

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

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT (See original solicitation
document.)

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 Informatics Prof. Services-TBIPS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation B8953-100262/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B8953-100262	Date 2012-06-12
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-380-24466	
File No. - N° de dossier 380zm.B8953-100262	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-06-27	
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: Cook, Gail	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 380zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-2591 ()	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

AMENDMENT NO. 003

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and answer Bidders' questions.

RFP REVISIONS:

1. At Page 1 of the RFP, Solicitation Closes:

Delete: 2012-06-20

Insert: 2012-06-27

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q7. In the RFP documents the term CORE is used in association with certain position types but there is no explanation as to its significance, additional response requirements or effect on scoring. Please clarify.
- A7. Core refers to those categories used to assess a bidder's corporate capacity. There are no additional response requirements or effect on scoring.
- Q8. Part 4.2 (d) Number of Resources Evaluated states the following:
- "Only a certain number of resources per category will be evaluated as part of this bid solicitation as identified in Annex D. Additional resources will only be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor. After contract award, the Task Authorization process will be in accordance with Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses, Article 7.2 Task Authorization. When a Task Authorization Form (TA Form) is issued, the Contractor will be requested to propose a resource to satisfy the specific requirement based on the TA Form's Statement of Work. The proposed resource will then be assessed against the criteria identified in the Contract's Statement of Work in accordance with Appendix 1 of Annex A."
- (a) Please clarify the above statement "Only a certain number of resources per category will be evaluated".
 - (b) If we submit 5 resources will all 5 be evaluated?
 - (c) Will the number evaluated vary by vendor or by stream?
 - (d) Will each be evaluated in succession until a perfect score is encountered at which time further evaluation of resources for that position will cease?
 - (e) Is there a maximum number per stream or per category that will be evaluated?

-
- A8. (a) The resources specified in Annex D Bid Evaluation Criteria for each Stream will be evaluated as follows:
- Stream 1 - ERP Functional:
1. A.2 ERP Functional Analyst - Siebel, Level 2 (Core)
- Stream 2 - ERP Siebel Development:
1. A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst - Siebel, Level 3 (Core)
- Stream 3 - ERP Siebel Data:
1. I.3 Database Analyst/IM Administrator - Siebel, Level 3 (Core)
- Stream 4 - EFP BI/Interface/Rational Development:
1. A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst - SSA-Name3, Level 3 (Core);
 2. A.5 EFP Technical Analyst - IBM Rational Suite, Level 3 (Core); and
 3. A.5 ERP Technical Analyst - Methodology, Level 3 (Core).
- (b) One resource for each category identified in (a) above for each Stream will be evaluated.
- (c) Bidders may bid on one or more of the Streams and the resources will be evaluated by Stream.
- (d) Each resource will be evaluated as part of the bid solicitation in accordance with the criteria identified in Annex D. Additional resources will only be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor
- (e) The number of resources evaluated will be in accordance with (a) above.
- Q9. For Bidder evaluation purposes (i.e. Stream 1 Mandatory - Corporate Capacity within Stream. The Bidder must have had one ERP functional support service contract with the government in the past five years (as of bid closing date) are self-financing, Crown corporations that operate at arm's length from the Government considered "government" in this context?
- A9. Yes.
- Q10. Would CIC consider allowing us to combine the value of multiple TBIPS contracts across the same category within the same government directorate/client servicing the same project, to create a total contract value that exceeds \$1M? (i.e. client issued 6 separate 1 resource ERP "Programmer/Analyst" TBIPS requests for the same project, and we won 4 of those separate ERP Programmer/Analyst contracts which together combine to exceed \$1M.)
- A10. No.
- Q11. How will CIC determine the validity of a Corporate Reference's similarity to CIC's Stream specific SOWs?
- a) Is CIC looking for our M1 Reference contracts to showcase the exact same resource category label, i.e. role categorized as "Programmer/Analysts" to show compliance for Stream 2?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

B8953-100262/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

003

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

380zm

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

B8953-100262

File No. - N° du dossier

380zmB8953-100262

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

-
- b) Or will CIC accept references that have similar SOW tasks and not necessarily the same category name ?
- A11. a) No.
b) Yes.
- Q12. To win a stream does a bidder have to provide at least one resume for each position in the stream?
- A12. Bidders must provide a resume for each resource category identified in Annex D for each stream. See A8. (a).
- Q13. Is there a maximum limit to the number of resumes that may be submitted?
- A13. See A8. (a).

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.

NOTE: A BID ALREADY SUBMITTED MAY BE AMENDED PRIOR TO THE CLOSING DATE. AMENDING CORRESPONDENCE SHALL ADDRESS THE SOLICITATION NUMBER AND THE CLOSING DATE AND SHALL BE ADDRESSED TO:

**BID RECEIVING
PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA
PLACE DU PORTAGE, PHASE III
MAIN LOBBY, ROOM 0A1
11 LAURIER STREET
GATINEAU, QUEBEC K1A 0S5**