

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

**Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement**

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

Electronic Information Technology Professional Srv
Div/Div des srv professionnels en technologie de
l'information électronique

11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier

Portage III 0A1 - 1

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-055605/E	Date 2013-02-15
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-055605	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
File No. - N° de dossier 003ei.EN578-055605	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EI-003-25338	
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement 2013-01-18 Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-03-04	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Benoit(003ei), Real	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 003ei
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 934-4667 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-7827
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

Solicitation Amendment #6

This solicitation amendment is raised to make the following:

A: Modification

B: Questions and Answers

A: Modification #6

Under Solicitation Amendment #5, delete the following;

Q36:

Re Data for DCC as it relates to EN578-055605/E

Please can you kindly clarify the following as it relates to the TBIPS Refresh RFP ?

1. We are a Canadian subsidiary but work in a seamless partnership with our parent company to deliver services here in Canada. As such, can we assume that it is equally acceptable for us to leverage references for projects won internationally by our parent company and/or other European subsidiaries/sister companies ?

A36:

1) Yes

Insert:

Q36:

Re Data for DCC as it relates to EN578-055605/E

Please can you kindly clarify the following as it relates to the TBIPS Refresh RFP ?

1. We are a Canadian subsidiary but work in a seamless partnership with our parent company to deliver services here in Canada. As such, can we assume that it is equally acceptable for us to leverage references for projects won internationally by our parent company and/or other European subsidiaries/sister companies ?

A36:

1) No

B. Questions and Answers

Q: 54

Hello. Could you please clarify the following:

- 1) What information do you need exactly for client references?**
- 2) What information do you have to confirm with our clients?**

A: 54

- 1) Please Refer to solicitation Amendment #5, A 34
- 2) Please refer to Attachments B and/or C of the solicitation, M.5, article 7.

Q: 55

Hello. Could you please clarify the following:

- 1) For the category "Application Services," you ask for 4 references for Level 1 and 9 references for Level 2. Do you mean that you need 4 references for the entire category for Level 2 and 9 references for category 2 as a whole?**
Or
- 2) Do you mean that you want 4 references per profile for Level 2 and 9 references per profile for Level 2?**

A: 55

1 and 2: With regard to M.5, please note that under Stream 1 "Application Services," you must receive 6 positive references out of 17 to obtain a standing offer and a supply arrangement at Tier 1. In order to qualify for Tier 2, you must receive 9 positive references out of 17.

Q: 56

We are requiring clarification on how to respond as a Vendor already qualified on CPSA Work Stream 3.

As a presently qualified CPSA holder in WS3, we would like clarification on the following. For reference, I have attached a screenshot of the file sent to us outlining our current Status within this Stream below.

- 1. As per the instructions and based on what is outlined in the table below and our company being an active and existing vendor on Stream 3 of the current CPSA arrangement, would it be correct that;**

(a) We can pick any 6 categories below (technically in our case, 5 as the allotment of 6 would include the PKI Specialist already identified) and mark/identify them as “Currently Substantiated” for a total of 6;

(b) Additionally, we can pick/identify any further 3 additional categories and mark them as “Currently Unsubstantiated”.

2. Additionally, as per the layout of the Stream and the inclusion of 17 categories, if we were wanting to qualify against the entire Stream and if our understanding of the first question was correct, then in order to qualify for all 17 categories we would then have to, in addition to the 9 granted as an existing holder (6 “Currently Substantiated” and 3 “Currently Unsubstantiated”):

(a) Submit references for 6 of the remaining 8 additional categories available after the granting process outlined in question #1 and mark them as “Newly Substantiated” in the CPSS System;

(b) Choose and rank 2 additional categories of the remaining 8 available after the granting process outlined in question #1 mark them as “Newly Unsubstantiated” in the CPSS System as new categories we seek to qualify against without substantiation should our 6 “Newly Substantiated” categories we submit references for be deemed compliant on evaluation.

A 56:

1. a and b) Correct

2. a and b) Correct

Q: 57

We have the following question regarding this TBIPS refresh (Both SO and SA):

This question pertains to a TBIPS Joint Venture between two existing TBIPS holders. If Company A is qualified for TBIPS Tier-1 and Tier 2 (under every stream/category) and they wish to create a Joint Venture with Company B who is also qualified for TBIPS Tier-1 and Tier 2 (under every stream/category), can the new Joint Venture automatically be compliant for these streams/categories without having to provide new project references / client references? In other words, can the respective efforts (project references / client references) that both companies made initially as individual respondents be grandfathered for the purposes of creating the joint venture? If yes, can you please clarify what documents need to be submitted for the new JV (same clarification/guidance provided for other scenarios under the Submission Grid, Page 15 of 108, RFP document).

A57:

No

Q: 58

We have a few questions about the TBIPS Refresh and hope you can help.

1)

a) We are currently qualified under CPSA in all streams and categories, as well as TBIPS SA/SO in all tiers and categories. However, the refresh for TBIPS indicates that we will only be able to move automatic qualification for 6 categories (plus an additional three unsubstantiated categories) from CPSA. Does this mean the government expects vendors to re-substantiate within this refresh up to 6 of the roles that were already substantiated within CPSA?

b) Keeping in mind the significant effort required of vendors to qualify for the CPSA in the first place, would you consider allowing ALL substantiated roles from current CPSA holders to be moved over automatically to the TBIPS vehicle as substantiated roles within TBIPS?

2) We are a current TBIPS SA/SO holder and a current CPSA holder. If we are submitting a grandfather certification within the CPSS, are we required to complete the online certifications and the mandatories for M1-M6 as well – or can we ignore these sections if we are submitting a grandfather certification as per the instructions of the RFP in section 1.4 Submission Grid?

3) We have noticed within the DCC that when applying for the regions we would like to be considered for, there are now cities within the regions that are identified. We have a few questions related to this:

1. If we are currently qualified for a SA/SO within a specific region, are we automatically qualified for these cities within the regions – and can simply select this within the DCC if desired, or must we submit some kind of additional documentation in order to qualify for work within these cities?

2. Must we have an office in the same province as each city we propose to be qualified for – the DCC form seems to indicate that this is the case?

A 58:

1 a) Yes

1 b) No

2) Depending on the Strategy that your company will adopt, either column F or column G from the submission grid under Part 3, 1.4 will apply.

3-1) Please refer to Amendment 5, A 33, 5

3-2) No.

Q: 59

With the Refresh out, we are looking at forming a joint venture. If we need to re-prove capabilities that both parties to the JV are being grandfathered on as individual suppliers, it is too busy these days with all the RFPs flying around to get it done in time. However, it would seem to be a waste of time for us to have to prove capabilities that both companies have already proven in the past, and for the government to have to validate capabilities that it has already validated previously. We were hoping not to have to wait out the time it will take for an Amendment to be issued and just try to find out if there are protocols in any Refresh whereby grandfathering is allowed for when current TBIPS providers come together to form a new JV?

A 59:

If submitting as a new JV, then you must submit as a new bidder.

Q: 60

1. If a joint venture chooses to dissolve it's JV do contracts previously issued under the JV get cancelled or can they still continue on ?

2. If a company in a JV wished to dissolve their current JV and submit a new JV thru the refresh process what notification is required if any?

A 60:

1. Refer to Amendment 3, Question 14, 2a and Answer 14, 2a.

2. The new JV must apply as new Bidder. The JV contact must submit a notification to the SO and/or SA Authority indicating the effective date of the dissolution.

Q: 61

1 a) We out here in industry are completely confused by what is going on. I need to check internally but the TBIPS refresh is out and it has TEMS wrapped in it as well. It is a huge mess. Are you now saying TSPS will also have TEMS in it?

For example, we already have TBIPS and TSPS and we are also in a JV with an Aboriginal Firm. We have TEMS in JV with (company name). We have other vehicles with other JVs. We are apparently collapsing all that into TBIPS and / or TEMS which permits only two appearances. 2 JV, 1 JV and 1 standalone etc.

1 b) So is each company in a JV for TEMS, for example in our case (company name), allowed to apply for TBIPS using the TEMS categories?

A 61:

1 a) Refer to Amendment 004; A: 18, 2a. Please also note that only the Telecommunication Stream of TEMS to TBIPS is migrating.

1 b) No, any new entity (either as a JV or a single) must submit a complete bid as a new bidder.

Q 62

We do not hold the newly created stream 6 but we hold 2 of the classifications that were moved from stream 3.

On the CPSS data collection page for streams, if we select “newly offered” for stream 6 we are unable to select “currently substantiated” for either of the classifications we currently hold, only “newly substantiated” or “newly unsubstantiated”.

In order to select “currently substantiated” we would have to say the entire stream is “currently offered”, which is not correct.

How should we complete this?

A 62:

Refer to Amendment 5; A 49

Q 63:

We have 2 very specific questions in regards to the closing dates for EN578-055605/E.

1) As a new tenderer, would it be accurate to say that march the 4th 2013 is the only date that we can answer the request for proposal number EN578-055605/E ? , in order to be considered as a potential vendor in june 2013.

2) Given that our firm chooses not to answer on march 4th 2013, is there another possible date in 2013 and or 2014, that we can , as a new tenderer, answer the request for proposal number EN578-055605/E ?

A 63:

- 1) Yes, unless the closing date is extended.
- 2) Yes, will be under the next version to be issued in July # **EN578-055605/F**.

Q 64:

As a new tenderer, if we decide not to bid on the EN578-055605/E (due on March 4th 2013): is it true to say that we could bid on a similar qualification in July 2013 (as per modification number 2)

A 64:

Correct

Q 65:

We have reviewed the Submission Grid provided on Page 15 of 247 to determine how the following situation should be interpreted using the Submission Grid.

Q1. Company 1 is currently qualified as TBIPS Tier 1 with Sufficient Substantiated Categories to meet SA Tier 2 in Stream # 1, # 3 and # 4.

A new CJV is being formed (Company 1 + Company 2) to submit an offer for Tier 2.

Company 1 holds Sufficient Substantiated Categories for SA Tier 2 in Streams # 1, # 3 and # 4 at Tier 1 (TCVB). Company 2 meets Sufficient Substantiated Categories in Stream # 1 and # 3.

Based on the requirements, we fully understand that Company 2 will have to provide information to support at least one Substantiated Category for a Stream.

Therefore, since Company 1 is qualified with Sufficient Substantiated Categories to meet SA Tier 2 in Stream # 1, # 3 and # 4, will PWGSC accept a simple cross reference to these Sufficient Substantiated Categories which are already on file with PWGSC?

A 65:

No

Q 66:

1. Looks like the ceiling rates for the SA have been blocked, so no rates to be entered?

2. In order to Qualify for Tier 2 you must have sales of 12 Million?

Could you please confirm?

A 66:

1) Correct

2) Correct

Q 67:**Question 1**

Can the Crown please confirm that we are able to use one reference to substantiate more than one category in the streams (for example: If we had a Quality Assurance resource on contract who was responsible for Testing, Test Coordination and QA Analysis will the 1 reference be able to substantiate for the Application Services Stream A.10, A.11, as well as the Project Management Services stream P.11)?

Question 2

Can the Crown please confirm that we are able to use the same resource/candidate who has worked multiple contracts with us to substantiate more than 1 category in the stream if they have a varied skill set? (For example, if we had a resource working one contract 2 years ago as a Database Administrator I.2 and the same resource is currently on contract with us as a Data Modeller/IM Modeller I.4 can we use the same resource/candidate to substantiate both requirements?

A 67:

1) Correct

2) Correct

Q 68:

In the past, ("company name") didn't bid on the Cyber Protection SA (CPSA) because the requirement was for a Top Secret facility clearance and we only have Secret. Are we able to bid now on the Cyber Protection categories? I don't see requirements of the firm for this area.

A 68:

Yes

Q: 69

With regard to the bid solicitation for supply arrangements and standing offers for Task-based Informatics Professional Services (TBIPS) for all federal government departments and Crown corporations, we have 2 questions regarding the requirements in Section I - Technical Bid:

1- As specified on page 14 under Section I – Technical Bid: "In their technical bid, bidders should explain and demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements and how they will carry out the Work. The technical bid should address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. Simply repeating the statement contained in the bid solicitation is not sufficient."

a) What are the evaluation criteria? Do you mean M.1 to M.6? If not, which line of the "Submission Grid" on page 13 does this requirement refer to?

2- Even if it is not identified in the "Submission Grid" on page 13, is it possible to include the presentation of our business?

A: 69

1. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #5. modification #5.

a) Yes, M.1 to M.6 are the mandatory criteria. Please refer to Attachments B and C of the solicitation.

2. Yes.

Q 70:

We have some questions regarding the current TBIPS Refresh.

1. Within the invitation to respond to the TBIPS we only received a status of current TBIPS M.5 Compliancy for the categories we hold under the SA. Can the crown please explain why we did not receive a status of current TBIPS Compliancy for the categories we hold under the SO?

2. The following is stated on page 8 of the RFP: "Suppliers must submit offers for a Standing Offer in accordance with the terms of each refresh solicitation and no such offers may be submitted after the refresh closing date until the next refresh solicitation is solicited. However, suppliers may submit a bid for a Supply Arrangement at any time by responding to the most recent refresh terms and conditions posted on GETS."

Our interpretation of this statement is that our firm is bound by the March 4, 2013 deadline if we are submitting a bid for an SO, but that we can submit a bid for an SA at

any time and that it can be awarded beyond the deadline. Is our interpretation correct? If not, can you please provide further clarification?

A 70:

1. Because they are the same
2. Please refer to Component II and III of the Solicitation, article 4.2.

Q 71:

As part of the RFSA we are to provide client references to substantiate experience in the categories of personnel.

Many companies who aren't yet on TBIPS will have provided services to government clients through another supplier. Although their client is the government department, and all interactions are with this end client, their contract is with this third party. Due to this relationship the government user is sometimes in the best position to verify the nature of the work that was done.

In the past we have been able to provide two contacts, both the end client and the third party contractor. With the new online DCC, this does not appear to be the case. As such, would it be acceptable for bidders to enter the most appropriate contact even where they may have contracted through a third party?

A 71:

Yes

Q 72:

We would like to know if for the references, we are able to have more than one reference from the same company.

A 72:

Yes

Q 73:

We are a member of a JV that holds a CPSA. Each member is "jointly and severally liable" for every contract issued to the JV.

1. Please confirm our understanding that we will be able to use those contracts as references to qualify for Stream 6 of TBIPS.

2. We are carrying over one substantiated category from TBIPS Stream 3, C.16. Please confirm our understanding that we will be granted five other categories of our choice without substantiation.

A 73:

1. Confirmed
2. If the legal entity holding the CPSA (JV) and the legal entity holding the TBIPS SO/SA is the same, then the answer is yes.

Q 74:

Here is another question for this solicitation...this one about Terms and Conditions.

This question relates to Part 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES, Section 7.8 (i) “[Applies if required by the RFP] Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer”

A competitive qualification process such as this RFP which requires respondents to assess their pricing for competitive advantage purposes militates against the need for the inclusion of an MFC provision. In this case, as respondents determine their response, market-driven forces will ultimately come to guide pricing. The crown will have the opportunity to assess those responses and qualify respondents accordingly. Moreover, there is no actual engagement established through this qualification process which further provides the crown with control over pricing for the response to the applicable future engagement for qualified respondents. For these reasons, Crown procurements have moved away from including MFC requirements.

Given (i) that inclusion of an MFC clause is more appropriate for non-competitive solicitations where market-driven pressures on pricing are not necessarily present and (ii) that such requirement does not appear to have been included in the previous TBIPS solicitation, will the crown agree to delete clause and retain a market-driven competitive pricing procurement in this solicitation?

A 74:

The clause remains as is. Please refer to Component II, 6B 2.3, article (i).

Q 75:

1. I need to clarify that I have all the Q&A. As far as I can see:
 - a. Amendment 2 has Q1 regarding Annex A. It is 96 pages long and has no other Q&A.
 - b. Amendment 3 has Modification #1, then the Q&A starts at Q5 and ends at Q17.
 - c. Amendment 4 has Modifications #2,3 & 4, then Q&A start at Q18.

d. Can you please tell me where to find Q 2,3,4? Thank you.

2. We fall under Column C of the Submission grid, and we are not going after any new categories. Can you please confirm my understanding that we have to

a. submit the following in Hard Copy

- i. Attachment E**
- ii. Bidders Statement**
- iii. Anything missing?**

b. Submit via DCC

- i. Attachment A – any new company information**
- ii. Attachment D – SO rates**
- iii. Attachment G – DCC**

c. I do not have to do anything with Attachments B, C, F & H

A 75:

- 1.a. That is incorrect. Solicitation Amendment #1 has Q1.
- b. That is correct.
- c. That is correct.
- d. Solicitation Amendment #2
- 2. a.
 - i. Yes (Grandfather Certification and Bidder's Statement)
 - ii. Yes
 - iii. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #4, A21 1b.
- b.
 - i. Yes
 - ii. Attachment D is the description of the financial evaluation for the SO. SO rates must be submitted via DCC.
 - iii. Yes.
- c. Bidders must ensure they follow instructions provided in those Attachments.

Q 76:

As per the voice mail I had left you moments ago, I wanted to follow up with you regarding security sponsorship. As ("company name") is new to doing business with the GoC, we have no prior clearance to speak of. If I am understanding things correctly, security sponsorship to begin the process is the order of the day; and as this is a TBIPS refresh bid we are bidding then the sponsorship needs to come from yourself.

As facility clearance of enhanced reliability is the minimum requirement to be awarded the bid, I want to ensure that we are following the correct and due process to ensure that we do not miss a step and find ourselves non-compliant. Although my preference is always a conversation, I do understand the level of sensitivity surrounding a bid when it is "on the street", so here is the list of questions I have and should they need to be published to be answered then that works just as well.

a) Can a company bid prior to being sponsored?

- b) If so, what specifically do we insert into the bid to ensure that this is recognized appropriately?
- c) Should we be considered compliant bending the security process being run, are we then just in a holding pattern until such time as it is completed?
- d) Is there documentation that we need to have filled out and submitted prior to being sponsored?
- e) If we are sponsored, how do we know that the process has begun?

I apologize for the barrage, however our new future of bringing innovation in staff augmentation is completely dependent on our being compliant and accepted on this bid; I am sure you understand our sense of urgency. Any guidance you can offer would be greatly appreciated.

A 76:

- a) Yes. Refer to A22 from Solicitation Amendment #4.
- b) Request for security sponsorship is done through the DCC.
- c) Please refer to Component I, Part 4, articles 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
- d) See b) above
- e) IMOS will contact the Bidder.

Q 77:

We are a TBIPS SO holder.

- a) If we want to keep the same SO categories as approved by PWGSC last time but want to change our rates, do we have to provide minimum substantiated references again for each category?
- b) Or do we only have to provide new rates?

A 77:

- a) No
- b) Yes