

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 (See original solicitation
document.)

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

Title - Sujet TBIPS - Business and PM Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation G7898-130001/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client G7898-130001	Date 2014-02-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-380-26888	
File No. - N° de dossier 380zm.G7898-130001	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-03-17	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
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: Cook, Gail	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 380zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-2591 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT CANADA	

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

AMENDMENT NO. 004

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and answer Bidders' questions.

RFP REVISIONS:

1. At Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstream 1 - Business Services, 2.2 B.2 Business Architect – Level 3, Rated Criterion R2 (iii):

Delete:

(iii) carrying out the recommended work plans to address the issues identified.

Insert:

(iii) providing oversight and direction on work plan activities to address the issues identified.

2. At Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria Workstream 2 - Project Management Services, 2.6 Project Scheduler - Level 2, Rated Criteria R4:

Delete:

(iii) The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience using and working with Microsoft Project Desktop and Microsoft Project Server.

Insert:

(iii) The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience using and working with Microsoft Project Desktop or Microsoft Project Server.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q18 Re: Bidder - Rated Criteria:

R1 does not explicitly state that the project value must be \$5 million or above. In all other cases within the requirements document, this value amount has been explicitly defined. Can ESDC please confirm that projects do not need to be \$5 million or higher in value for R1?

A18 R1 has been revised to specify that projects must be \$5M or more.

Q19 Can ESDC please clarify whether the \$5 million "project value" refers to the overall project value, including but not limited to the contract value delivered by the Bidder? For instance, a Business Transformation project may have a \$100 million dollar value, but the Bidder may have delivered \$1 million of the total; internal resources and other firms will have delivered the remaining value.

A19 The value of the project must be \$5M or more. The Bidder's contract value may have been less than \$5M.

Q20 a. Will Canada evaluate the resumes submitted at this stage against the Resource Mandatory and Rated Criteria?

b. If so, are those evaluations part of the evaluation at this stage? Specifically, does the 65% Total Technical Score include both Bidder Rated Criteria and Resource Rated Criteria? If not, are we correct in understanding that the submitted resumes must only meet the Minimum Score Required in order to meet Bidder Mandatory Criteria M1?

c. If so, is Canada intentionally weighting the Bidder Rated Criteria (Maximum Score 10) at less than, for example, the representative Business Analyst Rated Criteria (Maximum Score 12), or will Canada adjust the weighting between the Bidder and each of the Resources? If so, please explain how that adjustment will be calculated.

A20 a. Yes.

b. The Total Technical Score includes the total points obtained for both the Bidder and the resources.

c. There will be no adjustment to the points for the Bidder and the resources.

Q21 In order to deliver a quality bid to ESDC, an extension of 5 weeks is respectfully requested. The deadline of February 24th does not provide enough time to address the many and complex requirements demanded in this RFP.

A21 The original bid closing date has been extended to March 17, 2014.

Q22 On pages 85 and 106 on point #1, the Crown defines a 'Project' as 'a temporary, planned activity, involving multiple parties, with a start and end date, a duration of at least 3 months, specific milestones and deliverables, defined responsibilities and a budget of \$5M or more.' Will the Crown please confirm that \$5 Million is the value of the client project?

A22 Point 1 has been revised in Attachment 4.1 for both Workstreams. The value of the project must be \$5M or more. The Bidder's contract value may have been less than \$5M.

-
- Q23 Will the Crown confirm that the definition of "Project", as described in points #1 - #6 on pages 85 and 106 applies to corporate references only (i.e. not resource reference projects)?
- A23 Point 1 has been revised in Attachment 4.1 for both Workstreams. Points 1 to 4 apply to both the Bidder and the proposed resources. Points 5 and 6 apply to the Bidder.
- Q24 [R3] on page 88 and 109 - the point scale identifies 1 point for participation in the development of each of the following: (i) Risk Management; (ii) Change Management; (iii) Performance Management; (iv) IT Security Guidance IITSG-33); (v) Published whitepaper with a Maximum point score of three points. Can the Crown please clarify that to get the maximum of three points Vendors will need to address three of the five areas?
- A24 Please see A12 response of Solicitation Amendment No. 003.
- Q25 Does the Crown recognize the potential Conflict of Interest that will result if the Mainframe Legacy Application Migration Project ('MLAMP') Solicitation No. G7638-130001/C were to be awarded to one of the three firms that will be awarded a contract resulting from this solicitation? If so, how does the Crown plan to address the potential conflict of interest?
- A25 This RFP solicitation is for as-and-when required resources that may be deployed to any number for present and future projects throughout ESDC.
- The referenced solicitation pertains to only one of many projects currently in ESDC. Therefore, the Crown does not recognize at this time any potential conflict of interest.
- Q26 With reference to Bidder Mandatory and Rated Criteria M2, M4, M5 and R2 which all state '...the references must be from government or private projects valued at greater than \$5M', could the Crown please confirm that in this context, it is intended to mean the Bidder's awarded contract value was more than \$5M as opposed to the client's budgeted project scope?
- A26 The value of the project must be \$5M or more. The Bidder's contract value may have been less than \$5M.
- Q27 With reference to Bidder Rated Criteria R1 where 'the Bidder should demonstrate that it provided services similar to those outlined in the Statement of Work (SOW) attached at Annex A, by providing up to 4 project descriptions involving Business Transformation in government or the private sector within the last 5 years'. Could the Crown please confirm that in this context, it is intended that Bidder's would reference projects in which the Bidder's awarded contract value was greater than \$5M?
- A27 The value of the project must be \$5M or more. The Bidder's contract value may have been less than \$5M.
- Q28 Could the Crown please confirm that Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 will be evaluated separately? If so, please confirm that Bidders should prepare two (2) submissions (for each workstream)?
- A28 Confirmed, Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 will be evaluated separately. It is requested that Bidders submit a separate bid for each Workstream.

-
- Q29 With reference to Bidder Rated Criteria R3, could the Crown please confirm if Bidders can demonstrate their capacity as thought leaders through the provision of project work experience of past or ongoing projects performed by the Bidder?
- A29 Contractors are often retained for a small segment of work within a transformation project. Although a contractor's work may be completed (past project), the transformation project itself may span multiple years and may not be completed and is considered ongoing. For R3, experience may be demonstrated through past projects but not ongoing projects.
- Q30 With reference to Bidder Mandatory Criteria M6, 'the Bidder must detail the PMO and business transformation methodologies, processes, support tools and/or templates (toolset) that it has used to establish and support a PMO on past government or private sector projects in order to demonstrate that it is able to support the provision of services outlined in the Statement of Work. Could the Crown please confirm that it is acceptable for the Bidder to detail the PMO and business transformation methodologies, processes, support tools and/or templates (toolset) that it has used to establish and support a PMO on an ongoing project?
- A30 Contractors are often retained for a small segment of work within a transformation project. Although a contractor's work may be completed (past project), the transformation project itself may span multiple years and may not be completed and is considered ongoing. For M6, experience may be demonstrated through past projects, ongoing projects, or completed projects.
- Q31 Q1 Ref: Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstreams 1 & 2, on pages 85 & 106, sub-section 5, states, in part:
- "5. References must include the name of the organization, the contract number, a short description of the services provided, the name, title, e-mail address or telephone number of the organization's responsible manager, as well as the award date, expiry date and dollar value of each contract."
- Would Canada please confirm that sub-section 5 applies only to the corporate reference criteria on pages 86 to 88 and pages 107 to 109?
- A31 Please refer to A23. Point 5, now Point 4, applies to only the Bidder.
- Q32 Ref: Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstreams 1 & 2, Mandatory M2, on pages 86 & 107, section 5, states in part:
- "The Bidder must provide a reference for each of two projects where the Bidder provided a similar team of resources (3 out of the 6 resource categories listed in M1 above) to at least two projects that delivered the same or similar services outlined in the Statement of Work."
- The first part of the requirement asks for "two projects" (underlined). Later on, the requirement asks for "at least two projects" (underlined). Would Canada confirm that only two projects are required, and that only one client contact is required for each of the two projects?
- A32 Only two projects are required. One client contact is required for each project.

Q33 Ref: Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstreams 1, B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist – Level 2, rated criterion R4, page 98 states:

“The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience within the last 10 years, managing business transformation activities involving business service improvements.”

In our experience it is extremely unlikely that a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery (BC/DR) Specialist would have been ‘managing business transformation activities’ involving business service improvements. This role may have ‘supported’ a business transformation, but it is unlikely that they would have ‘managed’ a business transformation activity. They may have managed the BC/DR component of a business transformation activity. Would Canada reword this section to:

“The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience within the last 10 years, creating business continuity/disaster recovery plans and managing the implementation of business continuity/disaster recovery plans.”

A33 Agreed. R4 has been revised.

Q34 Ref: Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstream 1 - Business Services, 2.0 Resource Mandatory and Rated Criteria 2.3 Business Continuity / Disaster Recovery Specialist - Level 2 (Page 95/130) M2 requires:

“The proposed resource must have worked as a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist, on 2 relevant business projects, each for a minimum duration of 6 months, in a similar environment as that described in the Statement of Work, in a government or private sector environment, within the last 10 years. Both projects must have been valued at greater than \$5M.”

We have considerable expertise and a full practice in Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery (BC/DR) locally within our office. Furthermore, we believe that the criteria as stated does not accurately reflect the type of work nor the scope that a resource of this type typically performs. We have supplied resources to create BC/DR plans for many government and private organizations. In general, these are small engagements delivered as stand-alone consulting engagements by a specialist team; not in conjunction with major application development and delivery projects. As a consequence, we are unable to meet the \$5M project threshold with these small specialized engagements and will have to no-bid as a result of this single criterion. In addition we strongly recommend that industry certification, which is often required in other of Canada's RFPs, be added.

Would Canada consider the following to replace M2:

“The proposed resource must have worked as a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist:

- on 4 relevant Business Continuity/ Disaster Recovery projects;
- each for an organization having a minimum of 500 employees;
- each in a government or private sector environment, within the last 10 years; and
- where, for each reference, a report was delivered containing the Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan.

The proposed resource must be certified by DRI International as a “Certified Business Continuity Professional” or “Master Business Continuity Professional” and have attained that certification prior to 1 January 2014. A copy of the certificate must be included in the bidders proposal.”

A34 (Answer to follow.)

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

G7898-130001/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

004

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

380zm

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

G7898-130001

File No. - N° du dossier

380zmG7898-130001

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

-
- Q35 Could the Crown please confirm which projects this contracting vehicle is designed to support?
- A35 We cannot confirm at this time as the resulting contracts are for as and when requested services; we have no way of determining which projects will be approved in the future, nor which ongoing projects will use the resulting contracts.
- Q36 Given the number of initiatives currently underway at ESDC, and the nature of these roles to augment ESDC teams to support project delivery, could the Crown please confirm whether the successful bidder will be precluded from bidding on other opportunities related to the projects that this vehicle is meant to support?
- A36 The purpose of this solicitation is to provide as-and-when requested support to ESDC current and future projects. We have no way of determining which projects will use the resulting contracts, nor which projects will be approved in the future. Therefore, we are unable to confirm or deny whether successful bidders will be precluded from bidding on future requirements (if any).
- Q37 This RFP has been made under the TBIPS supply arrangement, and states in the SOW that "ESDC has a requirement for an "as and when requested" contract that satisfies the need for Business Services resources to be readily available for implementation into various projects while accommodating project and/or initiative time constraints."
- With regards to Bidder R3 on both work streams, the RFP requires that the Bidder "should demonstrate its capacity as a thought leader in overall Project Management with the Government of Canada or other national government, through the use of white papers, production of industry standards, the delivery of relevant practice specific disciplines such as Risk Management, Change Management, Performance Management, IT Security Guidance 33 (ITSG-33) or equivalent.". This suggests a requirement that the successful vendor(s) will be asked to provide corporate level service support in this capacity in addition to providing the resources that are to be made readily available via approved task authorizations, but this is not apparent in the SOW or nature of a TBIPS contract.
- Furthermore, from Section C (iii), "Replacement of Specific Individuals", the RFP states that "The Contractor must not, in any event, allow performance of the Work by unauthorized replacement persons." This indicates that no performance of the Work specified via approved task authorizations can be performed by unauthorized persons. In other words, only the resources that are identified and specified in approved task authorizations can work on the project.
- Clearly the Bidder R3 requirement for both work streams is contradictory if the crown's intent is to have the successful vendor provide an "as and when requested" services for Business and PM Services resources.
- Given the nature of this requirement and the Crown's use of TBIPS we respectfully request that Bidder R3 on both work streams be deleted.
- A37 As this is a rated criterion it will not be removed. The Crown wishes to acknowledge Bidders who have this experience. Points will be awarded for this criterion but bidders will not be excluded from bidding if they cannot meet this requirement.
- Q38 Under Attachment 4.1 for both work streams, the RFP states that the "The Bidder must have been the prime contractor, rather than a subcontractor." Given the nature of how many large organizations in the private and public sector contract to outsource their PMO establishment and

management, would the crown accept project experience and references where the party has a formal agreement in place that specifically names the project being referenced?

A38 No, the definition remains unchanged.

Q39 Due to the large number of resources required and the detailed corporate experience, this bid requires a significant amount of time and effort. We respectfully request that the Crown grant a 2 week extension to allow bidders the time it takes to put a bid of this magnitude together.

A39 Canada will grant Bidders a one week extension. The new solicitation closing date has been extended to March 17, 2014.

Q40 B.2 Business Architect – Level 3, page 93, R2: The requirement is requesting that resources for this position “have at least 1 year of demonstrated experience, within the last 10 years, in conducting gap analysis in each of the sub-elements” listed in (i), (ii), and (iii). “(iii) indicates carrying out the recommended work plans to address the issues identified”. Typically a Business Architect Level 3 would not be carrying out the activities identified in the work plan. Rather, they normally provide oversight and delivery of the work plan. Therefore would the Crown consider modifying this sub-element (iii) to Providing oversight and direction on work plan activities to address the issues identified.

A40 Agreed, the wording of this criterion will be changed as suggested using the wording provided.

Q41 RE: Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria – Workstream 2, 2.6 P.10 Project Scheduler - Level 2:

M3 calls for experience using Microsoft Project Desktop OR Microsoft Project Server. However, R4 calls for experience using Microsoft Project Desktop AND Microsoft Project Server. Please confirm our understanding that R4 should state OR, not AND, as in this context, experience with the one is as relevant as with the other.

A41 R4 has been revised to state “or”.

Q42 RE: Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria - Workstream 2, 2.2 P.5 Project Executive – Level 3, Rated criterion # R4:

“The proposed resource should demonstrate they have obtained a university degree from an accredited university in any of the following domains: Commerce, Computer Sciences, Engineering, Information Management or Information Technology by including a copy of the degree with the bid.”

The wording of this requirement, specifically the “domains” listed, are unclear. Various universities offer university degrees with majors in various Commerce related disciplines (e.g. Economics, Business Administration, etc.). Could the Crown please confirm that a B.A. with an Economics major from an accredited institution would qualify as university degree in the Commerce domain?

A42 The R4 rated requirement will remain unchanged. A BA with a major in economics is not acceptable.

-
- Q43** For R3 Corporate Rated Criteria, both Streams, the Bidder should demonstrate its capacity as a thought leader in overall Project Management with the Government of Canada or other national government, through the use of white papers, production of industry standards, the delivery of relevant practice specific disciplines such as Risk Management, Change Management, Performance Management, IT Security Guidance 33 (ITSG-33) or equivalent.
- Will successful bidders be asked to provide the above corporate level service support in this capacity, in addition to providing the resources via approved task authorizations?
- If not, we respectfully request that R3 be removed from the Bidder's Corporate Rated Criteria or the crown provide a SOW that reflects these services.
- A43** It is the expectation that successful bidders will be asked to provide support on projects that affect corporate level IT and business infrastructure, processes, and tools.
- Q44** Given the median evaluation approach that states "if a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that is lower than the median, the Bidder's financial evaluation will be conducted using a per diem rate equal to the median for that resource category" it appears possible that more than three firms could receive the same technical and financial score in each stream. Can the Crown please advise on how a ranking order will be made if this occurs?
- A44** In the event of identical Total Bidder Scores occurring, the bid with the highest Total Technical Score will become the top-ranked bidder, the bid with second highest Total Technical Score will become the second ranked bidder, and the bid with the third highest Total Technical Score will become the third ranked bidder.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.

NOTE: A BID ALREADY SUBMITTED MAY BE AMENDED PRIOR TO THE CLOSING DATE. AMENDING CORRESPONDENCE MUST ADDRESS THE SOLICITATION NUMBER AND THE CLOSING DATE AND MUST BE ADDRESSED TO:

**BID RECEIVING
PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA
PLACE DU PORTAGE, PHASE III
MAIN LOBBY, ROOM 0A1
11 LAURIER STREET
GATINEAU, QUEBEC K1A 0S5**