

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> DP - DPDA	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> M7594-125928/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> M7594-125928	<b>Date</b> 2013-03-20
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-602-25449	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 602el.M7594-125928	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-04-16</b>	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Ouellet, Monique	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 602el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-1775 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-5925
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

This Amendment is issued to amend the RFP.

**1) At article 1.2(g)**

**Delete:**

<b>A.2</b>	ERP FUNCTIONAL ANALYST	<b>3</b>	240	840				
------------	------------------------	----------	-----	-----	--	--	--	--

**Insert:**

<b>A.2</b>	ERP FUNCTIONAL ANALYST	<b>3</b>	624	840				
------------	------------------------	----------	-----	-----	--	--	--	--

**2) At Article 4.3(c)(ii)(C)**

**Delete:**

TABLE 1 - SUB-REQUIREMENT PEOPLESOFT							
TBIPS ID	RESOURCE CATEGORY	TBIPS LEVEL	MAXIMUM FINANCIAL POINTS ASSIGNED				TOTAL
			INITIAL CONTRACT PERIOD	OPTION PERIOD 1	OPTION PERIOD 2	OPTION PERIOD 3	
<b>A.2</b>	ERP FUNCTIONAL ANALYST	<b>3</b>	60	30	30	30	150
<b>A.3</b>	ERP PROGRAMMER ANALYST	<b>2</b>	240	120	120	120	600
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>300</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>750</b>

**Insert:**

TABLE 1 - SUB-REQUIREMENT PEOPLESOFT							
TBIPS ID	RESOURCE CATEGORY	TBIPS LEVEL	MAXIMUM FINANCIAL POINTS ASSIGNED				TOTAL
			INITIAL CONTRACT PERIOD	OPTION PERIOD 1	OPTION PERIOD 2	OPTION PERIOD 3	
<b>A.2</b>	ERP FUNCTIONAL ANALYST	<b>3</b>	156	78	78	78	390
<b>A.3</b>	ERP PROGRAMMER ANALYST	<b>2</b>	240	120	120	120	600
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>396</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>990</b>

**3) At article 4.4(a)(iii)(B)(1)**

**Delete:** MAXIMUM FINANCIAL POINTS (750)

**Insert:** MAXIMUM FINANCIAL POINTS (990)

**QUESTION 28:**

**RE: Section 4.4 Basis of Selection (iv) Limitation of Expenditure**

Please help us understand the rationale of awarding the highest scoring supplier 99% of the funding and the second highest supplier 1%. Under this approach, the runner-up will gain little if any work experience at RCMP which does not provide RCMP with the most viable back-up plan.

It seems that RCMP would be better served by a contractual arrangement like the one under the CIC Omnibus contract where funding is allocated based on your technical score. "During the Contract Period, the Contractors will be issued TAs with a combined dollar value that is in proportion to the percentage values determined in the Fund Allocation Formula. For example, based on the example and numbers

used in the Fund Allocation Formula, Contractor X would be issued Task Authorizations with a combined total dollar value of 53% of the combined total dollar value of all of the issued TAs.

Contractor	Total Bid Price	Price Score <i>Out of 40</i>	Allocation of Contract Funds	% of Estimated Initial Contract Period Value
X	\$3,600,000.00	40	$40/76 \times 100 = 53\%$	\$1,060,000.00
Y	\$4,000,000.00	36	$36/76 \times 100 = 47\%$	\$940,000.00
Total		76		\$2,000,000.00

RCMP could alternatively consider CBSA's approach in their recent IT Supply Chain RFP where Canada will use a funding allocation based on score and issuance of work on a rotational basis. "Where two contracts are awarded, the amount of the Limitation of Expenditure of each contract will be determined in accordance with the following:

(A) the Bidder with the highest Total Bidder Score will receive 55% of the funding initially allocated to that stream; and

(B) the Bidder with the next highest Total Bidder Score will receive 45% of the funding initially allocated for that stream."

Then the Taskings will be issued on a rotational basis based in the funding available under each stream.

With either of these methods, RCMP would be served by two motivated suppliers, have access to a broader talent pool, and be better position to quickly address shortcomings - all of which gives RCMP a better risk posture. Further, we are confident that the supplier community would view this as more fair and as providing for healthy competition.

So please consider changing the funding allocation and tasking approach to something more open such as 60% for the primary supplier and 40% of the secondary supplier.

#### **ANSWER 28:**

Proposed allocation approaches will not be appropriate for the RCMP because it is intended to have a relationship with a single Contractor, wherever possible.

#### **QUESTION 29:**

The transition-in requirement found in M2 for each stream of this RFP is an impossible bar to meet for many suppliers of Informatics Professional Services. Historically, transition-in has not been a function of many large projects. Large projects such as those being called upon across M1 are most often new projects that outsource for resources from suppliers once a skills gap has been identified internally in terms of project delivery. For most organizations, it has not been common practice to have a supply arrangement for Informatics Professional Services of a given skill set. Instead, most organizations have used TBIPs on an as and when required basis. Such contracts do not have a transition-in requirement.

The current construction of the RFP requirements lend themselves to large firms, especially as it has been opened to contracts outside of the National Capital Region.

In the interest of open and fair competition, it is requested that M2 be completely removed from the RFP.

#### **ANSWER 29:**

Note that M1 is open to contract experience in the National Capital Region.

M2 will not be removed as it is an important element of the requirement for the RCMP.

**QUESTION 30:**

On Page 7 of the RFP, It is stated that one primary and one back up contract will be awarded per stream. Can the RCMP please clarify the process for which the backup contract will be used after contract award? How will the backup contract be used? Upon contract award, what percentage of business (Task Authorizations) shall be directed to the primary and back up contract holders?

**ANSWER 30:**

The process under which each contract will be used is stated at Article 7.2. The actual business for each contract is dependent on the outcome of the process stated at Article 7.2.

**QUESTION 31:**

The bidder's response template on Page 96 refers to R3, however, R3 does not exist. Can this be removed from Page 96 please?

**ANSWER 31 :**

R3 exists for the SAP Sub-Requirement.

**QUESTION 32 :**

Re: R1 Corporate Rated Criteria all Sub-Requirements

The Bidder Score = sum of all categories /# categories. The formula as set out in the RFP equates to an average of each category being calculated and does not take into account the anticipated utilization and weighting/importance of each category. For example, PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst is only 1/5 utilization of ERP Programmer Analyst, yet is factored in at 50% of the score, skewing the relevancy of the score. Likewise for Sub-Requirement #6 where experience in providing Testers would be rated equally with experience in providing IDOL Programmer Analysts even though RCMP intends on hiring almost 10x as many testers. We request the Crown consider modifying the weighting based on the anticipated utilization.

**ANSWER 32 :**

The minimum billable days represent ¼ of anticipated utilization over the 5 year period. The request to change the weighting has been considered and is not accepted.

**QUESTION 33 :**

Please confirm that RCMP retains the right to use other methods of procurement outside of these contracts.

**ANSWER 33 :**

Yes.

**QUESTION 34:**

Re Stream 1 PeopleSoft

The calculation ratio for Functional Analyst is far in excess of every other category by almost 3x. Am #3 Q&A #15 says this is associated to an anticipated progressive increase in the level of effort over the 5 year timeframe, but the Table in 1.2 page 8 of 101 is an Estimated Average # of Days Per Resource Category (per year). Therefore the anticipated increase is already factored in to the ERP Functional Analyst category. Will the Crown reconsider reducing or removing the calculation ratio for this category?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

M7594-125928/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

602e1

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

M7594-125928

File No. - N° du dossier

602e1M7594-125928

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

**ANSWER 34:**

The RFP has been amended to rectify this. Refer to RFP Amendment 005.