

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 SYSTEMS & WEB SUPPORT | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP887-141960/A | Amendment No. - N° modif. 005 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20141960 | Date 2014-03-20 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-609-26872 | |
| File No. - N° de dossier 609e1.EP887-141960 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-04-01 | |
| 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: Bastien, Josée | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 609e1 |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6770 () | FAX No. - N° de FAX () - |
| 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 number 005 is raised to respond to the following vendor's questions and to apply changes to the RFP:

QUESTION 1

M2 states that the roles to be substantiated are for ERP services and based on M1. However, the three of the five roles described are generic and none make mention of SAP or PeopleSoft specifically. In the interest of clarity, please consider the following revisions:

The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed ERP contract(s) experience in M1, included supplying all of the following categories for either PeopleSoft or SAP:

1. *ERP Functional Analyst*
2. *ERP Programmer/Analyst*
3. *ERP Technical Analyst*
4. *ERP Business Transformation Architect*
5. *ERP Project Manager*

As well, please consider making changes to the roles and tasks described in the related Annex 1 to Attachment 1 to be ERP specific and indicating that all five roles and tasks must be for either an SAP or PeopleSoft system. For example:

ERP Functional Analyst

For the purposes of this evaluation, the roles and responsibilities of an ERP Functional Analyst are defined as followed and must be demonstrated conducting a minimum of 7 out of 15 of the following tasks and activities for either an SAP or PeopleSoft system:

ERP Programmer Analyst

For the purposes of this evaluation, the roles and responsibilities of an ERP Programmer/Analyst are defined as followed and must be demonstrated conducting a minimum of 6 out of 12 of the following tasks and activities for either an SAP or PeopleSoft system:

Otherwise revenues for non-ERP services (i.e. generic project management etc.) could be presented.

RESPONSE 1

The criteria remains unchanged.

QUESTION 2

Financial Evaluation Scope

In Appendix C to Annex A, the resource assessment criteria for the resulting TA process identifies five very different ERP areas: SAP, PeopleSoft, Freebalance, GCDOCS and Shared Case Management. Skills, expertise and resource availability for each one of these systems vary greatly so consequently the market rates vary as well. For example an ERP Functional Analysts for SAP is likely to be a CA with a certification in a given SAP module whereas one for Case Management might simply have a CRM certificate. By grouping all five together and assessing them on equal footing will result in aggregate rates that will not be supported in the market (rates too low to attract top/well qualified resources).

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP887-141960/A

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

20141960

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

File No. - N° du dossier

609e1EP887-141960

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

609e1

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

We recommend that the evaluation criteria be clarified to reflect the RFP SOW and technical evaluation so that PWGSC evaluates rates (using the median assessment) for SAP and PeopleSoft only. These rates could serve as ceiling rates for the other three ERP types (Freebalance, GCDOCS and Shared Case Management) for the resulting contract TA process thereby allowing lower market rates that align with the skills and experience of a given requirement at a given time.

RESPONSE 2

The criteria remains unchanged.

QUESTION 3

Basis for Financial Evaluation

Considering that the RFP technical evaluation pertains only to SAP and PeopleSoft, should the evaluated pricing not reflect this? Further, M2 identifies the five key resource categories so it follows that the financial evaluation should be aligned with the stated requirements. Accordingly we recommend that the financial evaluation be changed to assess pricing for SAP and PeopleSoft for the five resource categories only.

RESPONSE 3

The criteria remains unchanged.

QUESTION 4

R1 and R2

It is common practice (especially under TBIPS) to have rated criteria build on mandatory criteria. M1 already establishes a Bidder's ability to meet \$3.5M in revenues for each of SAP and PeopleSoft. Why then does R1 and R2 require the same \$3.5M again?

Recent RFPs such as CBSA 47060-136911/A had criteria where R1 (the only rated criteria) called for demonstrating revenues in excess/double that M2 (1 of only 2 mandatory criteria). Another example is HRSDC G7801-120019/A where R1 called for demonstrating revenues in excess/double that of M1. In fact in both of these instances (and many others) Bidders were required to substantiate that the ALL revenues presented as experience related to the actual ERP categories of the RFP.

By contrast, the changes to this RFP have now opened up the requirements to the extent that Bidders who have nominal experience in SAP and PeopleSoft requirements like the SOW outlines can comply. For example, a company who provides ERP training or hosting services can meet the SAP and PeopleSoft revenues of M1. Because M2 has no requirement for minimum revenues by category, a ten day engagement is treated with the same weight as a 2 year engagement so even with limited experience they could comply. Such a firm would lose 15 points for R5 but still hit the minimum requirements otherwise. So as long as this training/hosting firm could demonstrate the \$15M in revenues, that the minimum tasks were performed for the 5 resource categories they would comply yet they it is highly unlikely they could not meet the needs of the contract.

Please considering changing R1 and R2 so that it builds on M1 and require that the Bidder demonstrate the ability to provide an additional \$3.5 in ERP revenues for each?

RESPONSE 4

The Criteria remains unchanged.

QUESTION 5

Government of Canada ERP Experience

We believe that some of the changes in Amendment 3 are not reflective of the marketplace. By our assessment there are at least 8 firms that can comply with the original specifications. However, now many firms that have very little Government of Canada ERP experience can meet the criteria. In fact a firm with experience in SAP but has placed only 5 PeopleSoft resources per year could qualify and this clearly does not line up with SSI's needs.

There are numerous firms that have spent many years and much expense in building robust networks of highly skilled ERP resources that have been integral to building and running the GC ERP systems. By loosening the specifications (to the extent that Amendment 3 does), the government is disregarding this experience. Further, these changes do not account for what that the lack of GC ERP experience may cost PWGSC when these resources and firms are engaged. These other firms will have little to no experience whatsoever in many of the ERP requirements listed in the statement of work:

- No experience in "*functionality developed by the Government of Canada such as the Salary Forecasting Tool, Travel Management Solution and the Receiver General Interfaces. Some development uses limited SAP-HR*" (RFP Appendix C to Annex A Resource Assessment Criteria)
- No experience in systems that SSI support today i.e. IFMS, GC HRMS, AMMIS, GCDOCS
- No experience in any of the legacy ERP and/or related systems.

So why allow firms with possibly no GC ERP experience to participate when it is core to SSI's needs?

Without the relevant GC ERP experience these generalist (not ERP specialized) and potentially smaller (lower volume) firms are apt to put forward pricing that is not reflective of the complexity of the work and the nature of the market. They will have no real appreciation for the GC market conditions for ERP (i.e. high/low resource availability, common/in demand/rare expertise) which could mean low rates that result in inexperienced resources or lack of availability when properly skilled resources take other better paying engagements.

We often see requirement for Government of Canada experience in the rated section. We have even seen it recently as a mandatory requirement (see AAFC's RFP for SAP services). We routinely see it directly (general GC experience) and indirectly (naming specific GC systems) with the resource grids. There are plenty of other TBIPS opportunities to gain this kind of experience and, once firms have done so, they then can compete to support an ERP environment like SSI.

In our view, the evaluation criteria is no longer aligned with PWGSC's actual needs. Allowing more less qualified Bidders does not give PWGSC better competition and outcomes. On the contrary it only dilutes the value (price/quality/cost). We strongly urge PWGSC to reconsider the changes of Amendment 3 and reinstate the GC requirements. Otherwise, suppliers with the right kind of GC ERP experience (at the original volumes and criteria) will be disadvantaged and, more importantly, PWGSC will end up with an inexperienced supplier who cannot provide a suitable quality of service.

RESPONSE 5

The criteria remains unchanged.

QUESTION 6:

Would the Crown please reconsider its response to Q&A#6 of amendment #3 and allow a large, world class Bidder with relevant expertise and experience to utilize its Canadian based subsidiary which has a dedicated public sector PeopleSoft and SAP practice and, if the answer is no, why not?

RESPONSE 6

No, only TBIPS SA Holders currently holding a TBIPS SA for Tier 2 in the National Capital Region under the EN578-055605/E series of SAs are eligible to compete.

QUESTION 7Interpretation A

M2 requires a total of 5 CV's per project, 1 in each of the categories identified, meaning:
 2 projects provided in M1 x 5 roles = 10 CV's required
 3 project provided in M1 x 5 roles = 15 CV's required in M2; and so on

Or

Interpretation B

M2 requires a total of 5 CV's from the collective project experience described in M1, regardless of total projects described, meaning:
 2 projections provided in M1 = 5 CV's required in M2
 3 projects provided in M1 = 5 CV's required in M2; and so on.

RESPONSE 7

At **ATTACHMENT 1 - BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, 1. CORPORATE QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, 1.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS** of the RFP, amend as follows:

DELETE:

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| M.2 | <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed ERP contract(s) experience in M1, included supplying all of the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ERP Functional Analyst 2. Programmer/Analyst 3. ERP Technical Analyst 4. Business Transformation Architect 5. Project Manager <p>One CV per resource category must be submitted. All resources must have performed, for each resource category, the minimum number of Roles and Responsibilities defined at Annex 1 to Attachment 1.</p> | |
|-----|--|--|

INSERT:

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| M.2 | <p>The Bidder must demonstrate experience supplying all of the following categories in one project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ERP Functional Analyst 2. Programmer/Analyst 3. ERP Technical Analyst 4. Business Transformation Architect 5. Project Manager <p>One CV per resource category must be submitted for a total of 5 CVs. All resources must have performed, for each resource category, the minimum number of Roles and Responsibilities defined at Annex 1 to Attachment 1.</p> | |
|-----|--|--|

QUESTION 8.

Would the Crown please confirm that bidders must meet revenue criteria specified in Requirements M1, R1, R2, R3, and R4 based on revenue from work performed by employees, excluding revenue from work delivered by sub-contractors on the project?

RESPONSE 8

The project experience must have been completed by the Bidder.

The following change applies to the RFP:

At PAGE 1 of the RFP, **Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin** , amend as follows:

Delete:

On - Le 2014-03-25

At - à: 2:00PM

Insert:

On - Le 2014-04-01

At - à: 2:00PM

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.