

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC  
Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core OA1\Noyau OA  
11 Laurier St.\11, rue Laurier  
Gatineau  
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**  
Business Transformation and Systems Integration  
Service/Division de transformation des opérations et  
d'intégrat  
Special Procurement Initiative Dir  
Dir. des initiatives spéciales  
d'approvisionnement  
11 Laurier, Place du Portage III  
12C1  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TBIPS - MPMCT PROJECT	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8474-14MP22/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8474-14MP22	<b>Date</b> 2013-08-26
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XE-670-26308	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 670xe.W8474-14MP22	<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 2013-09-05</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> Chapple(XE Div.), Jeremy	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 670xe
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-1004 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-8303
<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>

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-14MP22/A

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

W8474-14MP22

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

004

File No. - N° du dossier

670xeW8474-14MP22

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

670xe

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

**Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Request For Proposal (RFP) W8474-14MP22/A**

**Task Based In Informatics Professional Services (TBIPS)  
Multiple Resource Categories And Levels  
For The Department of National Defence's  
Military Personnel Management Capability Transformation (MPMCT) Project**

**Amendment No: 004**

**RFP Published on August 2, 2013  
Closing Date: September 5, 2013**

---

**The following is a summary of Amendments issued to date for Solicitation W8474-14MP22/A:**

<b>Amendment Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Amendment No. 001	Electronic August 12, 2013	Clarification Question # 1 & RFP Revision No 1 to extend Bid Closing date.
2	Amendment No. 002	Electronic August 14, 2013	Clarification Question # 's 2 to 5.
3	Amendment No. 002	Electronic August 19, 2013	Clarification Question # 's 6 to 14.
4	Amendment No. 004	Electronic August 26, 2013	Clarification Question # 15 to 23 and RFP Revisions # 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 .

---

**CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS:**

Note: clarification questions are numerically sequenced upon arrival at PWGSC. A question and its answer will be provided via the Government of Canada's tendering web site BuyandSell.gc.ca as responses become available. Potential Bidders are therefore advised that questions and answers may be issued via BuyandSell.gc.ca out of sequence.

The following clarification questions were received from a potential Bidders. In accordance with Article 13 under 2003 (2013-06-01) Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, which has been incorporated into the RFP, and in accordance with Article 2.1 c) of the RFP, the clarification questions and corresponding answers are provided to all potential bidders as set out below:

**Question 15**

Regarding FA2.M2, since PeopleSoft HRMS/HCM version 8.9 came out in December 2004 (more than 8 years ago), we ask the client to kindly amend the criteria from "...the experience must have been acquired within the 6 years preceding the start date..." to "...the experience must have been acquired within the 8 years preceding the start date..."

**Answer 15**

The Crown does not accept modifying FA2.M2. This requirement is for current experience with PeopleSoft HRMS version 8.9 or PeopleSoft HCM version 8.9 or a Greater version of either.

**Question 16**

The combined requirements of the Data Conversion Specialist Level 3 are difficult for individual resources to meet. In order to alleviate this, while still offering the Crown the skills required, would the Crown consider the following modifications?

For the Data Conversion Specialist Level 3, criterion DCS2.M1, would the Crown consider modifying the requirement to read: "A minimum of 6 years of combined demonstrated experience performing 2 or more of the following tasks with Oracle PeopleSoft HCM version 7.5 or HRMS 7.5 or a greater version of either..."?

For the Data Conversion Specialist Level 3, criterion DCS2.R2, would the Crown consider modifying the requirement to read: "Combined demonstrated experience developing Data Models for an Oracle PeopleSoft HCM version 8.9 environment or a greater version."?

**Answer 16**

PeopleSoft HRMS version 8.9 or HCM 8.9 or a greater version has different data structures (i.e. Person Model and Organization Relationship) that do not exist in PeopleSoft HRMS version 7.5 or HCM 7.5. In addition, version 8.9 is the closest version of PeopleSoft to the Crown's target version for the upgrade to PeopleSoft 9.1. The minimum experience required of the Data Conversion Specialist Level 2 would be from version 8.9 or greater. For these reasons, the Crown does not accept changing DCS2.M1.

The Crown does not accept modifying DCS2.R2 for the Data Conversion Specialist Level 2. Aggregate time has been defined in Attachment 4.1, Section 1. Definitions.

**Question 17**

Could you please clarify the below question:

With regards to the above noted solicitation, can you please clarify if the Contractor is required to bid each Workstream? In addition, is a separate proposal required for each Workstream?

**Answer 17**

Please see Questions and Answers 6) and 9) of Solicitation Amendment No. 003 published August 19, 2013.

**Question 18**

In regards to Workstream 2 – ERP Programmer we would like to request that the Crown amend PA3.R1 as it relates to experience writing SQL and PeopleCode for an HR database on an Oracle platform. There is a significant blend of both Oracle and DB2 based HR database platforms within the various departments in the National Capital Area for which PeopleSoft is being implemented/maintained on. For example DB2 has been heavily used by CRA, PWGSC, RCMP and CBSA just to name a few. As such

---

we feel that it would be greatly limiting the amount of qualified resources available to respond under this category should it be limited to just Oracle as all of the experience from these departments would have to be excluded. Most candidates have a blend of experience on both of these platforms. It is also fair to note that in the most recent amendment issued on August 20th, that the Crown acknowledges that CRA has over 30,000 people and mentions that this is a reference-able department for this requirement particular rated requirement, however CRA operates on an HR database platform of DB2 therefore any references from CRA at this point would be deemed ineligible since they are not programming PeopleCode and SQL into a Oracle database platform but rather onto DB2. Therefore we would like to suggest that the Crown amend PA3.R1 as follows;

Suggested amendment:

“Experience writing SQL and PeopleCode for an HR database on an Oracle or DB2 platform where there is a minimum of 5,000 active employee records.”

### **Answer 18**

The Oracle database platform is considered a relevant factor for this point-rated criterion and for this work stream as a whole, as Programmer Analysts are expected to code both PeopleCode as well as SQR and SQL scripts. Experience for this point-rated criterion is not limited to DND experience only and can be gained outside of the Government of Canada. The Crown does not accept changing PA3.R1.

### **Question 19**

We have the following question/clarification in regards to the point rated requirements in Workstream 1: For both FA2.R2 and FA3.R2, the requirements states: “A certificate of completion for the following formal Oracle PeopleSoft training courses: 1. Oracle PeopleTools I; or 2. PS Query; Or A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools I or PS Query. In regards to demonstrating years of experience, we believe that the “Or” clause should read “A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools or PS Query.”

“PeopleTools I” refers to a course name, not the intended suite of tools.

### **Answer 19**

The Crown accepts to change FA2.R2 and FA3.R2 to the following:

A certificate of completion for the following formal Oracle PeopleSoft training courses:

1. Oracle PeopleTools 1;  
or

2. PS Query;  
or

A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools or PS Query.

Please see RFP Revision No. 2 and 3 herein.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-14MP22/A

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

W8474-14MP22

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

004

File No. - N° du dossier

670xeW8474-14MP22

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

670xe

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

### **Question 20**

Are there resources within the MPMCT Project (on the client site) currently occupying the positions in each workstream performing work on MPMCT in a similar capacity? If yes, please indicate the applicable position and workstream and vendor and contract value and duration.

### **Answer 20**

Please see Answer 2 to Question 2 of Solicitation Amendment No.002 published on August 14, 2013.

### **Question 21**

Regarding PA3.R1, any organization, Private or Public, can be used to substantiate the requirements of PA3.R1. and specifically, Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) and the Department of National Defence (DND) and Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) have employee records greater than 30,000 for Federal clientele.

Would the crown consider reducing the number of employee records to be less restrictive and allow ERP projects from a wider client base to qualify for maximum rated points. Many smaller departments and organizations have under taken ERP projects with the programmer analyst role solely responsible for data vice a larger team organizational setting in the largest departments/organizations.

### **Answer 21**

The Crown does not accept changing PA3.R1. The number of 30,000 active employee records is identified as the threshold for maximum points in this point-rated criterion; however the minimum is only 5,000 active employee records. Vendors do not need to achieve maximum rated points in order to qualify for this work stream. There is a specific (and very relevant) value for those vendors with resources who have worked with very large PeopleSoft environments.

### **Question 22**

In reference to question 13 in this amendment, you use DND and CRA as examples of government departments with over 30,000 users. CRA hasn't used PeopleSoft in several years so in order to obtain full marks, the resource has to have been working at DND non-stop for the past 10 years. This is clearly limiting the competition to a particular (incumbent) technical resource.

Furthermore, after 4000 users in a database, any number over this becomes irrelevant. I sincerely hope that DND will reconsider this rated requirement so that resources other than the incumbent can fairly compete.

Please adjust this rated to 10 years of this experience with a database of over 5000 users.

### **Answer 22**

The Crown does not accept changing PA3.R1. The required experience need not be attained within the Government of Canada only; private sector experience is equally relevant, as is experience with other governments. The intention with this point-rated criterion is not to limit competition. Programmer Analysts who have coded for environments supporting very large numbers of active employee records have to conform to strict performance standards in order for the code to function. Code programmed for use in smaller PeopleSoft environments needn't be efficient to function; however attempts to use such code in the DND PeopleSoft environments with 125,000+ active employee records routinely yields significant performance issues. Experience coding for larger PeopleSoft environments is therefore an asset to DND, as the resources will have learned to code with performance and load testing in mind.

**Question 23**

a) Would DND please confirm that every project reference referred to in the bid must be submitted upon request by the Contracting Authority and not at bid closing?

b) Regarding Workstream 1 -FA2.M1 and Workstream 2- PA3.M2 PA.3.M3 (as follows below), would DND please confirm that "the start date stated in the draft Task Authorization" should read "the bid closing date"?

**Answer 23**

a) This is correct. Please refer to Question and Answer 10) of Solicitation Amendment No. 003 published August 19, 2013.

b) When responding to the RFP please refer to *Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria* which refers to the closing date of the solicitation.

Please note that *Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table*, forms part of any resulting Contract issued under this solicitation and that *Appendix C to Annex A* will be used to assess resources at the Task Authorization stage.

**RFP REVISIONS:**

The following revisions are made to the Solicitation document:

- 1) At Page 4 of 6 of Attachment 4.2 (Pricing Schedule), WORKSTREAM 3:

**DELETE:**

The following tables:

**OPTION PERIODS:**

<b>Option Period 1</b>
<b>(August 1, 2014 to April 30, 2015)</b>

	<b>(B)</b>	<b>(C*)</b>	<b>(D)</b>
<b>Resource Category</b>	<b>Level of Expertise</b>	<b>Estimated Number of Days</b>	<b>Proposed Firm Per Diem Rate</b>
A3. ERP Programmer Analyst	Level 3	360	\$

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-14MP22/A

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

W8474-14MP22

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

004

File No. - N° du dossier

670xeW8474-14MP22

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

670xe

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

<b>Option Period 2</b>
<b>(May 1, 2015 to January 31, 2016)</b>

	(B)	(C*)	(D)
Resource Category	Level of Expertise	Estimated Number of Days	Proposed Firm Per Diem Rate
A3. ERP Programmer Analyst	Level 3	360	\$

<b>Option Period 3</b>
<b>(February 1, 2016 to October 31, 2016)</b>

	(B)	(C*)	(D)
Resource Category	Level of Expertise	Estimated Number of Days	Proposed Firm Per Diem Rate
A3. ERP Programmer Analyst	Level 3	360	\$

**REPLACE WITH:**

**OPTION PERIODS:**

<b>Option Period 1</b>
<b>(August 1, 2014 to April 30, 2015)</b>

	(B)	(C*)	(D)
Resource Category	Level of Expertise	Estimated Number of Days	Proposed Firm Per Diem Rate
A5. ERP Technical Analyst	Level 3	360	\$

Option Period 2
(May 1, 2015 to January 31, 2016)

	(B)	(C*)	(D)
Resource Category	Level of Expertise	Estimated Number of Days	Proposed Firm Per Diem Rate
A5. ERP Technical Analyst	Level 3	360	\$

Option Period 3
(February 1, 2016 to October 31, 2016)

	(B)	(C*)	(D)
Resource Category	Level of Expertise	Estimated Number of Days	Proposed Firm Per Diem Rate
A5. ERP Technical Analyst	Level 3	360	\$

- 2) At page 4 of 41 of Attachment 4.1 (BID EVALUATION CRITERIA), WORKSTREAM 1, (c) Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, (i) Level 2 ERP Functional Analyst, FA2.R2:

**DELETE:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools I or PS Query."*

**REPLACE WITH:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools or PS Query."*

- 3) At page 11 of 41 of Attachment 4.1 (BID EVALUATION CRITERIA), WORKSTREAM 1, (c) Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, (ii) Level 3 ERP Functional Analyst, FA3.R2:

**DELETE:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools I or PS Query."*

**REPLACE WITH:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools or PS Query."*

- 
- 4) At page 4 of 41 of Appendix C to Annex A (RESOURCES ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RESPONSE TABLE), WORKSTREAM 1, (c) Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, (i) Level 2 ERP Functional Analyst, FA2.R2:

**DELETE:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools I or PS Query."*

**REPLACE WITH:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools or PS Query."*

- 5) At page 11 of 41 of Appendix C to Annex A (RESOURCES ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RESPONSE TABLE), WORKSTREAM 1, (c) Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, (ii) Level 3 ERP Functional Analyst, FA3.R2:

**DELETE:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools I or PS Query."*

**REPLACE WITH:**

*"A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience working with Oracle PeopleTools or PS Query."*

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.**