

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. 008
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20141960	Date 2014-04-11
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 2014-04-22	
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 008 is raised to respond to the following vendors' questions and to apply the following changes to the RFP.

Question 1:

Amendment 003, Question 12, states that the justification for the Crown requesting CVs is to demonstrate the ability of a firm to deliver the five resource categories listed in M.2.

This reasoning is not consistent with the Requirement, which is to demonstrate corporate experience and not resource experience, given that this RFP defines each of these five resource categories by the Roles and Responsibilities Definitions and corresponding Tasks and Activities contained in Annex 1 to Attachment 1, including specifically requesting the minimum number of tasks and activities that need to be demonstrated in Contracts being referenced by the Bidder, will the Crown consider removing the requirement to provide one CV per resource category and instead be evaluated solely on how closely aligned the categories in the proposed ERP Contracts are to the Roles and Responsibilities defined at Annex 1 to Attachment 1?

Answer 1:

No. The requirement remains unchanged.

Question 2

In your financial evaluation Method B where there are only two technically compliant bids, if one of the two bidders exceeds 30% of the lower bidder's total average rate then the second bid is non-compliant. As a result, the lowest bidder will be the sole winner. We suggest that there be no median calculation when there are only two bids. Instead, award two contracts where the contract funding is determined similar to what it is in place on page 20 of 105.

Response 2

At Clause **4.3 Financial Evaluation of the RFP**, delete in its entirety.

Insert:

4.3 Financial Evaluation

- (a) The financial evaluation will be conducted using the firm per diem rates provided by the responsive bid(s).
- (b) **Financial Evaluation:** The following financial evaluation method will be used if three or more bids are determined responsive:
 - (i) **STEP 1 - ESTABLISHING THE LOWER AND UPPER MEDIAN BAND LIMITS FOR EACH PERIOD AND EACH RESOURCE CATEGORY:** The Contracting Authority will establish, for each period and each Resource Category, the median band limits based on the firm per diem rates provided by the technically responsive bids. For each such Resource Category the median will be calculated using the median function in Microsoft Excel and will represent a range that encompasses any rate to a value of minus (-) 20% of the median, and an upper median rate to a value of plus (+) 30% of the median. When an even number of technically responsive bids have been determined, an

average of the middle two rates will be used to calculate the median band limits and for an odd number of technically responsive bids, the middle rate will be used.

- (ii) **STEP 2 - POINTS ALLOCATION:** For each period and each Resource Category, points will be allocated as follows:
- (A) A Bidder's proposed firm per diem rate that is either lower than the established lower median band limit or higher than the established upper median band limit for that period and Resource Category will be allocated 0 points.
- (B) A Bidder's proposed firm per diem rate falling within the upper and lower median band limits, for that period and Resource Category, will be allocated points using the following calculation, which will be rounded to two decimal places:
- $$\frac{\text{Lowest proposed firm per diem rate within the median band limits}}{\text{Bidder's proposed firm per diem rate Within the median band limit}} \times \text{Maximum Points Assigned at Table 1 below}$$
- (C) A Bidder's proposed firm per diem rate falling within the established median band limits which is the lowest proposed firm per diem rate will be allocated the applicable maximum points assigned at Table 1 below.

TABLE 1 - MAXIMUM POINTS ASSIGNED				
RESOURCE CATEGORIES	INITIAL (1 YEAR) CONTRACT PERIOD	OPTION PERIOD 1	OPTION PERIOD 2	TOTAL POINTS
Application/ Software Architect Level 2	10	10	10	30
Application/ Software Architect Level 3	10	10	10	30
ERP Functional Analyst Level 2	30	30	30	90
ERP Functional Analyst Level 3	30	30	30	90
ERP System Analyst Level 2	10	10	10	30
ERP System Analyst Level 3	10	10	10	30
ERP Technical Analyst Level 2	10	10	10	30
ERP Technical Analyst Level 3	10	10	10	30
Programmer/Analyst Level 2	40	40	40	120
Programmer/Analyst Level 3	40	40	40	120
System Analyst Level 2	10	10	10	30
System Analyst Level 3	10	10	10	30
Tester Level 2	10	10	10	30
Tester Level 3	10	10	10	30
Web Graphics Designer Level 2	10	10	10	30
Web Graphics Designer Level 3	10	10	10	30
Data Conversion Specialist Level 2	10	10	10	30
Data Conversion Specialist Level 3	10	10	10	30
Business Analyst Level 2	10	10	10	30
Business Analyst Level 3	10	10	10	30
Business Architect Level 2	10	10	10	30
Business Architect Level 3	10	10	10	30
Business Process Re-engineering (BPR)	10	10	10	30

Consultant Level 2				
Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant Level 3	10	10	10	30
Business System Analyst Level 2	10	10	10	30
Business System Analyst Level 3	10	10	10	30
Business Transformation Architect Level 2	10	10	10	30
Business Transformation Architect Level 3	10	10	10	30
Courseware Developer Level 2	10	10	10	30
Courseware Developer Level 3	10	10	10	30
Help Desk Specialist Level 2	10	10	10	30
Help Desk Specialist Level 3	10	10	10	30
Change Management Consultant Level 2	10	10	10	30
Change Management Consultant Level 3	10	10	10	30
Enterprise Architect Level 2	10	10	10	30
Enterprise Architect Level 3	10	10	10	30
Project Coordinator Level 2	10	10	10	30
Project Coordinator Level 3	10	10	10	30
Project Manager Level 2	10	10	10	30
Project Manager Level 3	10	10	10	30
Quality Assurance Specialist / Analyst Level 2	10	10	10	30
Quality Assurance Specialist / Analyst Level 3	10	10	10	30
Risk Management Specialist Level 2	10	10	10	30
Risk Management Specialist Level 3	10	10	10	30
TOTAL	540	540	540	1,620

- (i) **STEP 3 - TOTAL FINANCIAL SCORE:** Points allocated under STEP 2 for each period and Resource Category will be added together and rounded to two decimal places to produce the total financial score. Bidders will find below an example of a financial evaluation using method 1.

- (ii) **EXAMPLE OF A FINANCIAL EVALUATION USING METHOD 1**

TABLE 2							
EXAMPLE OF A FINANCIAL EVALUATION USING METHOD 1							
Category of Personnel	Points Assigned	Bidder 1		Bidder 2		Bidder 3	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2
Programmer	150 (75 pts. per year)	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$420.00	\$450.00	\$450.00	\$450.00
Business Analyst	100 (50 pts. per year)	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	\$620.00	\$650.00	\$820.00
Project Manager	50 (25 pts. per year)	\$555.00	\$900.00	\$750.00	\$800.00	\$700.00	\$800.00
TOTAL	300						

STEP 1 - ESTABLISHING THE LOWER AND UPPER MEDIAN BANDS FOR EACH PERIOD AND EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

- (Median 1) For the Programmer Category of Personnel, the year 1 median would be \$420.00. The lower median band limit would be \$336.00 and higher median band limit would be \$546.00.
- (Median 2) For the Programmer Category of Personnel, the year 2 median would be \$450.00. The lower median band limit would be \$360.00 and higher median band limit would be \$585.00.
- (Median 3) For the Business Analyst Category of Personnel, the year 1 median would be \$600.00. The lower median band limit would be \$480.00 and higher median band limit would be \$780.00.
- (Median 4) For the Business Analyst Category of Personnel, the year 2 median would be \$620.00. The lower median band limit would be \$496.00 and higher median band limit would be \$806.00.
- (Median 5) For the Project Manager Category of Personnel, the year 1 median would be \$700.00. The lower median band limit would be \$560.00 and higher median band limit would be \$910.00.
- (Median 6) For the Project Manager Category of Personnel, the year 2 median would be \$800.00. The lower median band limit would be \$640.00 and higher median band limit would be \$1,040.00.

STEP 2 - POINT ALLOCATION

Bidder 1:

- Programmer Year 1 = 75 points (lowest rate within the lower and upper median band limits)
- Programmer Year 2 = 75 points (lowest rate within the lower and upper median band limits)
- Business Analyst Year 1 = 50 points (lowest rate within the lower and upper median band limits)
- Business Analyst Year 2 = 50 points (lowest rate within the lower and upper median band limits)
- Project Manager Year 1 = 0 points (outside the lower and higher median band limits)
- Project Manager Year 2 = 22.22 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$800.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$900.00) Multiplied by 25 pts)

Bidder 2:

- Programmer Year 1 = 71.43 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$400.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$420.00) Multiplied by 75 pts)
- Programmer Year 2 = 66.67 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$400.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$450.00) Multiplied by 75 pts)
- Business Analyst Year 1 = 50 points (lowest price within the lower and upper median band limits)
- Business Analyst Year 2 = 48.39 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$600.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$620.00) Multiplied by 50 pts)
- Project Manager Year 1 = 23.33 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$700.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$750.00) Multiplied by 25 pts)
- Project Manager Year 2 = 25 points (lowest price within the lower and upper median band limits)

Bidder 3:

- Programmer Year 1 = 66.67 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$400.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$450.00) Multiplied by 75 pts)
- Programmer Year 2 = 66.67 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$400.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$450.00) Multiplied by 75 pts)
- Business Analyst Year 1 = 46.15 points (based on the following calculation = (Lowest rate of \$600.00 / Bidder's proposed rate of \$650.00) Multiplied by 50 pts)

Business Analyst Year 2	= 0 points (outside the lower and higher median band limits)
Project Manager Year 1	= 25 points (lowest price within the lower and upper median band limits)
Project Manager Year 2	= 25 points (lowest price within the lower and upper median band limits)

STEP 3 - TOTAL FINANCIAL SCORE

Bidder 1

$75 + 75 + 50 + 50 + 0 + 22.22 =$ Total Financial Score of 272.22 points out of a possible 300 points

Bidder 2

$71.43 + 66.67 + 50 + 48.39 + 23.33 + 25 =$ Total Financial Score of 284.82 points out of a possible 284,82 points

Bidder 3

$66.67 + 66.67 + 46.15 + 0 + 25 + 25 =$ Total Financial Score of 229.49 points out of a possible 229,49 points

(c) Substantiation of Professional Services Rates

In Canada's experience, bidders will from time to time propose rates at the time of bidding for one or more categories of resources that they later refuse to honour, on the basis that these rates do not allow them to recover their own costs and/or make a profit. When evaluating the rates bid for professional services, Canada may, but will have no obligation to, require price support in accordance with this Article. If Canada requests price support, it will be requested from all otherwise responsive bidders who have proposed a rate that is at least 20% lower than the median rate bid by all responsive bidders for the relevant resource category or categories. If Canada requests price support, the following information is required:

- (i) an invoice (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for services performed for that customer similar to the services that would be provided in the relevant resource category, where those services were provided for at least three months within the twelve months before the bid solicitation closing date, and the fees charged were equal to or less than the rate offered to Canada;
- (ii) in relation to the invoice in (i), evidence from the bidder's customer that the services identified in the invoice include at least 50% of the tasks listed in the Statement of Work for the category of resource being assessed for an unreasonably low rate. This evidence must consist of either a copy of the contract (which must describe the services to be provided and demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks to be performed are the same as those to be performed under the Statement of Work in this bid solicitation) or the customer's signed certification that the services subject to the charges in the invoice included at least 50% of the same tasks to be performed under the Statement of Work in this bid solicitation;
- (iii) in respect of each contract for which an invoice is submitted as substantiation, a résumé for the resource that provided the services under that contract that demonstrates that, in relation to the resource category for which the rates are being substantiated, the resource would meet the mandatory requirements and achieve any required pass mark for any rated criteria; and

- (iv) the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (i), so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder.

Once Canada requests substantiation of the rates bid for any resource category, it is the sole responsibility of the Bidder to submit information (as described above and as otherwise may be requested by Canada, including information that would allow Canada to verify information with the resource proposed) that will allow Canada to determine whether it can rely, with confidence, on the Bidder's ability to provide the required services at the rates bid. If Canada determines that the information provided by the Bidder does not adequately substantiate the unreasonably low rates, the bid will be declared non-responsive.

(d) Formulae in Pricing Tables

If the pricing tables provided to Bidders include any formulae, Canada may re-input the prices provided by Bidders into a fresh table, if Canada believes that the formulae may no longer be functioning properly in the version submitted by a Bidder.

At Clause 4.4 - **Basis of Selection** of the RFP, delete in it's entirety:

Insert:

(a) Evaluation of Bid

Selection Process: The following selection process will be conducted:

- (i) A bid must comply with the requirements of the bid solicitation, meet all mandatory evaluation criteria and obtain the required pass mark for the point rated criteria identified in this bid solicitation to be declared responsive.
- (ii) The responsive bid that obtains the highest Total Bidder Score will be recommended for award of a contract. For any given Bidder, the greatest possible Total Technical Score is 60 while the greatest possible Total Financial Score is 40.
- (A) Calculation of Total Technical Score: The Total Technical Score will be computed for each responsive bid by converting the Technical Score obtained for the point-rated technical criteria using the following formula, rounded to two decimal places:
- $$\frac{\text{Technical Score}}{\text{Maximum Technical Points (50)}} \times 60 = \text{Total Technical Score}$$
- (B) Calculation of Total Financial Score: The Total Financial Score will be computed for each responsive bid by converting the Financial Score obtained for the financial evaluation using the following formula rounded to two decimal places:
- $$\frac{\text{Financial Score}}{\text{Maximum Financial Points (1620)}} \times 40 = \text{Total Financial Score}$$
- (C) Calculation of the Total Bidder Score: The Total Bidder Score will be computed for each responsive bid in accordance with the following formula:
- $$\text{Total Technical Score} + \text{Total Financial Score} = \text{Total Bidder Score}$$
- (iii) In the event of identical Total Bidder Scores occurring, then the bid with the highest Total Technical Score will become the top-ranked bidder.

- (b) Contract Funding Allocation:** Where more than one contract is awarded, each contract issued will be issued with an amount of funding specified in the article titled "Limitation of Expenditure" calculated based on the following:

-
- (i) when one contract is awarded, the amount of the Limitation of Expenditure will be determined at Canada's discretion;
 - (ii) where two contracts are awarded, the amount of the Limitation of Expenditure of each contract will be determined in accordance with the following:
 - (A) the Bidder with the highest Total Bidder Score will receive 70% of the funding initially allocated; and
 - (B) the Bidder with the next highest Total Bidder Score will receive 30% of the funding initially allocated.
 - (iii) where three contracts are awarded, the amount of the Limitation of Expenditure of each contract will be determined in accordance with the following:
 - (A) the Bidder with the highest Total Bidder Score will receive 45% of the funding initially allocated;
 - (B) the Bidder with the next highest Total Bidder Score will receive 30% of the funding initially allocated; and
 - (C) the Bidder with the next highest Total Bidder Score will receive 25% of the funding initially allocated for that Workstream.

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 2014-04-15

At - à: 2:00PM

Insert:

On - Le 2014-04-22

At - à: 2:00PM

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.