

**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**  
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY  
REQUIREMENT

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**  
**Raison sociale et adresse du**  
**fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Informatics Professional Services Division / Division  
des services professionnels en informatique  
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier  
3C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W6369-12P5RA/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W6369-12P5RA	<b>Date</b> 2013-11-15
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-608-26499	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 608zm.W6369-12P5RA	<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 2013-11-21</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> Kelly, James	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 608zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-5701 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-1207
<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>

**Question14** The response to Question 7 of amendment 3 is patently false and in fact discourages competition, encourages potentially higher costs to the Crown, and will certainly decrease the quality and quantity of proposals returned. The response precludes financially competitive bids, and in fact, may preclude many capable bidders from proposing:

If an industry member has delivered 15 resources within a 12 month period to a contract delivering help desk resources – identical to your need – yet that contract was very competitively priced, they may not meet the \$3M threshold.

If those services were delivered at \$2M, a far better price to the Crown, this would be non-compliant.

In our case, we have dozens of contractors and employees and dozens of contracts, yet very few with an excess of ten (10) contractors at any given time. In fact, if we have forty (40) consultants on four ongoing contracts, this too would be non-compliant. Clearly, four such contracts would demonstrate corporate capability to deliver to your potential needs, as would one or two like-sized contracts.

Could the Crown kindly eliminate the \$3M dollar figure from this solicitation entirely in order to avoid elimination of fiscally responsible proposals? Could the Crown eliminate a project limitation of two (2) projects, or lower the contractor count to half (eight resources) to ensure that corporate capability be fairly demonstrated rather than on the size of only two projects? Could the Crown kindly extend the closing date of this solicitation by a minimum of 2 weeks in order to allow for the changes requested, to be addressed?

**Answer 14** The qualification requirements of M1 are not restricted to providing Helpdesk Specialists. Any category of resources for IM/IT contracts will be accepted as long as it meets the stated requirements. The \$3M threshold for contract value is not directly related to the number of resources required. In fact it is possible that any contract awarded as a result of this solicitation could be much more than the \$3M threshold, yet Bidders are only required to demonstrate contract value of at least \$3M. Canada has operational needs for a substantial number of resources over several years. Managing multiple contracts with less resources does not in it self equate to managing one contract with 15 or more resources in our opinion. Canada is not prepared to change Bidder Mandatory criterion M1. Canada is not prepared to extend the closing date of this solicitation.

**Question 15** Would the Crown consider amending M1 of the corporate requirement to allow subsequent contracts with the same client for the same Statement of Work? TBIPS Level 1 has a \$2M limitation and the vast majority of contracts are tendered through Level 1. Instead of going to Level 2, they retender the work for another Level 1 contract. For example, a vendor is awarded an initial contract of \$2M, and when the client re-tenders the contract, the same vendor is awarded the 2nd contract. The initial contract ends on Friday. The new contract starts on the following Monday, with the same statement of work, and the same resources. Essentially, nothing changes but the contract number. This happens due to the \$2M limitation on TBIPS, where a client has to re-tender after a \$2M contract is complete. Would the Crown consider to meet Criterion M1?

**Answer 15** See answer 14 above.