

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. 008
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-126279	Date 2014-07-21
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, Michael	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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-126279/D

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

008

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

008xq

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

W8474-126279

File No. - N° du dossier

008xqW8474-126279

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

**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**

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS.

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 43:

Table 1 on page 106 lists the estimated resource requirements for steady state in-service support for SIGMA. Please confirm the data (220) under the column heading of "Estimated # of Days for each identified resource" will be used to calculate the initial 3 years and optional 5 years for the "total bid evaluation price" calculation. If not, please provide the estimated # of days by year for each identified resource.

Answer 43:

Canada can confirm that this level of effort will be used as a part of the calculation for both the initial 3 years and optional 5 years in the "total bid price" calculation.

Question 44:

There are 18 resource categories not listed on Annex A-1 Statement of Work Department of National Defence. For instance: Application Solution Architect Level 2 and Technical Architect Level 2 are listed under Annex A-1, Table 2 on Page 87, Annex B-1, Table 1 on Page 112, and Annex B-1, Table 2 on page 114. But they are not listed under Annex A-1, Table 1 on page 84.

Please confirm whether the bidder is required to submit per diem rates for the 18 resource categories that are not listed in the Table 1 of Annex A-1.

Answer 44:

Bidders must complete Table 1 of Annex B-1 – Basis of Payment (pages 112 to 115) as part of their proposals. This table contains all resource categories and levels for both DRMIS and SIGMA requirements.

Question 45:

Regarding PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, Section 5 Steps to Conduct the Evaluation, Step 5: Evaluation of Financial Bids:

The Crown is using the financial evaluation method that indicates that if a bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a resource category that is lower than the lower median band limit, that the bidders financial evaluation will be conducted using a per diem rate equal to the lower median band limit for that resource category.

In the draft RFP dated Dec 4 2013, page 18/141 the financial evaluation method indicated that 'if a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that is lower than the median, that Bidder's financial evaluation will be conducted using a per diem rate equal to the median for that Resource Category and Period.'

As the financial evaluation method has been significantly changed from the Draft RFP phase which provided a forum for the Vendor community to express their comments or concerns, we would like to respectfully request that the Crown return to its original presented financial evaluation method of bringing the per diem rate equal to the median rather than to the lower median band limit for that Resource Category and Period if the Bidder bids a per diem rate that is lower than the median.

Answer 45:

Canada has chosen to use a financial evaluation methodology based on the use of a lower median band limit. Canada will not be changing the methodology back to what was contemplated in the draft RFP.

Question 46:

C.M5 states that "The Bidder must complete Appendices A and B to Attachment A and provide Contract References."

Can the Crown please confirm that Appendix B is only required for proposed resources under PM M1, ASA-FI M1, ASA-MM M1 and ASA-PM M1.

If Appendix B to Attachment A is, in fact, required for C.M5, please confirm that the Crown expects bidders to submit resumes for all resource billable hours used to meet C.M5.

Answer 46:

Please see Answer 32 in amendment 005.

Question 47:

On behalf of industry, we would like to respectfully request an extension of two weeks to the submission deadline as a result of not having clarifications to our numerous questions for the past 3 weeks. We are seeking important clarifications that materially impact our response and preparations to meet the needs of the DRMIS and SIGMA in-service support resulting

contract. Not having this extension will severely impact the ability for firms to adapt to any responses and changes that may result, we are unable to complete the response activities until we get answers to some of our questions.

Answer 47:

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

Question 49:

RE: PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, Section 5 Steps to Conduct the Evaluation, Step 4: Evaluation of Financial Bids

Using the firm per diem median rate evaluation the consequence of bidding a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that is lower than the Lower Median Band Limit is that the Bidder's financial evaluation will be conducted using a per diem rate equal to the Lower Median Band Limit for that Resource Category. This evaluation method is materially different from the evaluation method in the DRAFT RFP, which states that 'if a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that is lower than the median, that Bidder's financial evaluation will be conducted using a per diem rate equal to the median for that Resource Category and Period.'

We respectfully request that the Crown change the evaluation method to utilize an approach that is consistent with the DRAFT RFP approach - that in these situations the financial evaluation uses a per diem rate equal to the Median Rate for the Resource Category, not the Lower Median Band Limit.

Answer 49:

Canada has chosen to use a financial evaluation methodology based on the use of a lower median band limit. Canada will not be changing the methodology back to what was contemplated in the draft RFP.

Question 50:

We respectfully request an extension to the deadline to August 7, 2014.

Answer 50:

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

Question 51:

Attachment A Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria – Evaluation Criteria C.M5 and C.R5 - Appendix A to Attachment A Project Reference Response Template and Appendix B to Attachment A Proposed Resource Reference Response Template

In C.M5, the evaluation criteria stipulates that Appendix A to Attachment A Project Reference Response Template and Appendix B to Attachment A Proposed Resource Reference Response Template must be completed in response to the criteria. Appendix B seems tailored to be specifically and uniquely used for the responses to the Resource Technical Evaluation Criteria. Would the Crown please clarify if Appendix B has to be used for the purpose of responding to C.M5 and C.R5 and, if it does, how the Appendix specifically has to be used (including providing the resumes for the purpose of the evaluation of C.M5 and C.R5)?

Answer 51:

Please see Answer 32 in amendment 005.

Question 52:

For the C.M5 and C.R5 evaluation criteria, bidders have to demonstrate that the work billed for each resource for each category under a project reference includes at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in the statement of work at Annex A of this bid solicitation for the corresponding resource category and level by filling out the Resource Details table in the Appendix A to Attachment A RFP Project Reference Response Template. This table does not include a Resource Level column or Resource Name column.

Would the Crown please indicate: (a) if the resource names are required; and (b) in which column the resource names must be included? Same with respect to the Resource Level? Finally, if the resource names are not required, is it an accurate interpretation that the mapping of project tasks to the RFP SOW tasks has to be provided at the Resource Category level only?

Answer 52:

No, the resources names are not required. Each bidder must complete an Appendix A to Attachment A – RFP Project Response template for each of the Corporate reference projects, to a maximum of ten (10). The information contained under the heading “Resource Details” on page 196 will be used to determine billable days for the resource categories. Although we do not require names for the resources, each resource must have a minimum of 36 months experience in performing the work required in order to be accepted, as is indicated on page 181 item 2) of C.M5. Bidders must provide the number of months of experience of each resource under the

heading “Resource Details” of Appendix A to Attachment A – RFP Project Response template on page 196.

Question 53:

A number of questions are still outstanding from June without any clarifications from the Crown since July 2, 2014. A response to these questions will have an impact on our solution and we are now at seven business days prior to delivery. We understand that the Crown has declined considering an extension thus far.

Based on the delay in clarifications to outstanding questions, would the Crown kindly reconsider an extension to 26 August 2014?

Answer 53:

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

Question 54:

Amendment 005 has removed the requirement to provide Appendix B to Attachment A form for the Corporate Reference Evaluation Criteria C.M5. This clarifies now that the numbers of billable days and cross-reference between the tasks for a project reference and the tasks for the RFP SOW is now only required at the applicable and corresponding Resource Category level in the Resource Details table of the Appendix A to Attachment A form. Could the Crown please clarify what exactly bidders have to provide for the Resource Experience (# of months) column at the Resource Category and Level?

Answer 54:

Although we do not require names of the resources, each resource must have a minimum of 36 months experience in performing the work required in order to be accepted, as is indicated on page 181 item 2) of C.M5. Bidder must provide the number of months of experience of each resource under the heading “Resource Details” of Appendix A to Attachment A – RFP Project Response template on page 196.

Question 55:

Could the Crown also please clarify if the Resource Category Level has to be captured and provided in the Resource Category column of the Resource Details table.

Answer 55:

Billable days must be for resources with at least 36 months experience performing the work under the particular resource category, as is indicated on page 181 item 2) of C.M5. Bidder must provide the number of months of experience of each resource under the heading "Resource Detail" of Appendix A to Attachment A – RFP Project Response template on page 196. The resources must also have performed at least 50% of the work listed in the SOW under that resource category as per item 4) of C.M5. Although there are no levels of expertise per se, this would equate to a minimum level 2 – intermediate.

Question 56:

RE: Attachment A Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, Section 2. A. General (p. 179) of the RFP states that "The Bidder must complete Appendices A and B to substantiate Corporate experience."

Appendix B is the Proposed Resource Reference response template. Can the Crown please confirm that Appendix B is only required for proposed resources under PM M1, ASA-FI M1, ASA-MM M1 and ASA-PM M1.

Answer 56:

Please see Answer 32 in amendment 005.

Question 57:

RE: Appendix A to Attachment A RFP Project Reference Response Template Appendix A includes sections to provide "Project Details" and "Resource Details". Can the Crown please confirm that the "Resource Details" section only needs to be completed if the reference project is being used for C.M5, otherwise it can be left blank.

Answer 57:

Bidders must provide all the information required in Appendix A to Attachment A on page 195 and 196.

Question 58:

The Crown has only provided an estimated number of days for the 53 Categories listed in Table 1, Section 3.2 of Annex A-1, Statement of Work, Department of National Defence, DRMIS Support Services. With the response provided to Question 28 it is now clear that per diem rates are required for 71 Categories. Will the Crown please provide the estimated number of days that

will be used in the financial evaluation for all 71 Resource Categories listed in Annex "B-1" Basis of Payment DRMIS for DND?

Answer 58

Please see Answer 42 in amendment 007.

Question 59

Financial Evaluation - Method A as written indicates that only the Reference Categories stated in Annex B-1 Basis of Payment - DRMIS for DND will be used in the financial evaluation. If the intent is to use Resource Categories and estimated days from Annex A-1 and Annex A-2 can the Crown please confirm that the Resource Categories and per diem rates provided in Annex B-2 Basis of Payment - SIGMA for PWGSC will also be used in the evaluation.

Answer 59

Please see Answer 42 in amendment 007.

Question 60

Can the Crown please provide the estimated number of days for all 8 years for the SIGMA Categories in "Annex A-2 Statement of Work - SIGMA for PWGSC", as was provided for the DRMIS Categories in "Annex A-1 Statement of Work - DRMIS for DND

Answer 60

Please see Answer 43 in amendment 008.

Question 61

R3 for the Application Solution Architects requests:

The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in 2 of the following:

Initial analysis;

Development and submission of an Implementation Plan;

Definition of time, cost and scope;

Management of the implementation;

for a major expansion initiative over the last 84 months.

It is unusual for a Solution Architect to manage all aspects of an implementation, though they do

manage the solution relating to the initiative and provide guidance to the Project Manager in that area. Will the Crown consider changing "Management of the implementation" to "Assist the project manager in managing issues relevant to their solution areas".

This change is consistent with item P in Annex A-1, Statement of Work for DRMIS, the required services for a Solution Architect.

Answer 61

The management of implementation as listed in rated criteria R3 for all 3 ASA resource categories was determined to be a valid skillset and as such is included as rated criteria. Please refer to item B of 3.3.3 of Annex A-1, Statement of Work for DRMIS.

Question 62

RFP (pg 181) Attachment A – Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria; 2. Corporate Technical Evaluation Criteria; B. Corporate Mandatory Criteria; C.M5 states, in part, “at least 16 of the **22** identified resource categories”. Ref: RFP (pg 195) Appendix A to Attachment A states, in part, “M5: Billable days for 16 of 24 resource categories”

There appears to be an inconsistency in the count of resource categories between these two statements. By our count of the categories on RFP page 185, there are 22 categories. Would Canada confirm that Appendix A to Attachment A should read “M5: Billable days for 16 of 22 resource categories”

Answer 62

Please see RFP change 5) in amendment 007 to the RFP.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.