

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 2013-03-13
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-055605		Amendment No. - N° modif. 012
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 Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale		2013-01-18
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-03-25		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 #12

This solicitation amendment is raised to make the following:

- A. Modifications #13 et Modifications #14**
 - B. Clarification #11**
 - C. Questions and Answers**
-

A. Modification #13

Under Component 1, Part 3, article 1.4 Submission Grid:

In the grid, under Column D (vertical), Mandatory M.4 (horizontal);

Delete:

“DCC & ADD (if applying for additional Tier)”

Insert:

“Grandfather Cert., or DCC & ADD (if applying for additional Tier)”

Explanation:

A current TBIPS Holder that is not applying for additional Tier(s), can satisfy the requirements for M.4 through the Grandfather Certification.

A. Modification #14

Under Component II, Part 6C,

Delete in its entirety:

Article 7.8 (i) Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer

- (i) **[Applies if required by the RFP] Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer**

- (i) To the best of the Contractor's knowledge, the prices it is charging to Canada under the Contract are not higher than the lowest prices/rates that it has charged any other customer (including other Government of Canada entities) for a similar quality and quantity of goods and services in the year before the Contract was awarded.

-
- (ii) The Contractor also agrees that, if after the date the Contract is issued it reduces the prices it charges to other customers for a similar quality and quantity of goods and services, it will reduce the prices for all remaining deliveries under the Contract (with notice to the Contracting Authority).
 - (iii) At any time during the six years after making the final payment under the Contract or until all claims and disputes then outstanding are settled, whichever is later, Canada has the right to audit the Contractor's records to verify that it is receiving (or has received) these prices. Canada will give at least two weeks of notice before the audit.
 - (iv) During this audit, the Contractor must produce invoices and contracts for similar quality or quantity of goods or services sold to other customers from one year before the Contract was awarded until the end of the Contract Period. If the Contractor is required by law or by contract to keep another customer's information confidential, the Contractor may black out any information on the invoices or contracts that could reasonably reveal the identity of the customer (such as the customer's name and address), as long as the Contractor provides, together with the invoices and contracts, a certification from its Chief Financial Officer describing the profile of the customer (e.g., whether it is a public sector or private sector customer and the customer's size and service locations).
 - (v) In determining whether the goods and services sold to another customer were of similar quality, the terms and conditions of the contract under which those goods and services were delivered will be considered, if those terms and conditions are reasonably likely to have had a material effect on pricing.
 - (vi) If Canada's audit reveals that the Contractor charged lower prices for a similar quality and quantity of goods and services under any contract where deliveries were made in the year before the Contract was awarded, or that the Contractor delivered additional goods or services under the Contract after reducing its prices for other customers but without reducing the prices under the Contract, then the Contractor must pay to Canada the difference between the amount charged to Canada and the amount charged to the other customer, up to a maximum of 25% of the value of the Contract.
 - (vii) Canada acknowledges that this commitment does not apply to prices charged by any affiliates of the Contractor

B. Clarification #11

The National Zone is used when a Client has no preference in terms of where the work is performed.

If applying for the standing offer, the Bidder must provide rates for each region and metropolitan area (including the National Zone) it is applying for.

Note to Bidders:

- By selecting the National Zone in the DCC, the Bidder is not automatically selecting all Regions and/or Metropolitan Areas.
 - By selecting a Region in the DCC, the Bidder is not automatically selecting the Metropolitan areas within that Region. For further clarity, please refer to Solicitation Amendment #7, A83.
 - By selecting "all Regions and Metropolitan areas" in the DCC, the bidder is selecting all possible regions and metropolitan areas including the National Zone.
-

C. Questions and Answers

Q 152

Please confirm that as an existing SA Tier 2 holder, it is not required for me to submit a bid for an SO and therefore it is not required for me to fill in “Financial Rates for Standing Offer” in CPSS system.

A 152

Confirmed

Q 153

As an existing TBIPS SO/SA holder, we are qualified in all categories for streams 1 to 5 (inclusive), across 2 regions. For the refresh (EN578-055605/E), we do not intend on making changes to our Technical Offer; however, we would like to qualify for streams 1 to 5 in additional regions/metropolitan areas. Other than selecting the desired regions/metropolitan areas in CPSS, do we have to do anything further to qualify under the additional regions/metropolitan areas?

A 153

If applying for the standing offer, bidders must provide rates for the regions and metropolitan areas they are applying for. Please refer to Clarificaton #11 from this solicitation amendment.

Q 154

We are a current holder of both TBIPS SA and SO. As PWGSC intended, TBIPS has become the primary – almost exclusive – vehicle for the federal government to procure Informatics Professional Services. As such, our entire business depends upon TBIPS – without holding it, we would be out of business.

In that light, the DCC has introduced a risk to our business which is unacceptable: there seems to be no practical manner by which we can review our proposal before submitting it. The only way possible seems to be to review each one of many, many web pages, but there is no way that we can be certain that we have reviewed each and every one.

Given the inevitable potential for human error, and the extreme consequences of any such error, please add to the DCC a simple function which will print the Bidder's entire response for review and filing, well before the solicitation closing date.

A 154

The only current print function is to print each screen which contains data input. The end result would be a complete print out of the information input by the Bidder into the DCC. An added print choice is anticipated for the next solicitation (fiscal year 2013-14) which will enable a Bidder to obtain a complete print out of all information input by the Bidder into the DCC.

Q 155

Currently our firm is currently qualified under TBIPS. Additionally, our firm is in a joint venture with another firm, and within this joint venture, our firm is the controlling party and has ownership of the joint venture agreement. This joint venture is a qualified CPSA supplier.

Within the RFSO/RFSa document, M.5; 8b (iv) reads:

“A Bidder that is a CPSA and a TBIPS SA Holder and is carrying over two (2) substantiated IM/IT Categories from TBIPS Work Stream 3 to Work Stream 6 Cyber Protection Services will be granted four (4) Categories of its choice (i.e.: C.5 and C.16 are to be factored into the total number of 6 substantiated Categories)”.

Our assumption is that our firm would be permitted to do this should we wish to qualify our firm in isolation of the joint venture currently qualified under the CPSA. Please confirm our assumption is correct.

A 155

No. Your CPSA (JV) is a different legal entity than your TBIPS SO/SA (the single entity).

These would be considered as two different bids.

Regarding your TBIPS SA/SO (single entity): The CPSA migration process does not apply. You have the option to bid for Streams 6 and/or 7. Refer to Component 1, Part 3, article 1.4, Column D.

Regarding your CPSA (JV): The CPSA migration process applies as detailed in M.5, article 8. Refer to Component 1, Part 3, article 1.4, Column E.

Q 156

1. We are a current TBIPS supplier who is part of a JV. At this time we are considering bidding as a single entity and not with our current JV partner.

In this case, do we then have to bid as 'New Bidder' and include all new references to substantiate each bidding category?

2. As my question is general to all RFPs and not specific to this refresh, can you let me know how in general this request would be handled? My guess is that when you are a JV but want to bid on your own you would have to produce all the materials as if you were a new bidder but I wanted to know before I committed the effort. If you are unable to answer this general question, when do you think the next set of answers would be released to get my answer?

A 156

1. Yes. All mandatory criteria must be met as a new bidder as detailed in Attachments B and/or C. Please refer to Component 1, Part 3, article 1.4, Column B.
2. Confirmed

Q 157

Currently the barrier to entry appears to be an organisations ability to apply, rather than provide services to Canada. In an attempt to remove said barrier, I'm requesting that a sample/example response to this TBIPS refresh that would be considered compliant be provided. I would expect that any figures, and references, amongst with names simply be made fictitious in that this is a sample guideline document. Canada may wish to also provide a number of examples/samples of previous responses from the last refresh that were deemed compliant.

I do feel that this is a reasonable request based on the hundreds of pages of information that need to be deciphered. Based on the many questions posed to Canada with regards to this refresh, is it obvious that this request does not appear to be clear, nor concise in its requirements. If Canada wishes for suppliers to spend dozens of hours in applying to supply services, it should endeavor to make the process as transparent and navigable as possible. In its current form, many organisations may be precluded or found not compliant unnecessarily, resulting in the process being considered unfair and inaccessible to Canadians, or businesses who wish to do business with Canada.

If Canada does not wish to provide a sample document, I request a full explanation from senior management at the ADM level or above be provided as to why, prior to closing of this solicitation.

A 157

PWGSC will not provide bidders with pre-filled or previously submitted answers for this Solicitation. PWGSC will re-issue a new bid solicitation this Summer (2013) and suppliers will have the opportunity to qualify on the SA portion on a quarterly basis from then on.

Q 158

We have a few questions with regards to references and the financial bid:

1. Do the references need to come from the specific metropolitan areas we are bidding on in order to qualify as substantiated references.

2. With regards to the financial bid pg. 17

“A financial bid must be completed for each Region and Metropolitan Area (if applicable) for which the Bidder is proposing to offer a Category of Work”

(a) Can you please clarify what that means?

(b) Do we have to show \$1.5 million/1 million in contracts awarded for each area in order to qualify for the SO/SA.

3. Do you require signed copies of each Amendment to be sent with the hard copy of the bid?

A 158

1. No. Regions have no bearing on the qualification process for the M.5 mandatory criteria.

2.(a) If applying for the Standing Offer (SO), you must provide per diem rates for each region and metropolitan area that you wish to provide services. Per diem rates are not to be submitted for the supply arrangement.

2.(b) No. The “\$1.5 million/1 million” is an aggregate amount and it relates to the mandatory criteria M.4 - Total Cumulative Value Billed (TCVB). Regions have no bearing on the qualification process for the M.4 mandatory criteria. Please refer to M.4 from Attachments B and C.

3. No.

Q 159

With the merger of CPSA with TBIPS, what happens to Work Stream 4 for Tempest?

A 159

The professional services required under CPSA Work Stream 4 are now covered under TBIPS Work Stream 6, Category C.17 - EMSEC Security Specialist.

Q 160

We are currently an existing TBIPS holder and not changing the Technical Offer already on file from the previous TBIPS Solicitation.

For M4 Total Cumulative Value Billed for SO and SA the values must be within the last (3) years immediately prior to the date of the bid submission: Some of our projects on file have end dates of 2009/06/30 and 2008/12/30 which are just outside the (3) year requirement, will our company be still satisfied by the Grandfather Certification?

A 160

By submitting the grandfather certification, you are confirming that you continue to meet all mandatory criteria that you previously qualified for. If this is the case, then the answer is yes.

Note: The start and end dates of projects are irrelevant. The start and end dates to satisfy M.4 refer to invoices.

Q 161

I'm arranging to apply as a Joint Venture, am I correct to say that each JV partner must register individually for the CPSS process and that the main submitted document, both digital and hard copy would show that the bid is a JV?

A 161

No. The Bidder (the JV) must enrol in CPSS using a unique JV PBN. The electronic and hard copy of the bid must be submitted by the Bidder (JV).

Q 162

To further clarify Q&A 73.2., please confirm that as our organization holds a CPSA contract with another organization in JV (both companies are a separate legal entity) that both organizations of the JV will still be granted five substantiated categories and three unsubstantiated categories for their own TBIPS SA/SO response (non-JV).

A 162

No. The migration process only applies to the CPSA JV and does not apply to the JV members individually.

Q 163

In regards to the Public Works Government Services Canada's RFP EN578-055605/E for Task-Based Informatics Professional Services (TBIPS), we would like to submit the following question(s):

1. In relation to the TCVB table what is meant by "The Bidder Warrants that the total amount to the subsidiary does not exceed 50% of the TCVB. Indicate "Confirmed". What is meant by subsidiary?

2. We are applying for Tier 2 and are demonstrating just over \$12M billed in the last three years. The line in question has a total amount billed of \$8,650,000 which does exceed more than 50% of \$12M in the TCVB. Are we not to indicate “confirmed” and if so what effect does this have on our response relating to the TCVB table?

A 163

1. A company that owns another company is considered the “parent company”. A company that is owned by another company is considered the “subsidiary” of the parent company.

2. If the invoices for the \$8, 650,000 are (i) from a subsidiary and (ii) represent more than 50% of the total TCVB, then the project cannot be used. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #10, Q&A 137 a), b), c). If the invoices for the \$8, 650,000 are from the Bidder, then the less than 50% is met.

Q 164

In addition to the questions sent on February 21st, we have an additional question about the above referenced solicitation:

1. M.5 requires the substantiation of work efforts in each of the categories by a client reference. While the RFP (Part 5 in section M.5 of Attachment C) provides a sample email of what client references will receive in order to substantiate the identified categories, some of our clients have expressed concerns that unknown emails may be filtered into a spam or junk folder and would prohibit them from responding in a timely manner. In order to facilitate successful contact with our client references, can you please provide more information about:

(a) Who will be sending this email / What email address these emails be originating from?

(b) What will the subject line of the email be?

Any information you can provide so we can pass it on to our client references would be helpful.

A 164

(a) The reference emails will be sent by the Informatics Method of Supply (IMOS) Division of PWGSC and will have an address ending in “@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca”

(b) The subject line format is currently:

“Bid # - Bidders name: Reference Verification Request / Demande de vérification de référence”

Q 165

Addendum #6, Question #36: as to whether it is acceptable for a company to leverage references for projects won internationally by its parent company or other European

subsidiaries/sister companies. The answer was changed from a yes to a no. Please can you clarify the following;

1. How does the Government of Canada plan to leverage global best practices, solutions, expertise, capabilities and consultants given this stance ?

2. (i) Are other companies that are only operating as a branch in Canada allowed to provide international references?

(ii) If they are, then please explain the rationale, as essentially this means that there is a disadvantage to organizations who chose to invest in Canada as full subsidiaries (as we have) .

A 165

1. Bidders can use references from outside of Canada as long as the work referenced was provided by the Bidder or their subsidiary.

**2. (i) Yes, as long as the work they are referencing was provided by the Bidder or their subsidiary.
(ii) The same rules apply to all bidders.**

Q 166

As a result of assessing our previous TBIPS submission we realize that we did not take advantage of the unsubstantiated opportunities available to us allowing us to select additional labour categories within a stream. Will we be able to exercise this option with our current TBIPS submission in 2013 based upon the acceptance of our previous submission from the last refresh? We would select the allowable number of unsubstantiated based upon our previous substantiated qualifications.

A 166

No. Please refer to M.5, article 7. (iii)

Q 167

Please refer to Attachment C the following sections in the above solicitation:

1. Section M.4 Total Cumulative Value Billed which states that “Within the last three years immediately prior to the date of bid submission, the Bidder must have provided Informatics Professional Services to Outside Clients above the following minimum billing thresholds: a) To Qualify For SA Tier 1: The Bidder must have invoiced for Informatics Professional Services a total cumulative value billed (TCVB) of a minimum of \$1.5 million; and b) To Qualify For SA Tier 2: The Bidder must have invoiced for Informatics Professional Services a total cumulative value billed (TCVB) of a minimum of \$12 million”

2. Section M.5 Identification of Categories which states that “For each Category for which an arrangement is offered, a Bidder must have provided Informatics Professional Services that closely match the services outlined for that Category in Annex “A” to Component II. The Informatics Professional Services must have been previously provided as required to an Outside Client within the last three years immediately prior to the date of bid submission”

Our question is:

To demonstrate our qualification in Section M4 above i.e. Total Cumulative Value Billed, we need to submit list of projects in Informatics Professional Services, secondly for qualification in Section M.5. we need to submit references of external client contacts who can substantiate that the Informatics Professional Services were provided as required. Please confirm whether the projects listed as per Section M4 and references listed in Section M5 should be from the same client. For e.g. If we have entered in Section M4 a project done for client A, so do we need to enter the same contact reference working with Client A in Section M5 or it could be from another client.

A 167

Projects provided to qualify for M4 and references provided to qualify for M5 do not have to be from the same client.

Q 168

We submitted our certification and completed the on line portion over a week ago. Are we required to submit the latest amendment sheet even though we have already submitted our bid and are not affected by any of the amendments?

A 168

No. However it is important to review all amendments until bid closing.

Q 169

M.4 Total Cumulative Value Billed table

For both the SO and SA response, clause 1 of this section states that is must, at minimum provide the following billing contacts: Contract/Project title, Contract/Project Number, etc.. However, in sub-clause 1 a) it states “may be provided in a word processing document or table as suggested below.”

- (i) **Is the use of this table mandatory or not?**
- (ii) **Can we provide the billing details as per previous versions of the TBIPS Refresh demonstrated by the table below?**

CLASS #2 Technology Services Application Services	Current TBIPS Holder for the following Categories	New Categories Proposed for this REFRESH	Unsubstantiated Reference Priority Ranking	Client (Government Department or Company Name)	Contact Name	Position	Telephone	E-mail	Contract/ Project/ Reference Nbr	Category Provided By Subsidiary	Provide Name of Subsidiary or JV Member	Name of Resource (optional)
Previously Provided Categories (Minimum Number Required 6)	[Yes/No]	[No / Substantiated/ Unsubstantiated]	[1-9]									
A.1 Application/Software Architect	No	Substantiated										
A.2 ERP Functional Analyst	No	Substantiated										
A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst												

A 169

- (i) The use of the table from M.4 1a) in Attachments B and C is not mandatory. The table was a suggestion to help bidders with their preparation. Bidders must ensure that the required information is provided in hard copy by the bid closing date.
- (ii) No. The information from the table in your question was for “M.5 Identification of Categories” from the previous TBIPS bid solicitation (this previous version is no longer being used) and cannot be used to satisfy the requirements for “M.4 Total Cumulative Value Billed”.

Q 170

Having reviewed the mandatory requirements and subsequent Q&As, we have an additional point for which we would appreciate clarification.

In Amendment 005, Answer A39: 2.a) (iii) implies that as part of the evaluation, Clients may be contacted to verify information relating to TCVB references. Yet, in Attachment B, M.4, there is no requirement to provide Client contact information (see below). Can you please confirm that Client contact information is not required for the response to M.4?

A 170

Confirmed. If clarification is required, Canada will request this information during the evaluation process.

Q 171

This question seeks clarification on to how to provide project reference information for both TVCB (M.4) and Category Substantiations (M.5). In AM 006, Answer 71 confirms that in situations where the end Client is the government but a third party is involved

(more or less as an agent providing access to a procurement vehicle), the contract reference can be the end (Government) client.

In this case the contract number we would provide would be assigned by and only relevant to the third party agency - and not to the government client who is otherwise able to substantiate the reference. Therefore, where this is the case, is it appropriate to simply enter n/a in the Contract Number column?

A 171

That is acceptable. However, the bidder runs the risk that the reference will not know what project/work is being referenced. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #5, A39, 3.(iii).

Q 172

1. We are a supplier on the Standing Offer. In stream 4 we have 6 categories, can we ask for 3 more categories as an unsubstantiated award and then submit rates for those categories?

2. We did not bid on the junior category , only level 2 and level 3, and were awarded level 2 and level 3. Can we submit rates for the junior category on those categories where we were previously compliant?

A 172

1. No. In order to qualify for 3 unsubstantiated categories in a stream, 6 positive references must be received in the same stream as a result of this bid solicitation. Please refer to M.5, article 7 (iii) and to Amendment #3, Clarification C 9.

2. Yes

Q 173

RE: Given that Categories I.12, I.13, I.14, I.15 from TBIPS Stream 3 IM/IT Services, have been removed and are now covered under Stream 6 Cyber Protection Services Categories C.5 and C.16, we have the following questions.

a) Will current TBIPS SA/SO holders that are not CPSA SAHs be granted the C.5 and C.16 categories within Stream 6 Cyber Protection Services without the need for substantiation within the Stream Information for the Mandatory Criteria?

b) Assuming that the answer to “a.” is “yes”, and the TBIPS refresh evaluation process (i.e. two positively substantiated categories for one (1) unsubstantiated Category), will these

same current TBIPS SA/SO holders be able to choose any other category in the Stream 6 Cyber Protection Services?

c) Assuming that the answer to “B.” is “yes”, would PWGSAC prefer suppliers to mark the chosen category within the Stream Information for the Mandatory Criteria as “Currently Unsubstantiated”?

A 173

a) If the TBIPS Holder previously qualified for either or both I.12 or I.15 as substantiated, then it will carry over the substantiation for category C.5. Similarly, if a TBIPS Holder previously qualified for I.13 as substantiated, then it will carry over the substantiation for the category C.16. The category I.14 has been removed and any previous substantiation is not carried forward.

b) No. TBIPS Holders that are not current CPSA Holders must provide references for additional categories so that the minimum number of substantiated categories is met in order to qualify for the Cyber Protection Services Stream. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #3, Clarification C3, and Solicitation Amendment #8, A 110.

c) n/a. To bid for this Stream, select the Stream as “Currently Offered”. Identify the migrated categories (C.5 and C.16 if applicable to you) as “Currently Substantiated”. Identify the Categories for which a reference is being provided as “Newly Substantiated”. If applying for unsubstantiated categories as described in M.5 , article 7 of Attachment B and/or C, then identify them as “Newly Unsubstantiated”.

Q 174

1.

- (i) Can the references that are required for section M.5 be from any organization, or**
- (ii) are they required to be a Canadian Federal Government Department?**

2.

- (a) For section M.4, can the referenced projects be for any organization, or**
- (b) only a Canadian Federal Government department?**

A 174

- 1 (i) Yes
- (ii) No
- 2 (a) Yes
- (b) No

Q 175

1. This question seeks clarification on the nature of information required in completing the table for M.4 (1.a). Specifically, we would like to confirm what would be considered as

an appropriate response under the “Description of Services Performed” column of the table. We have noted that in Amendment 007, Question 79.1 a very elaborate and detailed format offered by one vendor was deemed compliant. However, it is our understanding that for the purposes of demonstrating the TCVB, all that PWGSC really requires is confirmation that the referenced services align with one or more of the categories described in this solicitation – and that the provision of detailed SOW’s and project descriptions are unnecessary. Therefore in the interest of brevity and providing information in a concise, easily reviewable format, we would like to know if the following responses in the “Description of Services Performed” would be considered compliant:

a) [Company Name] provided services directly related to the functions of a P.1 Change Management Consultant.

b) [Company Name] provided services directly related to the functions of an A.10 Testers and an A.10 Test Coordinator.

A 175

- a) No. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #10, A136, 1.
- b) No. Please refer to a) above

Q 176

We are a current SA/SO holder and may wish to add to our existing categories (no change to Tier). Therefore for guidance we will be following column D of the Submission Grid on page 15 of 108. We are clear on the glossary of terms provided in section 1.4, but are not clear on the uses of the terms “&” and “or” in the table. Therefore we request the following clarifications:

1. For M.1 – Does Grandfather Cert. or DCC mean:
 - a. We can provide only the Grandfather cert. and be compliant?
 - b. We can complete only the DCC and be compliant?
 - c. We can provide both and be compliant?
2. For M.3 – Does Grandfather Cert. & ADD (if applying for additional Tier) mean:
 - a. If not bidding an additional Tier, we can provide only the Grandfather cert. and be compliant?
3. For M.4 – Does DCC & ADD (if applying for additional Tier) mean:
 - a. If not bidding an additional Tier, we can complete only the DCC and be compliant?
4. For all Certifications where the option is Grandfather Cert. or DCC, does this mean that:

- a. **We can provide only the Grandfather cert. and be compliant?**
- b. **We can complete only the DCC and be compliant?**
- c. **We can provide both and be compliant?**

A 176

- 1a. Yes
- 1b. If you go through the DCC , you will be instructed (in the DCC) to submit the signed M.1 certification with the hard copy of your bid (the same as a new bidder). As an existing TBIPS Holder, you have already qualified for this Mandatory. The Grandfather Certification will satisfy the requirements for M.1, unless your information on file with PWGSC for this mandatory has changed.
- 1c. Yes
- 2a. Yes
- 3a. If you are not applying for additional Tier(s), then the grandfather certification will satisfy the requirements for M.4. Please see Modification #13 from this Solicitation Amendment.
- 4a. Yes. Please see Clarification #10 from Solicitation Amendment #7.
- 4b. Yes
- 4c. Yes

Q 177

- a. **The newly created stream #6 Cyber Protection Services, includes 3 categories that were previously contained in, and moved from stream #3 (I.12, I.13, I.15). A document that was sent out to previous / existing TBIPS suppliers by IMOS in January, seems to indicate that if any of these moved categories had been previously successfully substantiated in an earlier refresh and deemed technically compliant, then we would be able to automatically offer these categories in newly created stream #6 without having to provide a substantiation (reference) for those categories or any other category in the stream. Is this correct?**
- b. **If this is correct, then should there not be a drop down box option that reads “Currently Substantiated” for stream #6?**
- c. **Further to this question: If 2 categories have been automatically grated to stream 6 from stream 3 and listed in the document sent out as “technically compliant”, does this mean that I am automatically granted an additional category by virtue of the 50% substantiated categories ratio rule?**

A 177

- a. See Answers 173 from this Solicitation Amendment.
- b. This selection capability is available when selecting the Stream as “Currently Offered”.
- c. No. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #3, Clarification #C9.

Q 178

In past TBIPS Standing Offers and Supply Arrangements, Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer has not been included in the Terms and Conditions. What is the

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EN578-055605/E

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

012

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

003ei

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

EN578-055605

File No. - N° du dossier

003eiEN578-055605

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

rationale for including the MFC clause in this iteration of the TBIPS refresh? Will PWGSC consider removing this requirement in the Ts and Cs as per previous versions of the refresh?

A 178

Please refer to Modification #14 of this Solicitation Amendment.