."

Granted that the resource must meet the general experience requirements of MQ-1 and TBIPS Level 2, please define how much experience is implied by the phrase "has performed" in order to meet the specific requirements of MQ-2. For example, for the Tester, would one month's experience "establishing and operating inter-operability testing procedures" (3.4.9) be sufficient to count towards the 50% threshold, or would one year's or five years' experience be necessary?

That definition of the experience requirement is critical to the vendors' pricing -lacking definition, the vendors will make different assumptions, leading to prices that are not comparable. In turn, the median used in the financial evaluation would be invalid.

6.3. The above clarifications are critical to the vendors' financial proposals, and to a fair and competitive evaluation. We must therefore request an extension to the closing date of one week beyond receiving the clarifications.

ANSWER 6 -

6.1 MQ-1 and MQ-2 of Appendix C to Annex A defines all the resource experience requirements.

6.2 For clarity purposes, the minimum of 5 years experience, as stated in MQ-2 of Appendix C to Annex A of the RFP, is for completing all demonstrated tasks experience and not a minimum of 5 years experience per individual task.

6.3 Canada has reviewed the question and the RFP will remain unchanged.

QUESTION 7

Regarding M1 could the crown please provide tools and technologies, by name, of acceptable "Fat" client/server architecture.

ANSWER 7 - Sybase 'PowerBuilder' is an example of "Fat" client/server architecture, and the intended primary and major use of this RFP.

Note to Bidder:

The English version of Amendment 009 of this RFP contains an error (typo). It does include only one question and correspondent answer.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED