

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 PMPS - Two years	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation M7594-142677/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client M7594-142677	Date 2013-11-20
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-602-26517	
File No. - N° de dossier 602el.M7594-142677	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-12-11	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: Ouellet, Monique	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 602el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1775 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-5925
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 is issued to amend the RFP.

QUESTION 33:

Ref: Q&A 13. We presume that Canada is including the 24-month period restriction in its criteria in order to identify vendors that have shown themselves to be capable of providing a high level of the same category of resources (e.g. Business Analysts) for an extended period of time. If that assumption is correct, please consider changing the requirement such that it need not be the same 24-month period for all categories within a workstream; if a vendor has provided a high level of Business Analysts over a 24-month period, and of Business Architects over a 24-month period, why do they need to be the same 24-month period?

ANSWER 33:

The assumption is not correct. The 24 month period is to identify vendors that have shown themselves to be capable of providing ALL of the categories of the workstream within a 24 month period. The 24 period is in line with the period of this requirement (2 years). It will not be changed.

QUESTION 34:

In a situation where a vendor is referencing billable days for resources provided under the same Task Authorization (Category and Role Description as published in the Contract) is it acceptable for the vendor to use a single instance of the deliverables from the TA to cover all the resources under that TA, provided the description maps to over 60% of the associated tasks?

In plain language: if a vendor were to provide 17 Testers under one contract (this category is used as an example and is not associated with this solicitation to avoid confusion) all the Testers have the same tasks listed on their Task Authorizations, and the associated tasks come from the same Contract, only the names would be different but the tasks would remain the same. Likewise, the "Cross-Reference to the associated tasks listed in the Statement of Work" would also be the same cross-references. This means that we would be copy/pasting the same two rows and the same cells of information 17 times, which procurement would be mandated to evaluate independently 17 times, even though the information is exactly the same.

Would it be acceptable for vendors in this scenario, to reference the 17 Testers and the Number of Billable Days and list the "Demonstrated Tasks" and "Cross-reference to.." only once per Resource Category and Level?

ANSWER 34:

This would be acceptable provided that the information provided meets all of the criteria M1.

Note that the requirement of Criteria M1 for all sub-requirements is for the resource "category".

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.