



**MAIL BIDS TO :  
ENVOYER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Contracting Officer : Solinda Phan  
 Agente d'approvisionnement | Supply Officer  
 Division de la voie de communication protégée  
 | Secure Channel Division  
 Services partagés Canada | Shared Services  
 Canada  
 Portage III, 12C1-64  
 11, rue Laurier | 11 Laurier Street  
 Gatineau, QC, K1A 0S5

**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**

**THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A  
SECURITY REQUIREMENT / CE  
DOCUMENT CONTIENT DES  
EXIGENCES RELATIVES À LA  
SÉCURITÉ**

**Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution**  
 SSC | SPC  
*Procurement and Vendors Relationships |*  
*Achats et relations avec les fournisseurs*  
 XK Division | Division XK  
 11 Laurier Street | 11, rue Laurier  
 Place du Portage, Phase III, 12C1  
 Gatineau, Quebec  
 K1A 0S5

<b>Title – Sujet</b> Strategic Advisory Services – Sourcing and Benchmarking Service-conseils stratégiques – Approvisionnement et analyses comparatives	
<b>Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation</b> 10031544/A	<b>Amendment No. –</b> 006
<b>Client Reference No. – N° référence du client</b> 13-1620	<b>Date</b> October 1, 2013
<b>File No. – N° de dossier</b> CAC10031544	
<b>Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin</b> at – à 11 :59 PM on – le October 18, 2013	<b>Time Zone Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) / Heure Avancée de l'Est (HAE)
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Inquiries to : - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Solinda Phan	
<b>Telephone No. – N° de téléphone :</b> 819-956-1363	
<b>Email – Courriel :</b> Solinda.phan@ssc-spc.gc.ca	
<b>Delivery required - Livraison exigée</b> See Herein	<b>Delivered Offered – Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Destination – of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination – des biens, services et construction :</b> See Herein	
<b>Vendor/firm Name and address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Facsimile No. – N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. – N° de téléphone</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/de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b> _____

This amendment is raised to answer Industry questions.

**Question 13:**

We appreciate that Canada wants to ensure that the selected vendor has experience with major IT consulting engagements of similar size and complexity as will be undertaken at SSC. However, the current requirement is that “the value of each engagement was greater than \$20-million”, and be “in addition to any previously stated references”. We are unclear as to why these references need to be in addition to any previously named references. Would Canada please remove the requirement that these references be “in addition to any previously stated reference”.

**Answer 13**

No. Canada will not make the requested change.

**Question 27:**

We understand that SSC is not required to post this RFP electronically for forty calendar days because the national security exemption applies (and is therefore not subject to Canada’s international trade agreement bidding obligations). However, given the complexity of the requirement, the number of other active opportunities on the street (from SSC and other federal departments and agencies), we believe SSC and market would be better served by a longer solicitation period than the 26 calendar days currently allotted to the response time frame. We therefore request that SSC extend this solicitation period by an additional two weeks.

**Answer 27:**

See Amendment 005.

**Question 33:**

With respect to M.8, what is SSC's expectation for bidders to demonstrate "bench strength" of 50 qualified employees?

**Answer 33:**

See Amendment 003, Modification 018.

**Question 34:**

Due to the complexity and the level of effort required for the bid response as well as the coordination of client references, we request an extension to the solicitation closing date to October 11th, 2013.

**Answer 34:**

See Amendment 005.

**Question 38:**

Reference RFP pages 46 of 55 and 47 of 55, Section 2 Point Rated Requirements. Each of the rated requirements has an allocation of points to be awarded to a maximum, what is the criteria the evaluation team will use to allocate each of the points? Is there a possibility only partial points will be awarded within each rated requirement? If so, please provide a breakdown of how the evaluation team will assign a score for each of the rated requirements.

**Answer 38:**

See Amendment 003, Modification 018 (Attachment 4.1).

Canada will not award partial points. Bidders will receive 0 or full points for each engagement, with substantiation and client reference, up to the maximum points available per criterion.



**Question 41:**

Reference RFP page 14 of 55 Section 4.2.2.3.4. We recognize that the same client reference may be used to meet multiple Mandatory and Rated criteria. Should separate client references documents be provided in each instance of use? Please review and respond to each example to ensure clarity.

Example 1: Reference A meets the requirement for M1 and M2. Using Form 2, do we provide a copy of Form 2 in each response section or can we provide pointers to the original instance.

Example 2: Reference B meets the requirement for M2 and R1. Do we need to use Form 2 for M2 and use Form 3 to show compliance for R1 for the same Reference B?

Example 3: Reference C meets the requirements for M3 and M4. The requirements for M3 and M4 are different and therefore the client references should highlight different aspects of the project. Can we provide different write-ups for the same project to focus on the relevant piece of the project?

**Answer 41:**

See Amendment 003, Modifications 006-016 and 018-021.

**Question 42:**

Reference RFP page 1 off and RFP page 7 of 55 Part 2, 2.21. Page 1 - The bid closing time is identified as 11:59 pm, please confirm if packages will be accepted until the identified closing time, or until close of the SCC office hours. If until close of office hours, please identify what that time is. Given this package is being directed to SSC XK Division at 11 Laurier are there any unique instructions our courier will need to follow as a result of security checkpoints or will they have direct access to XK Division?

**Answer 42:**

SSC currently does not have a central Bid Receiving Unit. Therefore, as per Part 2 of the RFP, bids must be submitted directly to the Contracting Authority by a Delivery Service Company (which includes an incorporated courier company, Canada Post Corporation or a national equivalent of a foreign country).

RFP Section 2.1.6 allows for late bids to be accepted by SSC if the Bidder provides evidence that the Delivery Service Company received the bid prior to the closing date and time identified on page one of the solicitation.

**Question 43:**

There is a significant amount of information that must be provided and reviewed to ensure compliance in addition to the numerous client references required for mandatory and rated requirements which require client sign-off that make the current closing date of September 20, 2013 difficult to achieve. We are therefore requesting that the closing date be changed to October 21, 2013 to allow sufficient time to engage global client references and submit a compliant response.

**Answer 43:**

See Amendment 005.

**Question 44:**

Section 2.1.2

If two arm's length organizations partner to reply to the RFP and both agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of the RFP, would SSC consider having a direct relationship with each of the organizations in the partnership and allow the partnership to determine if a TA will be delivered by one or both partners?



**Answer 44:**

No. Canada will not make the requested change.

Canada would like to reiterate that, as indicated in the RFP, only the Bidder will be considered for the purposes of evaluation. For purposes of precision, Canada is including the definition of Bidder.

“Bidder: Person or entity submitting a bid to perform a contract for goods, services or both. It does not include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the bidder, or its subcontractors.”

**Question 49:**

R1 and R5 state “The Bidder should provide client references for consulting engagements completed within the last seven (7) years where each individual consulting engagement had a value of greater than \$20 million. The value of the engagement refers to the “contract value” of the engagement between the Bidder and its client, and not the value of the project that was undertaken by the Bidder. Twenty (20) points will be awarded for each completed engagement up to a maximum of five (5) engagements”

- a. Please clarify SSC’s definition of the term “contract value”. Does this refer to the Total Contract Value (TCV) of the resulting outsourcing agreement between [Vendor]’s client reference and the service provider delivering the outsourced services? In other words, if we advised a client on an initiative where the client signed an outsourcing agreement with a service provider where the TCV was \$20 million or higher.

**Answer 49:**

Canada is requesting the Contract value. Contract value is the value of the individual contract between the Bidder and its client as part of the client project. Project value is the total value of the client project.

**Question 50:**

Forms 2 and 3 require that for each reference project, each client 'confirm' that they have read and understood the respective Mandatory and/or Point Rated Technical criteria provided in the RFP as well as that the primary and back up reference each sign the project references. This is not a request that we have encountered before in other solicitations. In the past, our clients have agreed to provide contact details when acting as references. What SSC is requesting us to ask of our clients is both onerous and time consuming for them. Additionally, this poses significant logistical issues for bidders given the large number of project references requested and in coordinating international project references. As such, we respectfully request that SSC modify Forms 2 and 3 such that bidders are required to provide reference contact details.

**Answer 50:**

See Amendment 003, Modifications 006-016 and 018-021.

**Question 52:**

Mandatory requirement M.8 requires bidders to demonstrate a “bench-strength” consisting of a minimum of fifty (50) qualified employees available to provide the required services to meet the requirements as described in Annex A – Statement of Work”.

We understand that a minimum of fifty resumes are not required to be provided within the bid submission, given the information provided on page page 16 of 55, which reads:

“Resources will only be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor. After contract award, the Task Authorization process will be in accordance with Part 7 – Resulting Contract Clauses, the Article 7.3 “Task Authorization”. When a Task Authorization Form (TA Form) is issued, the Contractor will be requested to propose a resource to satisfy the specific requirement



based on the TA Form's Statement of Work. The proposed resource will then be assessed against the criteria identified in the Contract's Statement of Work in accordance with Appendix C of Annex A".

With this understanding, would SSC please provide bidders with some guidance as to the type of information SSC expects to receive from bidders demonstrating compliance with mandatory requirement M.8? Given this is a mandatory requirement, we would like to ensure we are clear in relation to demonstrating our firm's compliance with this requirement.

**Answer 52:**

See Amendment 003, Modification 018.

**Question 54:**

Page 5 of 55 Section 1.2 Summary

The fourth paragraph states:

"Bidders must provide a list of names, or other related information as needed, pursuant to section 01 of the Standard Instructions 2003"

This is worded as a "must" requirement and we therefore assume this is a mandatory requirement to submit with our bid. Can SSC please clarify this requirement? What names are bidders required to list? And, what other related information is required to be submitted with the bid?

The Reference Project Verification Form for Mandatory Technical Criteria (Form 2) and Reference Project Verification Form for Point Rated Technical Criteria (Form 3)

Some client reference organizations have procurement policies which prevent them from signing these forms. These policies also prevent them from an email attestation. However, they are still able to provide a reference for our firm and we can complete all of the required fields in the form (company name, description of project, contact name, title, phone number, email address). Will the SSC accept a reference form for both the Mandatory and Point Rated Criteria where the reference client is not able to sign the form or provide an email attestation? SSC will still be able to validate and confirm the client reference as necessary directly with the reference client.

**Answer 54:**

See Amendment 003, Modifications 006-016 and 018-021.

**Question 55:**

What is the anticipated award date?

**Answer 55:**

It is Canada's expectation that the award date will be early to mid November 2013.

**Question 56:**

What is anticipated timing of first Task Authorization?

**Answer 56:**

It is Canada's expectation that the first Task Authorization will be issued shortly after contract award.

**Question 57:**

Will all work streams resulting from this solicitation have an associated Task Authorization?



**Answer 57:**

Yes. Refer to Annex A, Statement of Work, Section 5, Scope of Work.

**Question 59:**

What documentation must we provide, other than Form 4, to substantiate that our bench strength consists of a minimum of 50 qualified employees?

**Answer 59:**

See Amendment 003, Modification 018.

**Question 60:**

How much lead time prior to start date will be provided for each Task Authorization?

**Answer 60:**

It is Canada's expectation that the start date for each Task Authorization will be as soon as possible after the Contractor's proposal is accepted by Canada.

**Question 61:**

Is there an estimated percentage of work that will be performed in French?

**Answer 61:**

It is Canada's expectation that most work will be conducted in English.

**Question 62:**

Is there an estimated percentage of work that will be performed outside the National Capital Region?

**Answer 62:**

It is Canada's expectation that the bulk of the work will be performed in the NCR, however some of the work could be conducted from the contractor's premises.

**Question 63:**

Can the Consultant provide a Reference with signatures pending? In some cases, it is taking an extended period of time to obtain signatures as this requires approval by the Client's in-house legal counsel. We are working diligently on this requirement, but some signatures may not be obtained until after the due date of the bid submission.

**Answer 63:**

See Amendment 003, Modifications 006-016 and 018-021.

**Question 65:**

With respect to the above-referenced Solicitation, please confirm that for R.2, SSC is looking for client references where bidders have helped source/set up IT outsourcing engagements as opposed to having conducted IT outsourcing engagements.

**Answer 65:**

Confirmed. The client references being sought in Point Rated Criteria R2 should align to the requirements identified in Section 5 of the Statement of Work.



**Question 66:**

Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Section 2 - Point Related Requirements Page 46-47

R1 and R5 criteria refer to individual consulting engagements that had a “value of greater than \$20 million”. These criteria are further described as “The value of the engagement refers to the “contract value” of the engagement between the Bidder and its client, and not the value of the project that was undertaken by the Bidder”

\$20 million dollar+ individual consulting engagements are exceptionally large in the marketplace. Please clarify if SSC did indeed mean the value of the consulting engagement between the bidder and its client OR the \$20 million refers to the value of the agreement for outsourced services between the reference client and the service provider which the bidder advised on?

**Answer 66:**

See response to question 49. Canada is requesting 'contract value'.

**Question 70:**

Due to the extensive modifications in Amendment 3, we would like to request that the Crown reissue the RFP document with the changes incorporated.

As there are some unanswered questions that will impact the development of the response and the new, significant additional task of profiling the resources, we would like to request an extension to the closing date.

**Answer 70:**

Canada will not provide the requested information.  
See Amendment 005 for extension to the closing date.

**Question 71:**

We note in the recent Q&A released by SSC, that clarification was given that all bids must be mailed to SSC at Place de Portage rather than hand delivered or sent by courier to the SSC bid receiving unit at 700 Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario.

This represents a significant departure from both Government of Canada and SSC past practice for bid delivery. If SSC wishes to provide the widest possible opportunity for bidders to submit proposals, we request that SSC allow both postal delivery and hand delivery of bids to bid receiving at SSC or PWGSC, by a closing time of 2pm.

We are significantly uncomfortable submitting this bid through the mail given: 1) we will be submitting confidential client information as part of our bid and postal delivery represents an information security risk to our firm; 2) the physical size of this bid and the risk that it may not be delivered.

**Answer 71:**

See response to Question 42.

The Bid Preparation Instructions request Bidders to submit the Bid Submission Form, a complete financial proposal, and any required Certifications in hardcopy. These parts of the Bid should not pose a significant size to the physical proposal. The technical proposal would/may make for a significant physical size of a Bid. SSC has therefore requested that the technical proposal be provided in softcopy on a CD-Rom or DVD, as per Part 3 of the RFP.

If Bidders have confidential client information identified in their proposal, Bidders may submit their client reference(s), by attaching encrypted Forms 2 and/or 3, through email to the Contracting Authority's email address identified on page one of the solicitation. Bidders will require an Entrust PKI system in order to



proceed. Please contact the Contracting Authority via email to coordinate the exchange of public encryption keys. The Contracting Authority will open the encrypted attachment after the solicitation closes and save a copy of the client reference to a CD-ROM or DVD.

**Question 74:**

Please see Amendment 003 dated September 13th, page 10 of 21 Modification 011 wherein it states “ On Page 14 of 55 of the RFP, Section 4.2 Technical Evaluation, Subsection 4.2.2.4 Client References” and note that Subsection 4.2.2.4 is listed as “Corporate Information and Methodologies” and “Client References” is at 4.2.3.4. Please clarify which section is to be “deleted in its entirety”.

**Answer 74:**

Regarding Amendment 003, Modification 011, Subsection 4.2.2.4 was referenced incorrectly as Client References. It should state "On Page 14 of 55 of the RFP, Section 4.2 Technical Evaluation, Subsection 4.2.2.4 Corporate Information and Methodologies: Delete in its entirety".