

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
800 Burrard Street, 2nd Floor
800, rue Burrard, 2e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 0B9
Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526

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
Public Works and Government Services Canada -
Pacific Region
800 Burrard Street, 12th Floor
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 0B9

Title - Sujet MPS: ESDC, AAFC, CFIA	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EZ107-140001/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EZ107-140001	Date 2013-11-25
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$VAN-579-7098	
File No. - N° de dossier VAN-3-36162 (579)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-12-03	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Pacific Standard Time PST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Steckhan, Curt	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur van579
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (604) 666-1465 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (604) 775-7526
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: See herein	

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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EZ107-140001/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

van579

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

EZ107-140001

File No. - N° du dossier

VAN-3-36162

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Amendment 005

Amendment 005

The purpose of this amendment is to answer questions.

Questions and Answers

Q1: I really think you guys need to reread question 28, it's a great question, and really, you guys failed to answer it, similarly with Q52.

The Crown's answer is increasing the cost to the Crown and limiting competition. A3 devices are roughly a 25% price premium over A4 devices. The Crown's answer to both those questions is significantly increasing the cost to the Crown, and because A3 device needs in reality are so limited, not all the major manufacturers provide a broad portfolio of A3 devices, typically only in the sweet spots of the market which is not the total market.

The Crown needs to reconsider this answer, the solutions offered should include a A3 or A4 option, so if during the assessment a MFD is defined not requiring 11x17 or some other finishing option, than the contractor can put one in that does offer that, which will lower there cost which will have been built into the CPI rate.

By stating the devices offered "must have the capabilities" eliminates a ton of competition (like the largest printer device manufacturer in the world) and increased costs to the Crown. This tender should allow for a A3 and A4 product to be offered per MFD category, this will further drive the costs down and increase the competition for the tender.

As it stands, the Crown has eliminated competition and increase their costs.

The Crown should reconsider their answer, and if they reconsider, an additional extension should be granted.

A1: Canada has already stated in answer to A16 Amendment 004 that flexibility already exists to allow for either A3 or A4 MFD devices. As this is a services contract, ensuring users have the print capability and the features they need to conduct their work is what is most important, not the type of device they will use to print, copy, fax or scan. Canada wants to reiterate that nowhere in the technical specifications documents has it indicated that Bidders must only provide A3 type MFD's. In addition, in order to better respond to Q28 and Q52 of Amendment 003, Canada will not designate a certain percentage of devices as A3 vs. A4 as we expect the vendor to complete their assessment of a given site and based on this assessment, to install the appropriate device and required features to meet the printing needs of that site.

In response to the second part of the question, Canada does not agree with a further extension of the RFP deadline.

Amendments

1. On page 7 of 95, Part 3, section 1:

Delete:

Canada requests that bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:

Section I: Technical Bid (2 hard copies and 1 soft copy on CD, DVD)
Section II: Financial Bid (2 hard copies and 1 soft copy)
Section III: Certifications (2 hard copies)
Section IV: Additional Information (2 hard copies)

Insert:

Canada requests that bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:

Section I: Technical Bid (**4** hard copies and 1 soft copy on CD, DVD)
Section II: Financial Bid (2 hard copies and 1 soft copy)
Section III: Certifications (2 hard copies)
Section IV: Additional Information (2 hard copies)

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.