

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 INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 24062-130039/A		Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 24062-130039		Date 2013-04-30
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-619-25971		
File No. - N° de dossier 619el.24062-130039	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-05-14		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: Perkins, Deborah		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 619el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-8656 ()		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

This amendment No. 2 to Request for Proposal 24062-130039/A is drawn up to address the following Questions and Answers:

Question 1

In Appendix 1, Annex D, Resource Evaluation Criteria, Rated Criteria 3.4 Project Executive Level 3 and 3.6 Project Manager Level 2 and Project Manager Level 3.

In R.1 Canada asks for each of the above mentioned resources to "Holds a valid Project Management Professional (PMP) certification from the Project Management Institute (PMI)."

Would Canada consider a Master's Degree in Project Management, equivalent and score max points? This has been allowed in other TBIPS RFP's.

Answer 1

For the Project Executive Level 3 – we are already asking for both the PMP certification and a post secondary degree (the Master's would fall in this category).

For the Project Manager Level 2 no change to be made (need PMP certification only – will not accept equivalence).

For the Project Manager Level 3 – we are adding the post-secondary degree as an "OR" see full rating below:

The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed Project Manager – Level III holds a degree or diploma from a Canadian recognized* post-secondary institute or holds a valid Project Management Professional (PMP) certification from the Project Management Institute (PMI).

*Foreign credentials must be assessed by a Canadian official credential assessment agency, educational institution and/or regulatory body.

Copy of Certification to be provided with the bid. If a copy is not provided, points will not be awarded.

Points remain as 20.

Question 2

In 3.7 Project Manager – Level 3, Rated Criteria, R1 states: The Bidder should demonstrate that each proposed Project Executive – Level II holds;; should this read, The Bidder should demonstrate that each proposed Project Manager – Level III holds:?

Answer 2

Yes, it should read Project Manager – Level III.

Question 3

In 3.3 Technical Writer – Level 2, Rated Criteria, R3 states: The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed Technical Writer – Level II has a Technical Writing Certification or Diploma. Would Canada consider an alternate diploma to the stated Technical Writing Certification or Diploma such as a Business Administration or Information Technology?

Answer 3

Canada will not consider an alternate diploma.

Question 4

Project Equivalency – In many cases, the rated criteria require resources to have five (5) projects of 24 months duration to score full points. Would TBS consider allowing a project equivalency for resources who have been on longer duration contracts? For example, a 72 month contract could be considered as equivalent to three (3) – 24 month projects.

Answer 4

No it remains unchanged – five (5) projects with a duration of 24 months each.

Question 5

Can you confirm, per 5.0 Personnel Requirement of the Statement of Work on page 45, that up to 10 resources may be required throughout the duration of the contract?

Answer 5

That is correct.

Question 6

Can you confirm that as per Page 5 paragraph (g) only seven (7) resources (one for each category) are to be submitted with our proposal?

Answer 6

That is correct.

Question 7

Could Canada please confirm if it is a mandatory requirement that the Bidder's proposed resources meet the Language Proficiency requirement identified within the table presented in Section 5.0 of Annex A?

Answer 7

Yes.

Question 8

Annex D – Section 2.0; Mandatory Corporate Criterion M2

As this requirement for an HR Plan is mandatory, and as such we assume it is of the up most value to the Technical Authority. Having this type of criterion as a mandatory criterion means its evaluation is only pass or fail and provides no room for the Technical Authority to evaluate these documents in relation to the relevance and suitability of it to this particular requirement. Therefore, as welcomed in the RFP under Section 2.5, we respectfully offer the following suggestion for improvement.

Adding an additional Corporate Rated Criterion to Annex D Section 4.0 to allow the TBS to evaluate the relevance and suitability of the Bidder's HR Plan would help to reduce the largest risk associated with professional services supply arrangements of similar size and scope – the Bidder's ability to deliver and manage high quality resources within the allotted response time (5 working days) and within the ceiling rates bid. Requiring Bidders to provide client references to demonstrate the successful implementation and execution of the proposed HR Plan would help to ensure the plan is sound and effective.

Answer 8

No.

Question 9

Annex D – Section 1.4; Mandatory Criterion M1

M1 reads "The proposed resource must have a minimum one-hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience in managing at least three (3) large projects* simultaneously in the Information Management (IM)/Information Technology (IT) sector."

This criterion is very restrictive as it requires that a proposed resource have 120 months of experience managing 3 or more projects simultaneously. M2 also seeks for the resource to demonstrate their experience in a Senior role leading teams of project managers. Therefore, would the Crown please consider modifying this requirement slightly by removing the word "simultaneously" from M1, to read: "The proposed resource must have a minimum one-hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Project Executive managing at least three (3) large projects* in the Information Management (IM)/Information Technology (IT) sector."

Answer 9

Canada will not modify the Mandatory – The resource needs to demonstrate that he can manage multiple projects at the same time in a given period.

Question 10

Part 1, Section 1.2 (b); Part 4, Section 4.3 (ii) (C); Annex B – In Part 1, Section 1.2 (b) it is stated that the term of the contract is 3 years (initial contract term) with two additional one year options and the pricing tables in Annex B of the RFP, again indicate that there will be an initial contract term and two option periods (dates were omitted in the tables). However, Part 4, Section (ii) (C) indicates that the initial term of the contract is one year and there are three option periods. Please confirm the term of the initial contract period, as well as the number and term of the option periods for any resulting contract from this solicitation.

Answer 10

The term of the initial contract is three (3) years with two (2) one year option periods.

Question 11

Annex A, Section 5.0; Annex B – The “estimated number of days”, in the pricing tables of Annex B, implies that all category of personnel are expected to have the same amount of work under the resulting contract, yet in the table in Section 5.0 of Annex A indicates that it is expected that there will be varying quantities of resources utilized under the resulting contract. Should the estimated number of days for the initial contract period not be more reflective of the required quantities of resources per category of personnel (i.e. the categories of personnel with a higher quantity of resources also have a higher estimated number of days)?

Answer 11

No the estimated number of days remains unchanged. The evaluation is being set up based on 7 resources with additional resources being brought in at a later date.

Question 12

Years of experience versus certifications

Section 3.0 Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria,

Of the seven resources being evaluated as part of this bid solicitation, would the crown consider 'years of experience' in lieu of the specified Certifications or Diplomas for the following three resource categories:

1. Business Analyst - Level III, Ten or more years experience in lieu of an International Institute of Business Analysis (IIBA) Certificate or a Certified Business Analysis Professional Certification
2. Technical Writer - Level II, Five or more years experience in lieu of a Technical Writing Certification or Diploma
3. Project Manager - Level II, Five or more years experience in lieu of a Project Management Professional certification

Answer 12

No, the criteria remains unchanged.

Question 13

Reference 3.3 Technical Writer R3, page 85.

The requirement for a Technical Writer Certification or Diploma severely limits the pool of potential Technical Writers that vendors can source in relation to this requirement. In our experience, some of the best Technical Writers we have sourced have educational backgrounds in English, Journalism and even Project Management. Resources with diverse educational histories that have made the transition into IT/IM, each have a solid background in writing, grammar, punctuation, documentation styles, standards, word processing and desk-top publishing, which are the backbone of all forms of Technical Writing Documentation deliverables. Their skills and ability to perform the work in relation to the Mandatory and Rated requirements will be clearly evidenced by the IT/IM projects referenced in their resumes. Given that the majority of Technical Writers would not have completed specific Technical Writing Certifications or Diplomas and have gained their extensive experience through working on IT/IM projects (that become increasingly more complex as their careers progress), would Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat please consider amending R3 to include a degree or diploma in English, Journalism or Project Management and/or equivalent designations?

Answer 13

R3 is amended as follows:

The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed Technical Writer – Level II has a Technical Writing or English or Journalism Certification or Diploma from a Canadian recognized* post-secondary institute.

*Foreign credentials must be assessed by a Canadian official credential assessment agency, educational institution and/or regulatory body.

Copy of Certification to be provided with the bid. If a copy is not provided, points will not be awarded.