

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. 009
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-126279	Date 2014-07-25
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.

009

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 48

Would the Crown please confirm that for S.24(v)(B) Limitation of Liability – Information Management Technology that total estimated cost (meaning the dollar amount shown on the first page of the Contract in the cell titled "Total Estimated Cost") will be equal to the amount shown on each call-up, purchase order or other document used to order goods or services under this instrument, or \$2,000,000? We believe the intent, which would be reasonable and in line with industry standards, is for liability to start and end with each completed call-up, purchase order or other document, and that the cumulative value of that liability would be limited to each completed call-up, purchase order or other document, therefore representing "Total Estimated Cost".

However, "Total Estimated Cost" could also be interpreted to represent the cumulative value of all call-ups, purchase orders or other documents used to order good or services over the life of the contract which would mean that any single call-up, purchase order or other document would not have liability limited by its amount, but rather all contract value procured to date. This interpretation would lead to a liability cap that is not in line with industry standards for a multi-year contract of this nature. Such liability cap would require the Contractor to assume risk far in excess of what is reasonable or industry standard. If that is the interpretation that applies, we urge the Crown to consider a cap set at the greater of \$2,000,000 or an amount equal to the amounts paid or payable to the Contractor for Work performed under the Agreement during a twelve month period.

If the Crown can confirm that the understanding in the first paragraph above is correct, would the Crown then revise the clause as follows:

"(B) any other direct damages, including all identifiable direct costs to Canada associated with re-procuring the Work from another party if the Contract is terminated either in whole or in part for default, up to an aggregate maximum for this subparagraph (B) of the greater of the charges or amounts paid or due and payable to the Contractor under the Contract under the applicable call-up, purchase order or other document used to order goods or services under this instrument; or \$2,000,000.

In any case, the total liability of the Contractor under subparagraph (v) will not exceed the amounts paid or due and payable to the Contractor under the applicable call-up, purchase order or other document used to order goods or services under this instrument, or \$2,000,000, whichever is more?

Or if the interpretation in the second paragraph applies:

"(B) any other direct damages, including all identifiable direct costs to Canada associated with re-procuring the Work from another party if the Contract is terminated either in whole or in part for default, up to an aggregate maximum for this subparagraph (B) of the greater of the charges or amounts paid or due and payable to the Contractor under the Contract in the previous 12 month period; or \$2,000,000, whichever is more. In any case, the total liability of the Contractor under subparagraph (v) will not exceed the amounts paid or due and payable to the Contractor under the Contract in the previous 12 month period immediately preceding the event giving rise to the liability or \$2,000,000, whichever is more?"

Answer 48

The intent of the clause is to cap the Limitation of Liability at 0.75 times of the contract value or \$2,000,000.00, whichever is greater.

Please see RFP change 1) below.

Question 63

(RFP pg 193) DFPS R1 requirement states: "The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the last 60 months performing analysis, design, configuration and implementation of DFPS." Would Canada please change 60 months to 120 months? Our candidate has experience with DFPS over a number of years, and has continued to develop SAP experience in a number of related fields which makes the broad experience valuable to DND.

Answer 63

No changes will be made to the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS R1 rated criteria. We believe 60 months is a sufficient period of time to have gained demonstrated experience.

Question 64

Please provide confirmation that Appendix A to Attachment A RFP Project Reference Response Template section "Resource Details" must be completed only for the client references supporting criteria M5 and R5 for proof of billable days.

Answer 64

Please see RFP change 5) below which clarifies the information requirements of Appendix A to Attachment A.

Question 65

Attachment A: Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, section 3A of the Resource Technical Evaluation Criteria, states: "For each substantiating experience period for a proposed individual in response to the requirements set out below, the Bidder must provide a Customer Reference, which will include the Customer Name, Title, Telephone Number and E-mail Address, who may be contacted to verify the claimed experience. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that any information divulged has the permission of the references provided."

Given the high level of experience needed from each resource to respond to the evaluation criteria, we believe this to be a somewhat unreasonable request. Beyond recent experience (within the last 5 years, for example), the contacts for Customer References may not be valid/active. We respectfully request that resource Customer References only be required for experience falling within the last 5 years.

Answer 65

Given the seniority and level of expertise required for these key resources, Canada feels that providing references for the last 84 months is reasonable request. It is the Bidder's responsibility to make every effort to support this requirement.

Question 66

This question pertains to the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS – Level 3 resource evaluation. DFPS is a module that is very specific to DND, therefore limiting the pool of qualified resources. Please amend Requirement 1 by expanding the timeframe in which the resource can demonstrate DFPS experience as follows:

DFPS R1: "The proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the last **8 years** performing analysis, design, configuration and implementation of DFPS."

Answer 66

No changes will be made to the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS R1 rated criteria. Based on the fact that DFPS is a more recent SAP industry solution, we believe 60 months is a sufficient period of time to have gained demonstrated experience.

Question 67

For the SAP Functional Analyst - DFPS resource evaluation grid, please amend Requirement 2 (R2) to include a certification in the DFPS module (within the list of applicable certifications), as we believe that this would be very relevant to the role and would make the resource a valuable asset to the project team. Otherwise please provide rationale as to why a DFPS module certification is not as relevant as the ones cited in the requirement for this role?

Answer 67

Since the DFPS module is a fairly recent SAP industry solution, the Crown wants to ensure as many potential candidates can meet this rated criteria. As such, we will accept any of the module certifications listed under R2, which are the cornerstone of the DFPS solution.

Question 68

With all due respect, asking bidders to devote time to compiling numbers of billable days where the reference project is not being used to meet the billable days requirement in C.M5 & C.R5 adds needless work and cost to bid preparation. This work adds material and cost that is not subject to evaluation, and hence adds no value. Since Canada is not evaluating the number of billable days for C.M1, C.M2, C.M3, C.M4, C.R1, C.R2, C.R3, or C.R4, asking for billable days for corporate project references that respond to those requirements is not necessary. In the APPENDIX A TO ATTACHMENT A RFP PROJECT REFERENCE RESPONSE TEMPLATE, in the table RESOURCE DETAILS, would Canada change the column heading “Number of billable days” to read “Number of billable days (to be completed only if used to respond to criteria C.M5 and/or C.R5)”?

Answer 68

Please see RFP change 5) below which clarifies the information requirements of Appendix A to Attachment A.

Question 69

Please confirm that for corporate references, responses are required only for the Mandatory and Rated Criteria for which the project is being used. As an example, if a vendor is using a project to respond to M2, M3 and M4, then responses are only required for these sections and no responses are required for M1, M5 and R1 through R5 and the Resource Details chart.

Answer 69

Please see RFP change 5) below which clarifies the information requirements of Appendix A to Attachment A.

Question 70

For C.M3 on page 180, it does not appear that the criteria as laid out by the Crown is requiring the reference to be for SAP In Service Support. We would recommend the following wording change: “The Bidder must provide 2 corporate contract references where the Bidder was contracted to deliver professional services to provide In-Service Support (as defined in Annex A-1) of an SAP information management system having a user base greater than 3,500 over the last 84 months”

Answer 70

As the SAP-specific requirement is addressed in C. M1, no changes are required to C.M3.

Question 71

For C.M4 on page 180, it does not appear that the criteria as laid out by the Crown requires the reference to be for SAP In Service Support. We would recommend the following wording change: “The Bidder must provide 2 corporate contract references where the Bidder was contracted to provide and manage a team of at least 50 resources working concurrently on each contract within the last 84 months for an SAP Steady-State In-Service Support and/or for a SAP design, develop and implementation project.”

Answer 71

As the SAP-specific requirement is addressed in C M1, no changes are required to C.M4.

Question 72

As we're sure that DND and PWGSC can appreciate, due to the sensitive and classified nature of the scope and extent of some of our contracts (i.e., especially in the defense space), some clients are reluctant and/or will not disclose specifics in RFP Response Forms such as some specific fields in Appendix A to Attachment A. For example, disclosing the specific corporate credential details of the solution while also disclosing the specific client / defense organization name is not acceptable to some of our clients who have a sensitive nature to their solutions. They would prefer a "masked" approach to the RFP response - specifically the Customer/Client Organization. In addition, disclosing specific client Contact Names, email addresses and telephone numbers is not acceptable to some of our clients who have a sensitive nature to their solutions. They would prefer to have one of our Executives (bidder's organization) named in the RFP credential as the initial point of contact, who can then refer/coordinate a call with the client organization. For example, we would propose the following approach for Appendix A to Attachment A:

Name of Customer/Client Organization: Large European Defense Organization

Contact Name: Joe Smith from the bidder's organization

Contact's email address: joe.smith@bidder's organization.com

Contact's telephone number: Joe Smith's phone number.

- a. Would it be acceptable to mask the above information for the Customer/Client and instead, use a generic corporate name?
- b. Would it be acceptable to use an Executive contact from the Bidder's Team to be named in lieu of the client contact name for coordination of the reference call?

Answer 72

In order to validate Corporate references, we require the full customer information to be provided.

Question 73

With regard to Section 6. Evaluation of Experience of Bidder’s Teaming Members Sub-section A – For Both Corporate and Key Personnel Experience Page 21 of 202 ii) Except where otherwise expressly provided, Corporate Team Members or Key Personnel cannot pool their abilities to satisfy any single point-rated requirement of this solicitation. Wherever substantiation of a point-rated requirement is required, the Bidder is requested to indicate which team member or individual satisfies the requirement

Example:

A bidder is a joint venture consisting of members X, Y and Z. If a solicitation requires: (a) that the bidder have 3 years of experience providing maintenance services, and (b) that the bidder have 2 years of experience integrating hardware with complex networks, then each of these two requirements can be met by a different member of the joint venture. However, for a single requirement, such as the requirement for 3 years of experience providing maintenance services, the bidder cannot indicate that each of members X, Y and Z has one year of experience, totaling three years. Such a response would be declared non-compliant. (Note: this example is not specific to this solicitation and does not relate to the requirements of this solicitation - it is provided only for illustrative purposes.)

Question: In a situation where a joint venture consisting of members, Y, and Z are using both vendors’ references in order to satisfy the Corporate Mandatory and Rated Requirements, and a maximum of 10 corporate references are permitted to respond to this RFP, please confirm this clause does not apply to Corporate Mandatory C.M5 and Corporate Rated Requirement C.R5 and that vendors are permitted to combine their references to satisfy the # of billable days required.

For example:

C. M1	Company Y
C.M2	Company Z
C.M3	Company Z
C.M4	Company Y & Z – 1 Reference each
C.M5	Company Y – 4 Corporate References Company Z – 6 Corporate References

Answer 73

The total number of Corporate References provided by the Bidders cannot exceed 10, as stated in Attachment A, article 2.A Corporate Technical Evaluation criteria. For example, in the cases of

joint ventures, company X can provide 3 references, company Y can provide 2 and company Z can provide the remaining 5, to total no more than 10.

Question 74

In Attachment A: Technical Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, section 3A of the Resource Technical Evaluation Criteria, it states: "For each substantiating experience period for a proposed individual in response to the requirements set out below, the Bidder must provide a Customer Reference, which will include the Customer Name, Title, Telephone Number and E-mail Address, who may be contacted to verify the claimed experience. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that any information divulged has the permission of the references provided."

This would suggest that the Crown is expecting bidders/resources to provide a reference for each and every project used to satisfy all of the requirements (months and activities). Given the extensive number of months and activities that a resource must demonstrate, there could be upwards of a dozen projects used to meet the requirements.

In order to streamline the reference process we respectfully request that the Crown allow resources to provide contact information only for their three most relevant projects.

Answer 74

Bidders must provide customer references to validate the mandatory requirements.

Question 75

SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS – Level 3

Experience with DFPS is not something that is commonplace for SAP functional analysts. As such, we request that this requirement be changed to allow the proposed resource for SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS – Level 3 to show their demonstrated experience within the last 96 months rather than 60 months, consistent to several other requirements.

Answer 75

No changes will be made to the SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS R1 rated criteria. Based on the fact that DFPS is a more recent SAP industry solution, we believe 60 months is a sufficient period of time to have gained demonstrated experience.

Question 76

Given that DFPS is a certification that a resource may hold, and that it would seem logical that this would be a valuable certification for the DFPS resource to possess, we would ask that DFPS R2 be amended to include DFPS along with PM, MM, HR certifications listed.

Answer 76

Since the DFPS module is a fairly recent SAP industry solution, we want to ensure as many potential candidates can meet this rated criteria. As such, DND will accept any of the module certifications listed under R2, which are the cornerstone of the DFPS solution.

Question 77

Annex- A-2 Statement of work...SIGMA support services, section 2.4 Working location and hours clearly states that the associated work will be completed at a PWGSC site in the National Capital Region (NCR). In Annex A-1 Statement of DRMIS support services, section 2.4 Working location and hours the RFP indicates that a majority of the work will be completed at a DND location within the NCR but with DND approval work can be completed off site. Many clients use a variety of delivery models to perform in-service support and build activities. For example, a model could include the client site team, and both off and on-shore development/support centres (i.e. resources in Canadian global delivery centres not located in NCR).

Can the Crown please confirm that the use of this kind of blended team that would incorporate work done off-site in either off or on-shore delivery centres is acceptable given all security requirements are met?

Given that the use of this type of blended team can significantly reduce costs, in order for bidders to provide financial proposals that are based on similar structures can the Crown please provide bidders with an approximate percentage or a capped percentage (i.e. no more than 25%) of the work by work type (i.e. Steady state in-service support, Expansion of the DRMIS Footprint, and Additional Work Requirements) that would be acceptable to be performed by off-site delivery centre resources as long as all security requirements are met?

Answer 77

Please see answer 38 in amendment 006.

Question 78

Appendix A to Attachment A RFP Project reference response template requests that within the demonstration of Resource Details that a bidder indicate the resource experience (# of months).

In the case of the programmer/software developer the Crown is requesting that 5940 billable days be shown. Conceivably a bidder may use 100 resources in or across projects to meet that requirement and would require that a bidder complete a line for each resource, breaking out their experience, billable days and demonstrated tasks.

We believe the intent of this requirement is not to demonstrate the resources' experience, but rather to demonstrate the bidder's experience to provide a high volume of skilled resources. Given that is the intent, and that the RFP clearly stipulates that all resources must have a minimum of 36 months to be used to substantiate the resource requirements and there is no benefit from a rated perspective to show more than 36 months of experience, we would request that the Crown amend this table to remove the column "resource experience # months" to be more in keeping with the table used in the previous DRMIS (among other) solicitations requesting that bidders use billable day counts to demonstrate their capability to provide a high numbers of resources.

Answer 78

Please refer to Answer 27 in amendment 006.

All billable days in excess of those identified in C.M5 will count towards rated criteria C.R5.

Question 79:

Reference: Attachment A, Section B, Resource Mandatory Technical Criteria, Application Solution Architect - FI - level 3, ASA-FI M2

Would the crown also accept: Financial Accounting mysap ERP2005 certification. This version is after sap 4.7.

Answer 79:

Please see RFP changes 2) - 4) below.

RFP CHANGES:

The following changes are made to the RFP document:

- 1) Reference: Part 7 – A, article 25 and Part 7 – B article 24 Limitation of Liability, (b), (v), (B)

DELETE:

Any other direct damages, including all identifiable direct costs to Canada associated with re-procuring the Work from another party if the Contract is terminated either in whole or in part for default, up to an aggregate maximum for this subparagraph (B) of the greater of 0.75 times the total estimated cost (meaning the dollar amount shown on the first page of the Contract in the cell titled "Total Estimated Cost" or shown on each call-up, purchase order or other document used to order goods or services under this instrument), or \$2,000,000.00.

INSERT:

Any other direct damages, including all identifiable direct costs to Canada associated with re-procuring the Work from another party if the Contract is terminated either in whole or in part for default, up to an aggregate maximum for this subparagraph (B) of the greater of 0.75 times the total estimated cost (meaning the dollar amount shown on the first page of the Contract in the cell titled "Total Estimated Cost"), or \$2,000,000.00.

2) Reference: Attachment A, Section B, Resource Mandatory Technical Criteria, Application Solution Architect - FI - level 3, ASA-FI M2

DELETE:

The proposed resource must hold a valid SAP certification in the FI module of SAP version 4.7 or one of the following equivalent certifications: Management Accounting CO with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Management Accounting CO with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Management Accounting CO with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, Financial Accounting with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Financial Accounting with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5 or Financial Accounting with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6.

INSERT:

The proposed resource must hold a valid SAP certification in the FI module of SAP version 4.7 or one of the following equivalent certifications: Management Accounting CO with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Management Accounting CO with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Management Accounting CO with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, Financial Accounting with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Financial Accounting with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Financial Accounting with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, or any SAP ERP 2005 certifications in Management Accounting CO or Financial Accounting.

3) Reference: Attachment A, Section B, Resource Mandatory Technical Criteria, Application Solution Architect - MM - level 3, ASA-MM M2

DELETE:

The proposed resource must hold a valid SAP certification in the MM module of SAP version 4.7 or one of the following equivalent certifications: Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with

SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP6 or SCM - Planning in SAP SCM (SCM5.0).

INSERT:

The proposed resource must hold a valid SAP certification in the MM module of SAP version 4.7 or one of the following equivalent certifications: Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP6 or SCM - Planning in SAP SCM (SCM5.0) or any SAP ERP 2005 certifications in Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management, SCM or Procurement.

4) Reference: Attachment A, Section C, Resource Point-rated Technical Evaluation, SAP Functional Analyst: DFPS - Level 3, DFPS R2

DELETE:

The proposed resource should have SAP Certifications in the PM and/or MM and/or HR modules of SAP version 4.7 or the following equivalent certifications:

PM equivalent certification: PLM - Maintenance & Repair SAP ERP 2005, Enterprise Asset Management with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5, Enterprise Asset Management (Maintenance and Repair) with SAP ERP 6.0 Ehp6.

MM equivalent certification: Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP6, SCM - Planning in SAP SCM (SCM5.0).

HR equivalent certification: HCM Workforce Process Management with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5.

INSERT:

The proposed resource should have SAP Certifications in the PM and/or MM and/or HR modules of SAP version 4.7 or the following equivalent certifications:

PM equivalent certification: PLM - Maintenance & Repair SAP ERP 2005, Enterprise Asset Management with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5, Enterprise Asset Management (Maintenance and Repair) with SAP ERP 6.0 Ehp6

MM equivalent certification: Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp4, Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp5, Logistics

Execution and Warehouse Management with SAP ERP 6.0 ehp6, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5, Procurement with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP6, SCM - Planning in SAP SCM (SCM5.0) or any SAP ERP 2005 certifications in Logistics Execution and Warehouse Management, SCM or Procurement.

HR equivalent certification: HCM Workforce Process Management with SAP ERP 6.0 EHP5 or any SAP ERP 2005 certifications in HCM Workforce Process Management.

5) Reference: Appendix A to Attachment A, Project Reference Response Template

DELETE:

In its' entirety.

INSERT:

The attached Appendix A to Attachment A, Project Reference Response Template

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.

**APPENDIX A TO ATTACHMENT A
RFP PROJECT REFERENCE RESPONSE TEMPLATE**

Note to Bidders: Bidders are required to provide ALL information required, including Resource Details. Bidders may add additional lines to the response template, as required.

Referenced Project #:		
Referenced Project Title:		
Bidder's Name:		
Project Start Date:	Project End Date:	
CUSTOMER/CLIENT REFERENCE CONTACT INFORMATION		
Name of Customer/Client Organization:		
Contact Name:		
Contact's email address:		
Contact's telephone number:		
PROJECT DETAILS		
Applicable Mandatory Criteria for this Reference (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> M1: In-Service Support Services <input type="checkbox"/> M2: Design, Development and Implementation Services <input type="checkbox"/> M3: Support Services for user base >3,500 <input type="checkbox"/> M4: Management of team >50 concurrent resources <input type="checkbox"/> M5: Billable days for 16 of 22 resource categories		List SAP Modules supported/implemented:
Number of users supported / implemented to:		
Description of project services Describe the types of work performed, the business context in which various SAP modules were delivered and/or supported, and any other details required to demonstrate that the referenced project meets the required criteria.		

