

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
Quebec
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
Information Management/Information Technology -
IM/IT/Gestion de l'Information -Technologie de
l'Information-GI/TI
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
12C1, Place du Portage III
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet DRMIS PROF SVCS FOLLOW-ON SUPPORT	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8474-126279/D	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-126279	Date 2014-06-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XQ-008-27724	
File No. - N° de dossier 008xq.W8474-126279	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-07-22	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
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: Hradecky, Micahel	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 008xq
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1348 ()	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

Public Works and Government Services Canada
Request for Proposal (RFP) For
Defence Resource Management Information System (DRMIS)
and SIGMA System Support Services
Solicitation No. W8487-126279/D

Note, questions are numerically sequenced upon arrival at PWGSC. A question and its answer will be provided via BuyandSell as the response becomes available. Potential bidders are therefore advised that questions and answers may be issued via BuyandSell out of sequence. The following questions have been received from a potential bidder. In accordance with Article 13 under 2003 Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements (2014-03-01) which has been incorporated into the RFP in accordance with Article 1 of Part 2 of the RFP, the questions and corresponding answers are provided to all potential bidders as set out below:

Question 5:

With reference to Attachment A 3.3.5 SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS on page 193/202, did the client include this intentionally or was it left in by mistake?

Answer 5:

Please see Answer 7 below.

Question 6:

RFP pg 16 **PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION; 5. Steps to Conduct the Evaluation; Step 2: Evaluation of the Rated Requirements** states, in part:

Number of Resources Evaluated: Only the key resources specified at Annex “A-1” Statement of Work - DRMIS in section entitled “Contractor CoE Resource Categories” will be evaluated under the Evaluation stage. All other proposed resources will be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor.

RFP pg 88 Annex A-1 Statement of Work, 3.3 Resource Categories, has 31 different categories listed, and Tables 1 and 2 (pgs 84 to 88) have specializations within categories as well as varying experience levels. Thus, 31 resources would have to be evaluated.

Annex A-1 Statement of Work, section entitled “Contractor CoE Resource Categories”, Section 3.2 (pg 83), para 4 identifies the 4 mandatory resource categories that will be evaluated.

-
- a. One (1) Project Manager; and
 - b. Three (3) Application Solution Architects.

RFP pg 179 **ATTACHMENT A – TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA; 1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES; A. Technical Evaluation Methodology** states, in part:

The Technical evaluation will be comprised of two parts: technical evaluation of the Bidder as a corporate entity and evaluation of the following key resources proposed by the Bidder. Additional resources will only be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor.

- a. one (1) Project Manager - level 3
- b. one (1) Application Solution Architect - FI - level 3
- c. one (1) Application Solution Architect - PM - level 3
- d. one (1) Application Solution Architect - MM - level 3

The evaluation only requires 4 resources of specified specializations and levels for evaluation. Furthermore the evaluation criteria on pages 187 to 192 only reference the above 4 key resources.

Thus there appears to be a conflict between the number of categories evaluated as referenced on Pg 16 and the number of categories evaluated on Pg 179.

Would Canada please revise pg 16 to read:

Number of Resources Evaluated: Only the four key resources specified at ATTACHMENT A – TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA; 1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES; in section entitled “A. Technical Evaluation Methodology” will be evaluated under the Evaluation stage. All other proposed resources will be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor.

Answer 6:

Please see Answer 7 below.

Question 7:

RFP pg 179 **ATTACHMENT A – TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA; 1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES; A. Technical Evaluation Methodology** states, in part:

The Technical evaluation will be comprised of two parts: technical evaluation of the Bidder as a corporate entity and evaluation of the following key resources proposed by the Bidder. Additional

resources will only be assessed after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor.

- a. one (1) Project Manager - level 3
- b. one (1) Application Solution Architect - FI - level 3
- c. one (1) Application Solution Architect - PM - level 3
- d. one (1) Application Solution Architect - MM - level 3

Yet RFP pg 193 has additional rated requirements for a category not in the above list:

5. SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS – Level 3

Would Canada please delete this rated requirement as it does not seem to be applicable?

Answer 7:

Canada is evaluating résumé s in five resource categories. This includes the four key resources specified at Annex “A-1” Statement of Work - DRMIS in section entitled “Contractor CoE Resource Categories” and the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS. Should Bidders provide a résumé for the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS resource category in their proposal, the proposed resource will be evaluated as per the rated evaluation criteria on page 193. Only the resource categories identified in Attachment A Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria will be evaluated as part of the RFP process.

Question 8:

Please confirm a subcontractor may be submitted by more than one vendor for this solicitation.

Answer 8:

Yes, a subcontractor may be submitted by more than one Bidder for this solicitation.

Question 9:

R1 states “The Bidder should provide 1 corporate contract reference where the Bidder was the prime contractor tasked to deliver professional services in order to provide Steady-State In-Service Support (as defined in the Annex A-1) of an SAP system in excess of 24 months over the last 84 months.” Scoring starts at 25 months – does this mean if Project ABCD is used for the Mandatory and Rated requirements, and it was a **total** of 25 months it would score 10 points?

25 to <36 months = 10 pts

36 to <48 months = 20 pts

48 to <60 months = 30 pts

Greater than 60 = 40 pts

Answer 9:

Yes, one of the two corporate references used to meet C.M1 can also be used for the purposes of C.R1. Please note that demonstrated experience under C. M1 must be a minimum of 24 months **consecutive** whereas demonstrated experience used for C. R1 can be a cumulative number of months.

Question 10:

R4 states “The Bidder should have demonstrated experience **during the last 84 months** providing SAP system support to a Canadian or foreign government organization, Crown Corporation or Government Agency.” In order to score 25/25 the reference would require a duration of 84+ months of experience in the past 84 months. Please clarify how suppliers are to respond to this question.

Answer 10:

Please see RFP Change 1) below.

Question 11:

With regard to R4 - Please confirm that a bidder may use the total aggregate months from multiple projects to meet this requirement.

Answer 11:

Yes. Multiple projects can be used to a maximum of 10 Corporate References as identified in Attachment A - 2. A pg 179/202 for this Corporate point-rated Technical Criteria.

Question 12:

With regard to R3 - Please define “user base” – would this include an Employee Portal?

Answer 12:

With regard to R3 - Please define “user base” – would this include an Employee Portal?

Question 13:

Appendix A to Attachment A – Please confirm if we are to use the same table format to respond to the Corporate Rated Requirements?

Answer 13:

Yes. As per paragraph 2.A of Attachment A – Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, “The Bidders must provide a maximum of ten (10) separate and distinct Corporate Contract References. These Corporate Contract References will be evaluated for all Corporate mandatory and Corporate point-rated criteria.” One response template per Corporate Contract Reference is required and will be used for evaluation of both mandatory and rated criteria.

Question 14:

With regard to ASA-FI R2; ASA-PM R2; ASA-MM R2; Certifications – please confirm if the resource has the certification as identified in the corresponding Mandatory Requirement this counts as 15 points in the rated Requirement.

For example:

ASA-PM (M2) The proposed resource must hold a valid SAP Certification in the PM module of SAP version 4.7 or higher.

If the resource holds valid Certifications in PM and FI, this will score a total of 30 points in the rated.

ASA-PM (R2) Certified in 1 module = 15 points; **2 modules=30 points**; 3 or more modules =45 points

Due to the fact that the resource is certified in 2 modules, they would score 30 points, correct?

Answer 14:

ASA-FI R2, ASA-PM R2, ASA-MM R2 Certifications – States “**Additional** SAP Certifications to one listed in ASA-xx M2”.

Therefore, if the proposed resource has other certifications other than the one identified in the mandatory criterion, then the Bidder would obtain 15 points for 1, 30 points for 2 and 45 points for 3 or more.

As per the example above:

ASA-PM (M2) The proposed resource must hold a valid SAP Certification in the PM module of SAP version 4.7 or higher.

For example, if the proposed ASA-PM (R2) is certified in both PM and FI modules = then the proposed resource has met the mandatory criterion of PM certification and would receive a score of 15 points in the rated criterion for the FI certification.

RFP CHANGES:

The following changes are made to the RFP document:

- 1) Reference Corporate Point-rated Technical Criteria, C. R4, page 183 of 202.

DELETE

The Bidder should have demonstrated experience during the last 84 months providing SAP system support to a Canadian or foreign government organization, Crown Corporation or Government Agency.

INSERT

The Bidder should have demonstrated experience during the last 96 months providing SAP system support to a Canadian or foreign government organization, Crown Corporation or Government Agency.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.