

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. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-126279	Date 2014-07-14
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 2014-08-19	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 17:

With respect to the certifications required for the Architect candidates and the Functional Analyst candidate, the likelihood of candidates having 4 is very low. We request that the number of certifications be reduced to 1 in addition to the 1 requested in the mandatory requirements so as to ensure the Crown has access to a suitable pool of resources to draw from when the contract is awarded and TA's are released.

Answer 17:

Please see Answer 18 below.

Question 18:

With respect to the R2 requirements for Application Solution Architects (FI, PS and MM) and the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS, having 4 certifications is incredibly uncommon. Even if a vendor can successfully find 4 candidates to present as part of the bid, finding candidates on a regular basis that will meet the requirements will be incredibly difficult and may result in the Crown not being able to receive the proper volume of qualified candidates that they require. With this in mind, we respectfully request the Crown reduce the number of certifications in the rated requirements to 1, to ensure that they are able to access the many exceptional candidates in the marketplace who are more than qualified to perform the work.

Answer 18:

The evaluation criteria listed as R2 Application Solution Architects (FI, PM and MM) and SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS are not mandatory but rather rated criteria. Therefore, additional points will be given to Bidders that provide resources with multiple certifications. No changes are required for these evaluation criteria.

Question 19:

With respect to requirement R4 for the Application Solution Architects (FI, PS and MM), the likelihood of this type of candidate having a Project Management designation of any kind is very uncommon as role isn't aligned with the management of projects. On the basis that the Project Management related certifications don't align with the Architect role, we respectfully request that the requirement be removed from the RFP.

Answer 19:

The PMP or equivalent was determined to be a valid skill set for this resource category and as such, is included as a rated criteria.

Question 22:

Attachment A – Technical Evaluation Procedures

In Attachment A 1.A Technical Evaluation Methodology it states that only the 4 key roles resumes are required and that “additional resources will only be assessed after contract award”. For the rated criteria DFPS-R1 and DFPS-R2 (page 193), the criteria implies that the Crown requires a resume to provide the information for evaluation.

Can the Crown confirm that 5 resumes are required to support the Technical Evaluation Methodology?

Answer 22:

Please see Answer 7 in amendment 002 to the RFP.

Question 23:

Appendix A to Attachment A

On page 179, the Crown states that “*Bidders must complete Appendices A and B to substantiate Corporate experience.*” Appendix A to Attachment A (page 196) contains Resource Details for the referenced project. This Resource Details table appears to be requested by the Crown in support for Item # C.M5 (page 181) and Item # C. R5 (page 183). For example, if one of the Corporate References is not used for CM.5 or CR.5, the Number of billable days does not appear to be rated or evaluated for the other Mandatory or Rated evaluation criteria.

Can you please confirm that the Appendix A to Attachment A Resource table is required for each Corporate Reference provided in support of this RFP submission, or confirm if it is only required for the Corporate References that are used to support evaluation of the above mentioned Item # C.M5 (page 181) and Item # C.R5 (page 183)?

Answer 23:

Yes. The Bidders must complete one Appendix A to Attachment A for each of the Corporate References, up to a maximum of 10.

Question 24:

Appendix B to Attachment A

On page 179, the Crown states that the resources that will be evaluated are the “*key resources proposed by the Bidder*” It is mentioned that this includes the Project Manager, Application Solution Architects – FI, PM and MM (all level 3).

However, in support of the Corporate Credentials per Appendix B to Attachment A (page 198) the Crown’ evaluation table identifies cross-references to the CV Page of the proposed resource. As there will be multiple resources comprising the ability to meet the evaluation criteria, we would expect a significant number of resumes to support this.

Is it the Crown’ intent to receive and evaluate numerous resumes (i.e., 50+ resumes) as part of the support requirements for Appendix B to Attachment A.

Answer 24:

No. Each Bidder must provide one résumé for each of the 4 key resources being evaluated (ie. Project Manager as well as Application Solution Architects – FI, PM and MM level 3). In addition, the Bidder may also choose to provide a résumé for the SAP Functional Analysts DFPS. Should Bidders provide a résumé for this resource category in their proposal, the proposed resource will be evaluated as per the rated evaluation criteria on page 193 only.

Question 25:**Alternate Approach to Appendix B to Attachment A**

As an example of another method for evaluating billable days without providing an extensive volume of resumes in support, the following information has been provided from a previous RFP (Solicitation Number: EP549-120248, pages 60-61). As we don't believe it's the Crown's intent to review 50+ resumes for the evaluation of Item # C.M5 (page 181) and Item # C. R5 (page 183), the following represents an evaluation framework previously used by PWGSC.

Would the Crown be open to adjusting the evaluation method for Item # C.M5 (page 181) and Item # C. R5 (page 183) in line with the following example:

ID	Corporate Mandatory Criteria	Cross Reference
M1	The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in delivering informatics services supplying ALL of the categories (in the identified minimum billable days below). To be accepted, 1) The contract experience must have been for a SAP Business Intelligence System that meets the following definition. 2) Billable days must have occurred within the last seven years. 3) The work delivered by the resource category includes at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in the Statement of Work at Annex A of this RFP for that resource category. Definition: A Business Intelligence System extracts and analyzes business data, to provide historical, current and predictive views of business operations. The Bidder must provide the completed Appendices A and B of Attachment 3.2	
	CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL	Minimum Billable Days
	ERP Functional Analyst	1,125
	ERP Technical Analyst	300
	Database Modeler/IM MODELLER	300
	IM Architect	300
	Technology Architect	100

Question B: Will the Crown entertain adjusting the relative weightings of the evaluation criteria such that the focus on the ratings is reversed. i.e., 71% on the Corporate Evaluation and 29% on the Resource Evaluation.

Answer 26:

The Crown has developed significant mandatory corporate criteria to satisfy its requirement due to the size and complexity of the work. The rated criteria were developed to obtain additional levels of expertise with respect to the 4 key resources. No changes will be made to the weighing of the evaluation criteria.

Question 27:

Please confirm with regard to C.M5 – 2) all billable days must be for resources with a minimum of 36 months experience – Please confirm the resources individual experience must be 36 months and not 36 months on the referenced project.

Answer 27:

In order to qualify under this requirement, the proposed resources used to meet the billable days must have had at least 36 months of experience in the field (ie must have been billed at minimum a level 2 as described in Annex A-1 Statement of Work, Department of National Defence, Section 3.1 Contractor Resource Level of Expertise.

Question 28:

Table 1 in Section 3.2 of Annex A-1, Statement of Work, Department of National Defence, DRMIS Support Services lists 53 Resource Categories.

Table 1 and Table 2 in Section 3 of Annex B-1, Basis of Payment, Department of National Defence, DRMIS lists 71 Resource Categories.

Will the Crown please confirm that firm per diem pricing is required for 53 Resource Categories and updated Table 1 and Table 2 in Section 3 of Annex B-1 accordingly.

Answer 28:

Table 1 in Section 3.2 of Annex A-1, Statement of Work, Department of National Defence, DRMIS Support Services lists the 53 Resource Categories for Steady-State In-Service Support

only, as described in Annex A-1 Statement of Work Section 2.1.1.

In addition, other resources may be required to support Expansion of the DRMIS footprint as described in Annex A-1 Statement of Work Section 2.1.2.

The Crown requires firm per diem pricing for all 71 resource categories identified in Table 1 and Table 2 in Section 3 of Annex B-1 accordingly.

Question 29:

Due to the limited number of resources with DFPS and multiple certifications, please confirm the Crown will permit resources to bid with more than one company.

Answer 29:

Yes, the Crown will permit resources to bid with more than one company.

Question 30:

Regarding Section C. Resource Point-rated Technical Evaluation, R4 for the Application Solution Architect – FI – Level 3, Application Solution Architect – PM – Level 3, and Application Solution Architect – MM – Level 3: Will the Crown consider including ASAP methodology training/certification as an equivalent to PMP?

Answer 30:

Only the equivalencies for PMP certification identified under the various R4 criteria will be accepted.

Question 31:

Section C. Resource Point-rated Technical Evaluation, Project Manager – Level 3, item # PM R1 states: “proposed resource should have a minimum 12 months demonstrated experience during the last 84 months managing own organization resources in either an ISS or implementation contract.” SAP project teams usually consist of mixed resources from many different sources. Would the Crown consider changing this requirement to state: The proposed resource should have a minimum 12 months demonstrated experience during the last 84 months managing the resources in either an ISS or implementation contract?

Answer 31:

Please see RFP change 2) below.

Question 32:**Billable Days Evidence**

Ref: **SOW pg 181 ATTACHMENT A – TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA, 2. CORPORATE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA** which states, in part:

C.M5 The Bidder must have demonstrated corporate contract experience in delivering SAP informatics support services supplying **at least 16 of the 22 identified resource categories** in the identified minimum number of billable days applicable for each as identified below. To be accepted:

4) the work delivered by each of the 16 resource categories includes at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in the SOW at Annex A-1 for that resource category.

The Bidder must complete Appendices A and B to Attachment A and provide Contract References.

And

C.R5 The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess of the minimum billable days identified under C.M5.

The number of billable days to meet the mandatory requirement lies somewhere between 8,391 and 18,784 depending on which 16 of the 22 categories are used. Furthermore, to score 100% of the points on , the number of billable days doubles to 16,782 and 37,568. We estimate that to achieve the required billable days, the billable days of between 100 and 400 resources will be Required.

C.M5 states:

The Bidder must complete Appendices A and B to Attachment A and provide Contract References.

Appendix B to Attachment A (Corporate Reference template) is to be completed for each of the resources contributing billable days in response to this requirement. Appendix B (Resource

Reference template) requires a cross reference from the SOW to the CV of the resource and a mapping of the CV tasks performed to the SOW tasks to illustrate that at least 50% of the tasks were performed. We have several concerns in meeting this requirement:

- a) The work required to research the resources (locate the resource, contact them, obtain express permission, validate, etc.) and then their contact reference names, then update and validate their CV' Appendix A' and Appendix B' for 100 to 400 resources is a huge task that is impossible in the time available and will put us in a no-bid position.
- b) The requirement to produce the evidence to support the billable days submitted is not a competitive requirement but an evidence submission or audit requirement. To have us placed in a no-bid situation based on the onerous requirement to meet a non-competitive requirement is, frankly, indicative of an unfair practice that may favour the incumbent or other specific bidders.
- c) The cost of the above proposal work will be significant (hiring of temporary help, office space, etc.) It takes approximately 2 to 4 person days per CV & Appendices A & B, which equals 200 to 1,600 person days of effort. The cost of this work is ultimately reflected in the bid pricing of this RFP response and other GC responses as done by our NCR office and is therefore detrimental to Canada.
- d) The task of evaluating 100 to 400 resumes and Appendix B' to prove the material in Appendix A will be onerous and costly for Canada' evaluation team.
- e) The length of time for Canada' evaluation team to evaluate the 100 to 400 resumes and Appendix B' will likely push transition timelines well beyond what was planned, which may result in a non-competitive award of a contract extension.
- f) The time to do the work to deliver the proposal is limited by the bid closing date of 22 July, which further moves us towards a no-bid position.
- g) Where only one or two projects from a resource' career are used as references for the billable days, asking for a complete resume, and Appendix B for every project is redundant. It would suffice to extract only the applicable projects for the proposal.
- h) The printing of four hard copies of between 100 and 400 complete resumes and associated Appendix B' where each resume may have only one project relevant to this proposal is an obvious waste of paper. The non-relevant projects of the resource are not even going to be evaluated. This requirement clearly runs against the Policy on Green Procurement.
- i) The personal information that was collected for the purpose of delivering the work under the referenced contract was for the purposes of administration of that contract; and is not for use thereafter for other purposes; without express permission of the individual. Since the resources on the referenced project are not being bid on this project, we believe that a privacy breach would be committed by releasing that personal information in our proposal.
- j) In light of the potential for privacy breaches and subsequent potential litigation, the limited time available, and the onerous scope of this requirement, we would be forced to no-bid. This will reduce competition and is clearly favouring the incumbent(s) as they do have the personal information at hand and can easily obtain the required permissions to

use the resources' personal information.

In light of the requirement for evidence or audit of the claimed billable days, we offer the following suggestions, from least desirable to most desirable:

Q32.1 Submit Only Relevant Projects:

Would Canada accept only the relevant projects from the resumes, with Appendices A and B, that support the billable days. The impacts of this are:

- Less paper printed –Green Procurement
- Less material to evaluate – Canada's cost savings and time (duration) savings
- Less material to research and format – bidder savings, rippling through to lower pricing

Q32.2 Sampling of Supporting Evidence:

Would Canada accept Appendix A' and no Appendix B' at proposal time? During the evaluation period, Canada would have the option to randomly select one or two categories during the evaluation period. The one or two categories would be sent to all bidders and have the bidders would then have to submit the validation materials, say, within 15 working days? This would satisfy the validation requirements but not be as onerous a task, nor require the volume of Printing.

Q32.3 Invoices as Evidence:

In other GC RFP's to avoid many of the privacy issues, PWGSC has asked for copies of invoices (with names <due to privacy issues> and dollar values <normal commercial confidential> redacted), illustrating the billable days by category. A) Would Canada please change the evaluation criteria to the invoice evaluation method described? B) In light of the Green Procurement Policy, would Canada accept electronic submission of the invoices (.pdf) rather than hardcopy since the invoices would only be used for validation of the Appendix A Numbers?

Q32.4 Contracts as Evidence:

Would Canada accept awarded contracts (up to 10) that define roles and associated tasks, mapped to the SOW tasks by role, with aggregated billings of at least \$15M/year and \$150M over the contract terms, where the contract start date or end date is within the last 84 months, or is ongoing?

Q32.5 Client Contacts as Evidence Validators:

Would Canada accept as a replacement criterion, that if the client contact for the reference

project agrees with the submitted number of billable days, by category, that the agreement of the client contact constitutes sufficient evidence? The role of the client contact is to validate our response, so it would be appropriate to use that capability.

Answer 32:

The reference to Appendix B to Attachment A contained in C.M5 is in fact an error and has been removed. Please see RFP change 2) in amendment 005 to the RFP. To further clarify:

In order to comply with mandatory requirement C.M5, bidders must complete one Appendix A to Attachment A - RFP Project Reference Response Template for each of the Corporate References, up to a maximum of 10. The Bidder's billable days for each of the 16 resource categories will be detailed on each reference under "Resource Details" on page 196. Several resources of the same category can be used to meet the minimum billable days.

The same billable days provided in the corporate references will be used to assess C.R5.

Evidence to substantiate the billable days will be client references based on the information provided in each of the Appendix A to Attachment A - RFP Project Reference Response Template.

Appendix B to Attachment A is only required for the evaluation of the 4 key resources being evaluated as part of the RFP (ie. Project Manager as well as Application Solution Architects – FI, PM and MM level 3). Should the Bidder also choose to provide a résumé for the optional SAP Functional Analysts DFPS, an Appendix B to Attachment A for this resource category should also be included in their proposal.

Question 33:

Request for Extension

Ref: **Amendment 001, Answer 2** stated "are not considering an extension to the RFP at this Time."

With all due respect, given the magnitude of the work required to create a potentially winning response to the requirements as they now stand, we again request at least a 5 week extension to the closing date to 26 August, 2014.

Answer 33:

The RFP closing date has been extended until August 19, 2014. Please see RFP change 1) in amendment 005 to the RFP.

Question 34:

The language provided within Section 6, page 21/202 of Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection is somewhat unclear. Can the Crown please confirm that, as per (B) (iii), if a Bidder proposes as a formal JV entity, any of the experience of the members of the JV can be pooled to respond to any single corporate mandatory or rated requirement as the wording provided within (A) (ii) seems to conflict with this? Also the wording regarding the JV entity indicates ‘as otherwise specified’ Can the Crown indicate which, if any, single corporate mandatory or rated requirements would not be eligible to be responded to by either pooled Corporate Team Members or by a pooled JV members as it is not immediately clear in the RFP?

Answer 34:

As part of a formal Joint Venture (JV), the experience of any of the members of the JV can be used to respond to any single corporate mandatory or rated requirement by the Bidder, provided that the experience is available for use by the Bidder throughout the contract. The RFP does not specify any criteria for which this is not applicable.

Question 35:

NATO and Other Equivalence to Canadian Secret

In the RFP the requirement is for resources to have SECRET clearance, with the addition of “Canadian eyes only” for a small portion of the anticipated resource demand. Would Canada accept NATO Secret and/or other country for which Canada has a reciprocal agreement per Section 1103 of the PWGSC Industrial Security Manual <http://ssi-iss.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/msiism/ch11/intrntnl-eng.html#ch11-1103>) as equivalent to Canadian SECRET? If Canada agrees to the foregoing question, would Canada please provide the list of countries and the equivalent clearance names and levels?

Answer 35:

No. Please note that only the resource categories identified in Table 1 of Annex A-1 - SOW may be required to have Canadian Eyes Only. Proof of citizenship and security clearance will be required at Task Authorization issuance.

Question 36:

The Crown has requested support from a single service provider for both DRMIS / SIGMA. The Initial contract period is 3 years, with potential for 5 additional option years. Both DRMIS and SIGMA are important systems to their respective Departments, and therefore represent significant risk that needs to be carefully managed from a procurement and contracting perspective. By selecting a single supplier, locked into a single, long duration arrangement, the Crown exposes both Departments to increased risk, and misses an opportunity to give each Department better tools to ensure each project respects scope, schedule, and budget requirements and constraints.

We believe the procurement strategy demonstrated in PWGSC solicitation for “and Web Support” (Solicitation No. EP887-141960/A) presents a much better range of options to the sponsoring Departments. The “and Web Support” solicitation envisioned selecting up to 3 qualified vendors to provide services over a multi-year contract, and awarding work through task authorizations distributed between up to 3 vendors. This approach offered the following benefits to the client Department:

- **Service differentiation:** ability to use individual task authorizations to differentiate between vendor service offering, i.e. commoditized staff augmentation services vs. highly specialized, strategic systems integration advice;
- **Risk management – resourcing:** The “and Web Support” solicitation had a mechanism to disqualify vendors, at the discretion of the contracting Department, if vendors made 3 refusals to supply resources “and when requested” Directing the TA to an alternate, qualified, vendor is a far more agile solution than launching an expensive retendering exercise, as was the case when previous vendors were unable to support the DRMIS project; and
- **Risk management – project schedule:** the ability to direct TA to more than one vendor gives the contracting department access to a greater number of total resources, preventing a single vendor’s staffing arrangements from becoming a bottle neck for any of the required resource categories.

Given the large financial and project risk surrounding the present procurement, the expense and operational risk of re-procurement, and the relative ease of arming the contracting Departments with service differentiation and risk management options, we would ask that the Crown amend the DRMIS / SIGMA support solicitation to select up to three qualified bidders, with work to be distributed via task authorizations, and terms and conditions similar to the mechanisms envisioned in Solicitation No. EP887-141960/A.

Answer 36:

Please see Answer 41 below.

Question 37:

Re: DFPS R2

The DFPS Functional analyst role specified rated criteria for SAP certification in SAP PM, MM and HR.

1. We assume that DND has included this criteria to demonstrate that the DFPS functional analyst has an understanding key integration points within the DFPS SAP solution.

Please confirm the rationale for this criteria.

2. We propose that DND considers allowing for equivalent criteria to score these points that would include as substitutes for one or more certifications:

- Demonstrated project experience integrating DFPS with one or more of the relevant modules (SAP PM, MM, HR)
- Demonstrated project experience implementing DFPS for more than one Defense Client

Answer 37:

Yes the 3 SAP certifications required are to demonstrate that the SAP Functional Analyst DFPS has an understanding of the key integration points of the DFPS module. No changes will be made to this rated criteria.

Question 38:

Re: Section 2.4 Working Location and Hours

Question: Firms with large pools of qualified talent could leverage existing SAP resources that provide in-service support to SAP clients in several cities, supporting a national solution such as DRMIS. Would DND consider use of other DND locations outside of the NCR in Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver as potential locations that could be cost effective to leverage in support of DRMIS?

Answer 38:

No. All work must be completed within the NCR.

Question 39:

10(f) Discretionary Audit

The Crown' provision for Discretionary Audit is intended to determine whether the actual profit earned is "and justifiable" In order to determine reasonable profit, we would need to provide the Crown with access to internal financial and cost information that is commercially confidential. Industry benchmark information should be readily available and the Crown also has the benefit of prior history to identify an acceptable budget and fee structure for the DRMIS ISS going forward. We therefore recommend that this provision be removed.

Answer 39:

Canada is not willing to remove this provision. Please be assured that should any proprietary or business confidential information be required by Canada, it will be treated with discretion and only be accessible to those who require access to the information as part of their official duties.

In addition, please note that this applies only to new labour categories.

Please see RFP change 1) below.

Question 40:

13 Price Protection.

With respect to "Favoured Customer" Provisions, a competitive qualification process such as this RFP which requires respondents to assess their pricing for competitive advantage purposes militates against the need for the inclusion of an MFC provision. In this case, as respondents determine their response, market-driven forces will ultimately come to guide pricing. The crown will have the opportunity to assess those responses and qualify respondents accordingly. For these reasons, Crown procurements have moved away from including MFC requirements. Given (i) that inclusion of an MFC clause is more appropriate for non-competitive solicitations where market-driven pressures on pricing are not necessarily present. Will the crown agree to delete clause and retain a market-driven competitive pricing procurement in this solicitation?

Answer 40:

Please note that this clause applies to new labour categories not already contemplated in the contract, should they be required. As such, a rate(s) for these categories would need to be

negotiated at the time of the issuance of a Task Authorization which includes the new categories, and would therefore not be obtained through the competitive process. As this clause provides Canada with some assurance that it is receiving fair market value for the Work in question, it will remain as part of the draft contract.

Question 41:

In order to provide PWGSC with the 16 resources required for the steady-state in-service support of SIGMA operations, the Bidder must also be able to provide 180+ secret cleared resources, in a controlled goods environment, for the support and potential expansion of DND' DRMIS footprint. This, along with the volume of experience required to meet the mandatory and point-rated requirements, has effectively reduced the competition to include only the largest organizations. While the experience of a large integrator is required for DRMIS, we believe that a medium sized company would be able to satisfy the SIGMA requirements.

According to The Office of Small and Medium Enterprises (OSME) Department, the Government of Canada is committed to giving small and medium enterprises (SME) access to compete for government business by reducing the barriers that prevent SMEs from participating in federal procurement. In keeping with the OSME commitment and to ensure each department receives qualified resources at the time they are required, we respectfully request the Crown split this requirement into two separate RFP' resulting in one contract for SIGMA Support Services at PWGSC and one contract for DRMIS Support Services at DND.

Answer 41:

Since both the DND and SIGMA requirements need similar professional service resources to fulfill their respective requirements, two contracts with two contractors would create a scenario whereby DND and SIGMA would be competing for the same resources, especially for SAP expertise, from two contractors. This would highly likely result in resources not being available for either DND or SIGMA, or both, on certain occasions. This scenario could seriously jeopardize DND' ability to obtain resources for critical and urgent operational work needed under its contract.

Based on Canada' analysis, it has been concluded that Canada can, with greater certainty, manage the risk of not having the necessary resources when required to perform work under both the DND and SIGMA contracts, with one contractor rather than with two contractors.

RFP CHANGES:

The following changes are made to the RFP document:

- 1) Reference: Article 10 (f) of Part 7 of the RFP

DELETE:

Discretionary Audit Non-commercial Goods and/or Services

INSERT:

Discretionary Audit Non-commercial Goods and/or Services (New Labour Categories)

- 2) Reference: Attachment A, Section C. Resource Point-rated Technical Evaluation, Project Manager – Level 3

DELETE:

The proposed resource should have a minimum 12 months demonstrated experience during the last 84 months managing own organization resources in either an ISS or implementation contract.

INSERT:

The proposed resource should have a minimum 12 months demonstrated experience during the last 84 months managing the resources in either an ISS or implementation contract.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.