

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> RFP SYSTEMS INTEGRATOR	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 47060-148584/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 1000318584	<b>Date</b> 2014-07-04
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-609-27729	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 609el.47060-148584	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2014-09-15</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Bastien, Josée	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 609el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6770 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**This Amendment number 001 is raised to respond to Vendors following questions:**

### **QUESTION 1**

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table Requirements M1.1 and M1.2 The Bidder response table for each of these requirements provides a column for confirming that the requirement has been met/not met and another column for the Bidder's Response.

Given that this is stated to be a mandatory requirement that is either met or not met and the response table provides a column to answer this, can the Crown please clarify what additional response or data it is expecting the Bidder to provide in the Bidder Response column?

### **RESPONSE 1**

Clause 3.3 Bid Submission Requirements for Phase 1 - Section I: Technical Bid - Phase 1, states:

In their technical Phase 1 Bid, Bidders must demonstrate their understanding of the requirements contained in the bid solicitation and explain how they will meet these requirements. Bidders must demonstrate their capability and describe their approach in a thorough, concise and clear manner for carrying out the work. The technical Phase 1 Bid must address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. Simply repeating the statement contained in the bid solicitation is not sufficient. In order to facilitate the evaluation of the bid, Canada requests that Bidders address and present topics in the order of the evaluation criteria under the same headings. To avoid duplication, Bidders may refer to different sections of their bids by identifying the specific paragraph and page number where the subject topic has already been addressed.

### **QUESTION 2**

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table Requirement M1.2 for SAP Public Sector Collection and Disbursement or SAP CD Variant Implementation Experience requires that the three (3) projects the Bidder uses to meet this requirement have been delivered in the past ten (10) years. Requirement R2.2 which sets out the rated version of this requirement does not require that the three (3) client references be for projects delivered in the past ten (10) years.

Can the Crown please clarify whether these requirements are intended to be different? If no, can the Crown please clarify whether the referenced projects must have been delivered in the past ten (10) years or not and amend the RFP accordingly?

### **RESPONSE 2**

No, referenced projects must have been delivered in the past ten (10) years.

### **QUESTION 3**

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table – Requirement R1.6 requires that the Bidder include the client name (i.e. company or organization name) for each of the large scale SAP implementations the Bidder proposes to use to meet the requirement. Many of Bidder's clients will not agree to have their name disclosed for competitive, regulatory or other reasons but will agree to have their project identified but only on a "masked" or "unnamed" basis where the industry is identified (e.g. Large Global Retailer) but the organization or company name is not provided. Requiring that each

organization or company be named will unduly limit the pool of projects Bidder can draw upon without adding additional probative value to the Crown's evaluation.

For purposes of the list to be provided in response to Requirement R1.6, will the Crown please allow Bidder to "mask" the company or organization name and amend the RFP accordingly?

### RESPONSE 3

At **Attachment 1 - Phase 1 Evaluation** of the RFP, amend as follows:

#### Delete:

<b>R1.6</b>	The bidder should provide the list of large scale (i.e., over \$20M CAD) end-to-end SAP implementations (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy), broken down over the last 10 years, including client names (i.e., company or organization name), that are completed or in-progress in North America.	20 points	20 = More than 50 implementations 16 = More than 40 implementations 12 = More than 30 implementations 8 = More than 20 implementations 4 = More than 10 implementations 0 = Less than (or equal to) 10 implementations
-------------	---	-----------	---

#### Insert:

<b>R1.6</b>	<p>The bidder should provide the list of large scale (i.e., over \$20M CAD) end-to-end SAP implementations (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy), broken down over the last 10 years, including client names (i.e., company or organization name), that are completed or in-progress in North America.</p> <p><i>For the purposes of the list to be provided in response to Requirement R1.6, the Crown will allow Bidders to "mask" the company or organization name.</i></p>	20 points	20 = More than 50 implementations 16 = More than 40 implementations 12 = More than 30 implementations 8 = More than 20 implementations 4 = More than 10 implementations 0 = Less than (or equal to) 10 implementations
-------------	--	-----------	---

### QUESTION 4

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table – Requirement R1.7. The point scale for this requirement allocates 10 points for a "Global Partner in Services and Outsourcing Operations" and 6 Points for a "Global Services Partner".

The wording used to describe the level of partnership relative to services is slightly different in each case. Can the Crown please confirm that Global Partner in Services and Global Services Partner as used in this section mean the same thing and are the same level of partnership? If not, can the Crown please clarify the difference between these two levels of partnership for services?

#### RESPONSE 4

Yes these are the same.

#### QUESTION 5

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table – Requirement R3.1 and R3.2. This requirement names the seven (7) Lead Resource roles as follows:

1. Senior Delivery Lead;
2. Business Process Lead;
3. Change Management and Training Lead;
4. Solution Architect;
5. Technical Lead;
6. Testing Lead;
7. Deployment Lead.

...and requires Bidder to provide resumes highlighting the proposed personnel's experience in delivering end to end SAP projects and end to end SAP PSCD or SAP CD variant implementations. The scoring table provides the point allocations for this requirement and provides extra points if each resource has more than 5 years of SAP experience and 1 year of PSCD or SAP CD industry variant experience.

While we understand the need for SAP experience and PSDC or SAP CD industry variant experience for certain of these Lead Resource roles, it is our experience that the Change Management and Training Lead role and Deployment Lead role should not require such experience and to require it will force Bidder's to trade off change management and deployment skills in favor of technical SAP or PSCD skills in roles that we submit do not require these skills. This will unduly limit the pool of candidates Bidder can propose for these roles.

Will the Crown please delete the requirement that the Change Management and Training lead and Deployment lead have SAP and PSCD experience to score maximum points and score their resumes based on the strength of their change management and deployment experience and amend the RFP accordingly?

#### RESPONSE 5

Request is denied. The Criteria remain unchanged.

#### QUESTION 6

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table – Requirement R3.2. The scoring table for requirement R3.2 allocates 48 points for "Average or mixed qualified team (more than 70% of submitted resources have more than 5 years of experience)". The scoring table allocates 60 points if "all of the submitted resources have more than 1 year of experience" and 36 points if "more than 50% of the submitted resources have more than 1 year experience."

The 60 points and 36 points descriptions refer to 1 year of experience while the 48 points description refers to 5 years of experience. Can the Crown please confirm that the 48 points description should be read as referring to 1 year of experience and amend the RFP accordingly?

## RESPONSE 6

At **Attachment 1 - Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table**, amend as follows:

### Delete:

<b>R3.2</b>	<p>The bidder should provide resumes of all Lead Resources (i.e. team leads in the areas mentioned below) who will be staffed on the project to complete and deploy the ARL solution, highlighting the nature and years of expertise and experience around end-to-end (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy) SAP PSCD or SAP CD variant implementations.</p> <p><u>Lead Resources:</u>  Senior Delivery Lead  Business Process Lead  Change Management and Training Lead  Solution Architect  Technical Architect  Testing Lead  Deployment Lead</p>	60 points	<p>60 = All strong and highly qualified team (All of the submitted resources have more than 1 year of experience)</p> <p>48 = Average or mixed qualified team (More than 70% of submitted resources have more than 5 year of experience)</p> <p>36 = Average or mixed qualified team (More than 50% of submitted resources have more than 1 year of experience)</p> <p>24 = Weak qualifications or limited experience (More than 50% of submitted resources have more than 6 months of experience)</p> <p>12 = Very weak qualifications or limited experience (More than 50% of submitted resources have less than 6 months of experience)</p> <p>0 = Missing response (or no experience)</p>
-------------	---	-----------	---

### Insert:

<b>R3.2</b>	<p>The bidder should provide resumes of all Lead Resources (i.e. team leads in the areas mentioned below) who will be staffed on the project to complete and deploy the ARL solution, highlighting the nature and years of expertise and experience around end-to-end (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy) SAP</p>	60 points	<p>60 = All strong and highly qualified team (All of the submitted resources have more than 1 year of experience)</p> <p>48 = Average or mixed qualified team (More than 70% of submitted resources have more than <b>1 year</b> of experience)</p>
-------------	---	-----------	---

	<p>PSCD or SAP CD variant implementations.</p> <p><u>Lead Resources:</u>  Senior Delivery Lead  Business Process Lead  Change Management and Training Lead  Solution Architect  Technical Architect  Testing Lead  Deployment Lead</p>	<p>36 = Average or mixed qualified team (More than 50% of submitted resources have more than 1 year of experience)</p> <p>24 = Weak qualifications or limited experience (More than 50% of submitted resources have more than 6 months of experience)</p> <p>12 = Very weak qualifications or limited experience (More than 50% of submitted resources have less than 6 months of experience)</p> <p>0 = Missing response (or no experience)</p>
--	--	--

## QUESTION 7

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table – Requirement R1.7. The point scale for this requirement allocates 10 points for a “Global Partner in Services and Outsourcing Operations” and 6 Points for a “Global Services Partner”.

Our understanding is that having the “Global Partner in Outsourcing Operations” level of partnership with SAP is being scored higher because it provides the Crown with assurances that the Bidder has proven methodologies and processes in place to support CBSA’s applications on an ongoing basis.

For ARL, this includes the SAP application, interfaces that link into third party applications and a handful of other components. We believe that the Crown should be seeking a certification that covers all of the ARL applications and that the requested level of certification does not do this as its coverage is limited to the SAP components. We submit that there are other generally accepted industry wide certifications including ITIL and CMMI that would provide a level of assurance that would cover all applications including SAP. Alternatively, we suggest that the Bidder’s experience in providing application support, as evidenced by the size of its application support business or overall application support business that includes SAP as a part the application portfolio, as another means of gaining this assurance.

Will the Crown please accept an ITIL or CMMI certification as an alternative to a Global Partner in Outsourcing Operations certification? Alternatively, will the Crown please accept evidence of the size of the Bidder’s application support practice as an alternative to such certification?

## RESPONSE 7

No. The Crown will not accept this request.

## QUESTION 8

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation – Bidder Response Table – Requirement R2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Within the requirements description for the reference projects, the Crown asks for "Project budget by phase (originally scoped and actual price incurred)". Many of our clients are uncomfortable sharing this level of

detail due to the proprietary/competitive nature of the information and this requirement may unduly limit the projects Bidder can use as references.

Would the Crown consider modifying this requirement to be more in line with other RFP reference project requests? For example, would the Crown please consider replacing "Project budget by phase (originally scoped and actual price incurred)" with "describe the extent to which the project was completed on time, within budget and in accordance with established objectives"? Alternatively, will the Crown please accept confirmation that the project budget exceeded the requirement set out in R2.1 and R2.3 (\$20M for R2.1 and \$20M – with one project greater than \$30M – for R2.3)?

## RESPONSE 8

At **Attachment 1 - Phase 1 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table of the RFP**, amend as follows:

**Delete R2.1, R2.2 and R2.3, in it's entirety:**

**Insert:**

<b>R2.1</b>	<b>SAP ERP Implementation Experience Details</b>	<p>The bidder should demonstrate their experience in delivering 3 recent (i.e. past 10 years), large-scale (i.e., over \$20M CAD), end-to-end (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy), SAP ERP implementations while addressing the following details:</p> <p>Client Name, Client Contact Name and Details (Telephone Number and Email), Duration of Project (including start and end dates), Description of Business Challenge, Description of the Project (including technology solutions), Confirmation that the project budget exceeded \$20M CAD", Description of Key Accomplishments, Description of Key Issues and Challenges and how they were addressed, Description of experienced gained from the project.</p>	30 points	<p>30 = Has provided required number (3) of client references and all necessary details required were clearly provided, and all of the references were over \$20M in value</p> <p>18 = Has provided required number (3) of client references and all necessary details required were clearly provided, and at least one reference was over \$20M in value</p> <p>6 = Has provided required number (3) client references but did not provide all the necessary details requested or details were not clearly defined</p>
-------------	--	---	-----------	---

<b>R2.2</b>	<b>SAP PSCD or SAP CD Variant Implementation Experience Details</b>	<p>The bidder should demonstrate all of their experience in delivering end-to-end (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy) SAP PSCD or other SAP CD variant implementations while addressing the following:</p> <p>Client Name, Client Contact Name and Details (Telephone Number and Email), Duration of Project (including start and end dates), Description of Business Challenge, Description of the Project (including technology solutions), Confirmation that the project budget exceeded "\$20M CAD", Description of Key Accomplishments, Description of Key Issues and Challenges and how they were addressed, Description of experienced gained from the project.</p>	60 points	<p>60 = Has provided three or more client references, with at least three being SAP PSCD implementations</p> <p>48 = Has provided three or more client references, with at least two being SAP PSCD implementations</p> <p>36 = Has provided more than three client references, with one being an SAP PSCD implementation</p> <p>24 = Has provided less than three client references and only one for an SAP PSCD implementation</p> <p>12 = Has provided client references for SAP CD variant implementations but none for an SAP PSCD implementation</p> <p>0 = Did not provide any client reference for either SAP PSCD or SAP CD variant implementations</p>
<b>R2.3</b>	<b>Public Sector Experience Details</b>	<p>The bidder should demonstrate their experience in delivering 3 large scale (i.e., over \$20M CAD), end-to-end (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy), packaged solution (preferably SAP) implementations within the Public Sector industry in North America while addressing the following:</p> <p>Client Name, Client Contact Name and Details (Telephone Number and Email), Duration of Project (including start and end dates),</p>	10 points	<p>10 = Has provided required number (3) client references in public sector within North America and all are SAP solutions over \$20M, and at least one of the references was over \$30M in value</p> <p>8 = Has provided required number (3) client references in</p>



		<p>Description of Business Challenge, Description of the Project (including technology solutions), Confirmation that the project budget exceeded either \$20M CAD or \$30M CAD.</p> <p>Description of Key Accomplishments, Description of Key Issues and Challenges and how they were addressed, Description of experience gained from the project.</p>		<p>public sector within North America and all are SAP solutions over \$20M</p> <p>6 = Has provided required number (3) client references in public sector within North America and two are SAP solutions</p> <p>4 = Has provided required number (3) client references in public sector within North America and one is an SAP solution</p> <p>2 = Has provided three or less client reference in public sector within North America and none are SAP solutions</p> <p>0 = Does not have any client reference in public sector within North America</p>
--	--	---	--	---

## QUESTION 9

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation – Bidder Response Table – Requirement M1.1, M1.2 and R2.1, R2.2 and R2.3. The RFP and Bidder response table are silent on whether Bidder can use the same reference to meet a number of different requirements. For example, if Bidder believed that a reference from Client X met the requirements of M1.2, R2.1, R2.2 and R2.3, Bidder would propose to use that single reference to meet each of these requirements rather than providing a different client reference to meet each requirement. This approach has been accepted on recent similar federal government procurements.

Can the Crown please confirm that a single reference can be used to meet multiple reference requirements?

## RESPONSE 9

A single reference can be used to meet multiple reference requirements.

## QUESTION 10

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Evaluation – Bidder Response Table – Requirement M1.2 R2.2. The R2.2 requirement requires that Bidder “should demonstrate all of their experience in delivering end to

end SAP PSCD or other SAP variant implementations". The scoring table states that "60 points = Has provided three or more client references, with at least three being SAP PSCD implementations".

Read together, these requirements appear to require that Bidder submit more than three (3) references to meet this requirement and require the Crown to perform reference checks on and score each of the Bidder's reference submitted in response to this criteria and to award as many points as can be earned by all of the submitted references.

Can the Crown please confirm that this interpretation is correct? For example, if Bidder submitted five (5) references – 3 PSCD and 2 CD variant and was awarded full points for 2 of the PSCD references, 0 points for one of the PSCD references and full points for the 2 CD variant references, the Crown would score all 5 reference and award 48 points?

## RESPONSE 10

Yes, correct.

## QUESTION 11

Section 2.3 (b) of the RFP states, inter alia, that "Technical enquiries that are of a "" nature must be clearly marked "" at each relevant item. Items identified as proprietary will be treated as such unless Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a proprietary nature.

Can the Crown please:

1. Confirm that the missing word between the "" is proprietary?
2. Confirm that questions of a commercial nature that the Bidder believes are proprietary can be submitted as proprietary and will be treated as such through this procurement process?

## RESPONSE 11

1. At Clause **2.3 Enquiries - Bid Solicitation** of the RFP, amend as follows:

### Delete:

(b) Bidders should reference as accurately as possible the numbered item of the bid solicitation to which the enquiry relates. Care should be taken by Bidders to explain each question in sufficient detail in order to enable Canada to provide an accurate answer. Technical enquiries that are of a "" nature must be clearly marked "" at each relevant item. Items identified as proprietary will be treated as such except where Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a proprietary nature. Canada may edit the questions or may request that the Bidder do so, so that the proprietary nature of the question is eliminated, and the enquiry can be answered with copies to all Bidders. Enquiries not submitted in a form that can be distributed to all Bidders may not be answered by Canada.

### Insert:

(b) Bidders should reference as accurately as possible the numbered item of the bid solicitation to which the enquiry relates. Care should be taken by bidders to explain each question in sufficient detail in order to enable Canada to provide an accurate answer. Technical enquiries that are of a "proprietary" nature must be clearly marked "proprietary" at each relevant item. Items identified as proprietary will be treated as such except where Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a proprietary nature. Canada may edit the questions or may request that the Bidder do so, so that the proprietary nature of the

question is eliminated, and the enquiry can be answered with copies to all bidders. Enquiries not submitted in a form that can be distributed to all bidders may not be answered by Canada.

2. Items identified as proprietary will be treated as such except where Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a proprietary nature.

## QUESTION 12

Section 3.3 (a) (ii) (F) states "that for work experience to be considered by PWGSC, the bio must not simply indicate the title". The introductory paragraph of this section states "Resumes for Proposed Resources: Bid should include resumes of the resources identified in the statement of requirements".

The Crown sometimes uses resumes and sometimes uses bios. Can the Crown please confirm that the use of these two different terms references the same requirement – the requirement to describe the experience of the seven (7) lead resources identified in the Statement of Work? Can the Crown also please confirm that what they are expecting to receive in response to this requirement is detailed resumes setting out the experience each of these seven (7) lead resources brings and not high level bios for the seven (7) lead resources?

## RESPONSE 12

At **3.3 Bid Submission Requirements for Phase 1 - (a) (ii)** of the RFP, amend as follows:

**Delete (F), in it's entirety.**

### Insert:

(F) For work experience to be considered by PWGSC, the resume must not simply indicate the title of the individual's position, but must demonstrate that the resource has the required work experience by explaining the responsibilities and work performed by the individual while in that position. In situations in which a proposed resource worked at the same time on more than one project, only one project will be counted toward any requirements that relate to the individual's length of experience.

At Clause **3.4 Bid Submission Requirements for Phase 2, a) Section I: Technical Phase 2 Bid** of the RFP, amend as follows:

### Delete:

**The Technical Phase 2 Bid consists of the following:**

- (i) Bios for Proposed Resources: Bid should include bios of the resources identified in the Statement of Requirements of the bid solicitation that demonstrate that each proposed individual meets the qualification requirements described in Attachment 2 - Phase 2 Evaluation Bidder Response Table (including any educational requirements, work experience requirements, and professional designation or membership requirements). With respect to bios and resources:

### Insert:

**The Technical Phase 2 Bid consists of the following:**

- (i) Resumes for Proposed Resources: Bid should include resumes of the resources identified in the Statement of Requirements of the bid solicitation that demonstrate that each proposed individual meets the qualification requirements described in Attachment 2 - Phase 2 Evaluation Bidder Response Table (including any educational requirements, work experience requirements, and professional designation or membership requirements). With respect to resumes and resources:

### QUESTION 13

Section 3.4 (a) (i) and Attachment 2 – Phase 2 Evaluation – Bidder Response Table. This Section of the RFP sets out the Phase 2 technical response requirements and requests that the Bidder provide Bios for the Proposed Resources identified in the statement of requirements of the bid solicitation and that the Bidder demonstrate that each individual meets the qualification requirements described in Attachment 2 – Phase 2 Evaluation Bidder Response Table.

1) Can the Crown please clarify whether bios are required in the Phase II response and, if yes, how these are to be different than the resumes included with Bidder's Phase 1 response?

2) Bidder was unable to locate any requirement for bios in the Phase 2 Evaluation Bidder's response table or requirement for bios of additional resources or requirement for additional data on the resources Bidder provided with its Phase 1 response.

### RESPONSE 13

1) Yes, resumes should be included in the Phase II response. See Response 12 of this Amendment.

At **Attachment 1 - Phase 2 Evaluation - Bidder Response Table**, amend as follows:

**Delete R2.6 and R2.10, in it's entirety:**

**Insert:**

<b>2.6</b>	Staffing / Resource Plan	Does the bidder provide a staffing plan that is aligned with CBSA's responsibility matrix (in section 6.3 of SOW) utilizing Lead Resources with SAP ERP experience.  In support of the above, the bidder should provide resumes of all Lead Resources (i.e. team leads in the areas mentioned below) who will be staffed on the project to complete and deploy the ARL solution, highlighting the nature	10 points	10 = Very strong (clear roles and responsibilities that are aligned with CBSA's responsibility matrix, and all of the submitted resources have more than 5 year of SAP ERP experience).  8 = Strong (clear roles and responsibilities that are aligned with CBSA's responsibility matrix, and more than 70% of submitted resources have more than 5 year of SAP ERP experience).  6 = Average (clear roles and responsibilities that are aligned with CBSA's responsibility matrix, and more than 50% of submitted resources have more than 5 year of SAP ERP experience).  4 = Weak (roles and responsibilities that are not aligned with CBSA's responsibility matrix).
------------	--------------------------	--	-----------	---

		and years of expertise and experience around end-to-end SAP ERP implementations (i.e., planning, design, build, test, deploy).  Lead Resources: Senior Delivery Lead, Business Process Lead, Change Management and Training Lead, Solution Architect, Technical Architect, Testing Lead, Deployment Lead		2 = Very weak (unclear roles and responsibilities)  0 = No response
<b>2.10</b>		The bidder should provide resumes of all Training Team resources.  How experienced is their team (in number of years) specifically planning, creating and delivering end-user training?	5 points	5 = Very strong (More than 50% of team has more than 3 years of experience in training)  4 = Strong (More than 50% of team has more than 2 years of experience in training)  3 = Average (More than 50% of team has more than 1 year of experience in training)  2 = Weak (More than 50% of team has more than 6 months of experience in training)  1 = Very Weak (More than 50% of team has less than 6 months of experience in training )

2) At Clause 3.4 Bid Submission Requirements for Phase 2, **a) Section I: Technical Phase 2 Bid, The Technical Phase 2 Bid consists of the following**, of the RFP, amend as follows:

**Delete:**

(ii) **Substantiation of Technical Compliance Form**, in it's entirety.

#### QUESTION 14

Section 4.4 (a) This section requires that the Bidder's response must, inter alia, "obtain the required pass marks for the point rated criteria identified in this bid solicitation to be declared responsive".

Bidder was unable to identify any required pass marks in the Phase 1 Bidder Evaluation Form or Phase 2 Bidder Evaluation Form. Can the Crown please confirm that there are no required pass marks applicable to this solicitation?

#### RESPONSE 14

At Clause **4.4 Basis of Selection** of the RFP, amend as follows:

**Delete:**

- (a) A bid must comply with the requirements of the bid solicitation, meet all mandatory evaluation criteria and obtain the required pass marks for the point rated criteria identified in this bid solicitation to be declared responsive.

**Insert:**

- (a) A bid must comply with the requirements of the bid solicitation and meet all mandatory evaluation criteria, to be declared responsive.

**QUESTION 15**

Section 7.22 - This section refers to transition assistance and states "the contractor agrees that, in the period leading up to the end of the Contract Period and for up to three months afterwards, it will make all reasonable efforts to assist Canada in the transition from the Contract to a new Contract with another supplier. The Contractor agrees that there will be no charge for these services"

Can the Crown please clarify the scope and expected volume of these transition assistance services?

**RESPONSE 15**

At Clause **7.22 Transition Services at End of Contract Period** of the RFP, delete in it's entirety.

**QUESTION 16**

Attachment 3 – Bid Submission Form. The Canadian Content Certification section of this form states "as described in the solicitation, bids with at least 80% Canadian content are being given a preference".

Bidder was unable to locate within the Solicitation the description of this preference and how it will be evaluated. Can the Crown please direct Bidder to the description within the solicitation and Bidder with further clarity on how this preference will be scored?

**RESPONSE 16**

At **ATTACHMENT 3 BID SUBMISSION FORM** of the RFP, delete in it's entirety.

**Insert:**

**ATTACHMENT 3**  
**BID SUBMISSION FORM**

BID SUBMISSION FORM	
Bidder's full legal name  <i>[Note to Bidders: Bidders who are part of a corporate group should take care to identify the correct corporation as the Bidder.]</i>	

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

47060-148584/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

609e1

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

1000318584

File No. - N° du dossier

609e147060-148584

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

<b>Authorized Representative of Bidder for evaluation purposes (e.g., clarifications)</b>	Name	
	Title	
	Address	
	Telephone #	
	Fax #	
	Email	
<b>Bidder's Procurement Business Number (PBN)</b> <i>[see the Standard Instructions 2003]</i> <b><i>[Note to Bidders: Please ensure that the PBN you provide matches the legal name under which you have submitted your bid. If it does not, the Bidder will be determined based on the legal name provided, not based on the PBN, and the Bidder will be required to submit the PBN that matches the legal name of the Bidder.]</i></b>		
<b>Jurisdiction of Contract:</b> Province in Canada the bidder wishes to be the legal jurisdiction applicable to any resulting contract (if other than as specified in solicitation)		
<b>Former Public Servants</b>  See the Article in Part 5 of the bid solicitation entitled Former Public Servant Certification for a definition of "Former Public Servant".	Is the Bidder a FPS in receipt of a pension as defined in the bid solicitation?  Yes ____ No ____  If yes, provide the information required by the Article in Part 5 entitled "Former Public Servant Certification"	
	Is the Bidder a FPS who received a lump sum payment under the terms of a work force reduction program?  Yes ____ No ____  If yes, provide the information required by the Article in Part 5 entitled "Former Public Servant Certification"	

<p><b>Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity (FCP EE) Certification:</b></p> <p>If the bidder is exempt, please indicate the basis for the exemption to the right. If the bidder does not fall within the exceptions enumerated to the right, the Program requirements do apply and the bidder is required either to:</p> <p>(a) submit to the Department of HRSD form LAB 1168, Certificate of Commitment to Implement Employment Equity, DULY SIGNED; or</p> <p>(b) submit a valid Certificate number confirming its adherence to the FCP-EE.</p> <p>Bidders are requested to include their FCP EE Certification or signed LAB 1168 with their bid; if this information is not provided in the bid, it must be provided upon request by the Contracting Authority during evaluation.</p> <p>For joint ventures, be sure to provide this information for each of the members of the joint venture.</p>	<p>On behalf of the bidder, by signing below, I also confirm that the bidder <i>[check the box that applies]</i>:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="812 352 1318 457">(a) is not subject to Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity (FCP-EE), because it has a workforce of less than 100 permanent full or part-time employees in Canada;</td> <td data-bbox="1318 352 1430 457"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="812 457 1318 531">(b) is not subject to FCP-EE, because it is a regulated employer under the <i>Employment Equity Act</i>;</td> <td data-bbox="1318 457 1430 531"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="812 531 1318 762">(c) is subject to the requirements of FCP-EE, because it has a workforce of 100 or more permanent full or part-time employees in Canada, but has not previously obtained a certificate number from the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development (HRSD) (having not bid on requirements of \$200,000 or more), in which case a duly signed certificate of commitment is attached; OR</td> <td data-bbox="1318 531 1430 762"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="812 762 1318 867">(d) is subject to FCP-EE, and has a valid certification number as follows: _____ (and has not been declared an Ineligible Contractor by HRSD).</td> <td data-bbox="1318 762 1430 867"></td> </tr> </table>	(a) is not subject to Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity (FCP-EE), because it has a workforce of less than 100 permanent full or part-time employees in Canada;		(b) is not subject to FCP-EE, because it is a regulated employer under the <i>Employment Equity Act</i> ;		(c) is subject to the requirements of FCP-EE, because it has a workforce of 100 or more permanent full or part-time employees in Canada, but has not previously obtained a certificate number from the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development (HRSD) (having not bid on requirements of \$200,000 or more), in which case a duly signed certificate of commitment is attached; OR		(d) is subject to FCP-EE, and has a valid certification number as follows: _____ (and has not been declared an Ineligible Contractor by HRSD).	
(a) is not subject to Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity (FCP-EE), because it has a workforce of less than 100 permanent full or part-time employees in Canada;									
(b) is not subject to FCP-EE, because it is a regulated employer under the <i>Employment Equity Act</i> ;									
(c) is subject to the requirements of FCP-EE, because it has a workforce of 100 or more permanent full or part-time employees in Canada, but has not previously obtained a certificate number from the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development (HRSD) (having not bid on requirements of \$200,000 or more), in which case a duly signed certificate of commitment is attached; OR									
(d) is subject to FCP-EE, and has a valid certification number as follows: _____ (and has not been declared an Ineligible Contractor by HRSD).									
<p><b>Number of FTEs</b>  <i>[Bidders are requested to indicate, the total number of full-time-equivalent positions that would be created and maintained by the bidder if it were awarded the Contract. This information is for information purposes only and will not be evaluated.]</i></p>									
<p><b>Security Clearance Level of Bidder</b>  <i>[include both the level and the date it was granted]</i>  <b><i>[Note to Bidders: Please ensure that the security clearance matches the legal name of the Bidder. If it does not, the security clearance is not valid for the Bidder.]</i></b></p>									
<p>On behalf of the Bidder, by signing below, I confirm that I have read the entire bid solicitation including the documents incorporated by reference into the bid solicitation and I certify that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Bidder considers itself and its products able to meet all the mandatory requirements described in the bid solicitation;</li> <li>2. This bid is valid for the period requested in the bid solicitation;</li> <li>3. All the information provided in the bid is complete, true and accurate; and</li> <li>4. If the Bidder is awarded a contract, it will accept all the terms and conditions set out in the resulting contract clauses included in the bid solicitation.</li> </ol>									
<p><b>Signature of Authorized Representative of Bidder</b></p>									

## QUESTION 17

Section 7.18 (a) This section states that the contractor grants to Canada the irrevocable option to extend the Software Support Period by one additional 12 month period.



Section 7.5 (i) of the RFP requires that the Bidder agrees to extend the term for up to two (2) additional one year optional terms and Section 2 of the Bid Pricing Table requires that Bidder provide pricing for two (2) option years for the Upper Tier ARL Support Services.

Can the Crown please clarify whether Bidder must commit to and price one (1) or two (2) optional years of Upper Tier ARL Support Services?

#### RESPONSE 17

The Bidder must commit to and price two (2) optional years of Upper Tier ARL Support Services

#### QUESTION 18

Both Section 3.4 and 5.6 of the SOW in the title describe the ARL Solution Support Services as optional. This contrasts with the language in the body of the SOW that states that "the Contractor will provide second and third tier escalated Solution Support Services for the ARL solution" and the Bid Pricing Table that requires that Bidder provide pricing for these services.

Can the Crown please clarify whether the ARL Solution Support Services are in fact optional or mandatory services under the Solicitation?

#### RESPONSE 18

The ARL Solution Support Services are optional and are to be provided upon request from the client. Bidders are required to provide pricing for these services.

#### QUESTION 19

Please advise whether there are or have been contractors other than Forrester Research and Meijin Consulting delivering these services in the past? If so, which company(s) were delivering the services and what was the value of the contract(s)?

#### RESPONSE 19

Below are all the firms which have provided services on the ARL project since 2012

ARL Contracts from 2012 to Present	
Vendor	Total value of Contracts
Calian	\$ 85,059.20
Emerion	\$ 5,524,206.66
GSI International	\$ 182,026.67
Maplesoft	\$ 32,592.00
MGIS Inc	\$ 125,193.07
Systematix	\$ 273,055.33
Teksystems	\$ 2,590,320.66
Veritaaq	\$ 60,242.33

Below are all the firms which have provided services on the CARM project since 2012

**CARM Contracts from 2012 to Present**

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Total value of Contracts</b>
BPM Consulting	\$ 41,788.00
Coradix	\$ 272,899.20
Deloitte	\$ 1,700,000.00
Emerion	\$ 3,856,150.53
Empowered	\$ 276,613.00
Excel	\$ 219,340.00
Forrester	\$ 124,215.00
Gartner	\$ 258,000.00
Ibiska	\$ 276,055.67
Interis	\$ 103,496.83
Lumina IT	\$ 48,672.00
Maplesoft	\$ 209,813.00
NavPoint	\$ 487,361.00
Nisha Technologies	\$ 366,155.07
Price Waterhouse Cooper	\$ 156,136.00
RFP Solutions	\$ 12,136.00
S.I. Systems	\$ 76,588.50
Sole Source (Pararye, Richard)	\$ 5,375.00
SOMOS	\$ 26,255.13
TekSystems	\$ 1,469,522.70
Veritaaq	\$ 655,563.37

At Clause **1.4 Conflict of Interest** of the RFP, delete in it's entirety:

**Insert:**

- (a) To avoid any conflict of interest, appearance of conflict of interest, unfair advantage or appearance of unfair advantage, the Contractors listed below have acknowledged and agreed that they, any of their subcontractors, any of their respective employees or any of their respective former employees who work or have worked on the delivery of the Work under the Contracts listed, must:
- (i) Not share or provide any information to any third party concerning the CBSA Accounts Receivable Ledger (ARL) Solution Implementation or the procurement processes for follow-on work it or they may have obtained through the performance of the Work under Contract with Canada;
  - (ii) Not prepare, participate in, or advise upon the preparation of, any bid in response to a bid solicitation relating to the CBSA Accounts Receivable Ledger (ARL) Solution Implementation; and
  - (iii) Not act or propose to act, as a Contractor itself, member of a Joint-venture or subcontractor to any third party submitting a bid, in relation to the contract required for the CBSA's Accounts Receivable Ledger (ARL) Solution Implementation.

1. **Forrester Research Inc.;**
2. **Meijin Consulting Inc.;**
3. **Emerion; and**
4. **NavPoint Consulting Group Inc.**

If a Contract is awarded as a result of Solicitation 47060-148584/A, the suppliers and individuals listed above may be proposed as subcontractors by the winning Bidder. The Bidder selected for Contract must comply with the provisions of the Contract, including article 06 of the General Conditions 2035, when entering into subcontracting arrangements.

## **QUESTION 20**

After reviewing the point breakdown for R3.2 we feel there may be a typo with regard to the number of years of experience required to obtain full points.

## **RESPONSE 20**

Refer to Response 7

## **QUESTION 21**

In addition, given that many SAP CD variant projects typically run for more than a year, would the Crown grant favour to bidders who propose resources with greater than 1 year experience (e.g. 3 years of experience or more) for maximum points.

## **RESPONSE 21**

Request denied. The criteria remains unchanged.

## **QUESTION 22**

Rated criteria R2.1, R2.2 and R2.3 state that for the reference projects, bidders are to provide the "Budget by Phase (originally scoped and actual price incurred)". While our clients are willing to share overall project budgets, many either haven't kept records of budget vs. actuals or prefer not to make this information public. Will the Crown please confirm that if bidders are not able to provide the budget vs. actual by phase for all references this will not result in bidders losing points for these criteria? Alternatively, will the Crown consider amending these requirements to request only the Project value?

## **RESPONSE 22**

Please refer to response 8 of this Amendment.

## **THE FOLLOWING CHANGE APPLIES TO THE RFP:**

At Clause **2.2 Submission of Bids** of the RFP:

**Delete:**

- (a) Technical Bids submitted in response to **Phase One** of the bid solicitation, ("Bids" must be submitted only to Public Works and Government Services Canada Bid Receiving Unit by **2:00 p.m. July 7, 2014**, eastern daylight savings time at the place indicated below:

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

**Insert:**

- (a) Technical Bids submitted in response to **Phase One** of the bid solicitation, ("Bids" must be submitted only to Public Works and Government Services Canada Bid Receiving Unit by **2:00 p.m. July 11, 2014**, eastern daylight savings time at the place indicated below:

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

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**