

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
800 Burrard Street, 2nd Floor
800, rue Burrard, 2e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8
Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)

Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Public Works and Government Services Canada -
Pacific Region
800 Burrard Street, 12th Floor
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8

Title - Sujet Imaging Hardware NMSO		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EZ107-120003/C		Date 2013-04-10
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EZ107-120003		Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
File No. - N° de dossier VAN-2-35013 (576)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$VAN-576-6971		
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2013-03-27
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-05-07		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Pacific Daylight Saving Time PDT
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Sobhee, Sachin		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur van576
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (604) 775-7022 ()		FAX No. - N° de FAX (604) 775-7526
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 Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.		

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		

This amendment is created to make changes to the RFSO and to answer questions from bidders.

Please note that Question #35 of Amendment 001 was answered incorrectly and has been clarified in the Changes to the RFSO below. Multifunction printers with functions disabled cannot be bid into the single function categories. A single function printer that is field upgradeable to an MFP is allowed as long as the hardware that enables it to be an MFP is not part of the single function version of that printer.

Changes to the RFSO:

Annex A, Section A2,

Delete: #18. Hardware must not prevent, through specific design features or manufacturing processes, the use of remanufactured imaging consumables, except where a licensing agreement has precluded the remanufacture.

At Annex A, Section A4,

Category 1 devices

Delete: be configured as a single function page printer;

Insert: be a single function page printer (must not be a multifunction printer with functions disabled);

Category 2 devices

Delete: be configured as a single function page printer;

Insert: be a single function page printer (must not be a multifunction printer with functions disabled);

Sub-category 2.1

Delete: have a minimum input capacity of 350 sheets from a minimum of 2 paper sources, one of which can be the bypass;

Insert: have a minimum input capacity of 300 sheets from a minimum of 2 paper sources, one of which can be the bypass;

At Form 6 SUBSTANTIATION OF COMPLIANCE TO MANDATORY HARDWARE REQUIREMENTS MATRICES,

Delete all reference to Form 6 from the RFSO. Form 6 no longer forms part of the RFSO and is not required as part of the bid. Offerors should ensure that all products meet the mandatory requirements listed in Annex A.

Questions and Answers:

Q1) In A2/18 crown asks about remanufactured imaging consumables. It is common in the copier industry to either "key" or has a "chip" in the consumable that the hardware would detect and/or allow use. This has certainly not stopped the remanufacturers from duplicating the "key" or "chip" as we have experienced. Can you please confirm that our imaging consumables that have machine detectable "chips" would be acceptable?

A1) The specification regarding remanufactured imaging consumables has been removed from the RFSO. See Revision to the RFSO above.

Q2) In A2 – CAT 1 and 2 crown stated “configured” as a single function printer. This could be manipulated in several ways. Would the crown please clarify that an MFD can or cannot be used but “configured” to only be a single function printer? A MFP could simple be configured as such that the copy and scan features are disabled. Making this compliant with the terms listed.

A2) No, an MFP with functions disabled cannot be proposed into this category. This has been clarified in the Revision to the RFSO above.

Q3) In A2 1.1 requirements. You have listed specifications that would lead to believe you would like to have in your offer a simple single function monochrome, DESKTOP style printer. Would the crown consider removing the 3rd tray and paper input amounts? Putting the additional tray as an option? Crown could specify that this printer MUST have the ability to accept a 3rd tray..ect.? Clients have had issues in the past with purchasing equipment from CAT 1.1 and receiving large printers that do not “fit” in the space they had in mind.

A3) No, this specification will not be changed at this time.

Q4) In A2 1.1 requirements. You have listed specifications that would lead to believe you would like to have in your offer a simple single function monochrome, DESKTOP style printer. Would the crown consider listing some Maximum Dimensions (length and width only) and weight for this category? Clients have had issues in the past with purchasing equipment from CAT 1.1 and receiving large printers that do not “fit” in the space they had in mind.

A4) Maximum length and width specifications are not required since the sub-category is already limited to products that accommodate a maximum paper size of letter/legal.

Q5) In A2 1.1 requirements. You have listed specifications that would lead to believe you would like to have in your offer a simple single function monochrome, DESKTOP style printer. Would the crown consider listing a low noise rating so that users in the next cubicle would not be affected by a noisy printer?

A5) No, this specification will not be added at this time.

Q6) In A2 1.4 requirements. The crown has asked for 512MB default memory. The industry standard in the single function monochrome space is 256MB but can be upgraded. This is again a single function monochrome only device and would take a considerable amount of print jobs to utilize the extra memory being asked for. Such consumers would order an upgrade to the memory. But asking all consumers in this category to pay for upgraded memory would be a wasted expenditure for the crown. Would the crown please reduce this requirement to 256MB?

A6) No, this specification will not be changed at this time.

Q7) In A2 2.1 requirements. The crown has asked that 350 sheets from a min of “2” paper sources. Would the crown please change this requirement to 300 sheets from a min of “2” paper sources. From our research it shows that this requirement would limit this “basic” category.

A7) Yes, this specification has been changed. See Changes to the RFSO above.

Q8) In A2 2.1 requirements. Would the crown ask that an additional "optional" tray must be available to accommodate customers that would like both letter/legal paper sizes?

A8) No, this specification will not be added at this time.

Q9) In A2 2.2 requirements. Crown asks for a 3 tray 750 sheet min. Since customer is purchasing a fairly large print volume in this category (3000 pages per month). Would the crown consider moving the min input capacity to 1000 sheets? Thus eliminating the requirement to fill paper trays more often in a shared environment?

A9) No, this specification will not be changed at this time.

Q10) In A2 2.3. Would the crown allow for a MFD device "configured" as a single function printer in this category?

A10) No this is not allowed. See Changes to the RFSO above.

Q11) For Cat 3.2. This is a full copier letter legal category. Being so, would the crown please take some of the specifications to those that would reflect an actual copier? Please clarify if this is to be desktop mounted or floor mounted? Pedestals are available at an extra cost however are not included in the base price.

A11) This has already been clarified in the RFSO and previous amendments.

Q12) For Cat 3.3. This is a full copier letter legal category. Being so, would the crown please take some of the specifications to those that would reflect an actual copier? Please clarify if this is to be desktop mounted or floor mounted? Pedestals are available at an extra cost however are not included in the base price.

A12) This has already been clarified in the RFSO and previous amendments.

Q13) Annex B – B5.5 CPP for Purchased Hardware

Our assumption is that to be compliant, a bidder must provide both a cost per page including maintenance and service and a cost per page excluding maintenance and service for purchased devices and that the comment "not mandatory" is for PWGSC contracting officers only. Please confirm.

A13) This is correct. Bidder must provide both a cost per page including maintenance and service and a cost per page excluding maintenance and service for purchased devices. The "not mandatory" in this instance refers to clients placing call-up.

Q14) Annex J – Evaluation, Value Factor and Basis of Selection, J5, Estimated Monthly Copy/Print Volume

As a significant provider of printing technology, our familiarity with industry averages tells us that the MFD volumes appear to be quite high. We are certain that the vendor community can provide the volume recommendations for assessment by category. Will you consider changing the volumes after receiving adequate rationale?

A14) No, this will not be changed at this time.

Q15) Part 8, Item 8.5 Invoicing Instructions

The last 2 sentences of this section state: "The company submitting the invoices pursuant to any given call-up must be the same as the company to whom the call-up is placed. Invoices must NOT be sent to a client from a third party not named in the call-up." Please see the following scenarios submitted for your comments:

Scenario 1 – A call-up occurs with a supplier/reseller/VAR registered in the Standing Offer that requires equipment, service and leasing. The supplier (who is not the manufacturer) elects to use the manufacturer, who is also listed in the Standing Offer, to provide lease financing. The periodic lease invoices would be from the manufacturer's leasing arm and other invoices may be from the supplier.

Question: Would this scenario comply with Section 8.5 Invoicing Instructions?

Scenario 2 – A call-up occurs with a supplier registered in the Standing Offer that requires equipment, service and leasing. The supplier elects to use a third party leasing company to provide lease financing. The periodic lease invoices would then be from the third party leasing company and other invoices may be from the supplier.

Question: Would this scenario comply with Section 8.5 Invoicing Instructions?

A15) These two scenarios would not comply with Section 8.5 Invoicing Instructions since the company submitting the invoice would not be the same as the company to whom the call-up was placed.

Q16) Part 7 – Standing Offer, Item 7.5.5 – Offeror's Authorized Agents and Subcontractors

Since the Offeror is solely responsible for the conduct of the Authorized Agents noted in the RFSO response, and therefore the relationship is between the Offeror and the Authorized Agents, can the Offeror impose restrictions on what part(s) of the NMSO an Authorized Agent can support with respect to the work performed under the NMSO, without jeopardizing being deemed non-responsive to the RFSO? (i.e. Restrict the ability of an Authorized Agent to receive call-ups from select categories on the Offer)

A16) NMSO Offerors can place restrictions on their Authorized Agents with respect to receiving call-ups for lease or purchase and for call-ups from certain categories. If the Offeror is bidding in this manner, the Offeror must clearly indicate which sub-categories each agent is supporting and whether they are accepting call-ups for lease or purchase. Further to this, the Offeror must still ensure that for each sub-category, the Offeror is still meeting the requirements of Part 7, 7.5.5.1 Lease, Sales and Service Network. In other words, there must be sufficient nationwide coverage (lease and purchase) for each sub-category.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFSO REMAIN UNCHANGED.