

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 EP304-131244/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20131244	Date 2012-10-29
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-618-24994	
File No. - N° de dossier 618el.EP304-131244	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-11-05	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
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: Brewster, Shannon	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 618el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5879 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT No. 003**RFP No. EP304-131244/A**

This solicitation amendment No. 003 is raised to:

1) publish questions and answers that have been received in relation to this solicitation.

1) The following Questions and Answers has been provided:

QUESTION 1:

"With regards to M5 (Web Architect), would SSMD consider reducing the minimum number of years required to meet this mandatory to three years? In our practice three years of contiguous experience in using a product as a Web Architect is sufficient to demonstrate expertise in the product?"

ANSWER 1:

For M5 under the category of Web Architect, the minimum number of years will not be reduced.

QUESTION 2:

"With regards to M4 (Programmer Analyst), would SSMD consider reducing the minimum number of years required to meet this mandatory to two years? In our practice two years of contiguous experience in using a product as a Programmer Analyst is sufficient to demonstrate expertise in the product?"

ANSWER 2:

For M4 under the category of Programmer Analyst, the minimum number of years will not be reduced.

QUESTION 3:

"With regards to R4 (Web Architect), R2 (Web Developer), and R3 (Programmer Analyst)
A. *Would SSMD please confirm that within this requirements the following two standard/tools are being specified: i. PWGSC Web development and approval standards; and, ii. PWGSC Web Planning Standards Services testing tool.*
B. *Would SSMD please specify the differentiation associated with these standards/tools compared to similar tools used in other GC departments/agencies?*
C. *Will SSMD allow the experience gained using other GC departments/agencies standards/tools to be used as substantiation in meeting this requirement?*

ANSWER 3:

A. Yes.

B. SSMD is unaware of similar tools used in other GC departments/agencies.

C. No.

QUESTION 4:

"In regards to R2 (Web Developer), please confirm if CLF 2.0 and W3C and WCAG 2.0 are PWGSC acceptable web development and Web Planning standards?"

ANSWER 4:

No, CLF 2.0, W3C, and WCAG 2.0 are not acceptable as PWGSC web development and web planning standards."

QUESTION 5:

"In regards to R2 (Web Developer), please confirm if the Canada Gazette Standards would be considered an acceptable PWGSC Web Standard?"

ANSWER 5:

No, the Canada Gazette Standards would not be considered an acceptable PWGSC Web Standard.

QUESTION 6:

"With regards to R4 (Web Architect), R2 (Web Developer), and R3 (Programmer Analyst) are the PWGSC Web development and approval standards, and PWGSC Web Planning Standards Services Testing tools specific to PWGSC or are they standards that are used across other Federal government departments?"

ANSWER 6:

The PWGSC Web development and approval standards are specific to PWGSC. The PWGSC Web Planning Standards Services Testing tool is used across other Federal government departments.

QUESTION 7:

"All of the rated criteria have the same general format. Each criteria has a list of applications/technologies. For example the R1 Rated Criteria for the Web Developer, is written as follows: The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience creating a web site using the following software applications and technologies: . Adobe Dreamweaver . Adobe Acrobat Professional . Adobe LiveCycle . Adobe Photoshop or Adobe Fireworks . File Transfer Protocol (FTP) . Subversion . 2 points for each application and technology demonstrated in the total Projects provided up to a maximum of 12 points. (note, each installation will be counted only once irrespective of the number of Projects demonstrated)

Based on this description, can I assume that if one project encompassed all of these applications/technologies that the maximum of 12 points will be awarded?"

ANSWER 7:

If one project encompasses all of the applications, technologies, or installations, the maximum number of points will be awarded. This applies to R1 for Web Architect, R1 for Web Developer, and R2 for Programmer Analyst.

QUESTION 8:

"We respectfully ask the crown to remove R4 for the Web Architect, R2 for the Web Developer, and R3 for the Programmer Analyst."

ANSWER 8:

The Crown will not remove R4 for the Web Architect, R2 for the Web Developer, and R3 for the Programmer Analyst."

QUESTION 9:

"With regards to R4 (Web Architect), R2 (Web Developer), and R3 (Programmer Analyst) can the crown please confirm that experience developing websites or web applications using CLF 2.0 and WCAG 2.0 and using similar tools, such as WPSS Validator Tool (which is equivalent or similar to PWGSC Web development and approval standards and PWGSC Web Planning Standards Services testing tools) will be accepted?"

ANSWER 9:

CLF 2.0 and WCAG 2.0 are not accepted as PWGSC Web development and approval standards. Experience developing websites or web applications using CLF 2.0 and WCAG 2.0 will not be accepted by Canada.

WPSS Validator Tool is accepted as PWGSC Web Planning Standards Services testing tool. Experience developing websites or web applications using the WPSS Validator Tool will be accepted by Canada.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.