

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
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Informatics Professional Services Division / Division
des services professionnels en informatique
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet APPLICATION SERVICES (2 YEARS)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation HT218-143802/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client HT218-143802	Date 2014-11-13
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-608-28059	
File No. - N° de dossier 608zm.HT218-143802	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-12-02	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
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: Kelly, James	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 608zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5701 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207
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

HT218-143802/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

003

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

608zm

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

HT218-143802

File No. - N° du dossier

608zmHT218-143802

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

See attached

Request for Proposal**Solicitation Amendment 3****Purpose:**

To respond to various enquiries regarding this solicitation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**QUESTION 3**

Due to the size of the subject solicitation (900+ pages), would it be possible for PWGSC to post a Word copy of the RFP?

ANSWER 3

The entire solicitation is not available in MS Word format, however some attachments are available in MS Word such as Attachment 4.1 - Bid Evaluation Criteria. Bidders can request a copy directly from the Contracting Authority by submitting an email request to james.kelly@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca. Please note that Attachment 4.2 - Pricing schedule is not available in any format other than the format currently published on BuyandSell.

Please note as well that if Canada has provided bidders with multiple formats of a document (for example, a document may be downloaded through BuyandSell, but may also be made available on CD-ROM through BuyandSell), the format downloaded through BuyandSell will take precedence. If Canada issues an amendment to the bid solicitation revising any documents provided to bidders in multiple formats, Canada will not necessarily update all formats to reflect these revisions. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that revisions made through any solicitation amendment issued through BuyandSell are taken into account in the alternate formats it uses of bid

QUESTION 4

Our company is qualified under Tier 2 but not necessarily on all streams. Are we still able to submit onto the Streams we are qualified under?

ANSWER 4

Yes, Bidders can submit a bid under one or more Workstreams. A Bidder must be qualified under TBIPS Tier 2 Stream before contract award, for all categories and levels of expertise within the NCR, identified in the solicitation for the relevant Workstream. Canada will not delay the award of a contract to allow a Bidder to become qualified under TBIPS. Bidders must also be qualified for the level of security identified in the solicitation.

QUESTION 5

We are wondering if there is also an Aboriginal Set Aside for this RFP. Historically large Tier 2's (especially ones dealing with first nations) have an aboriginal set aside. In this case, it is to provide professional services to program initiatives such as First Nations and Inuit Health and as such we see this RFP as an excellent candidate. Please advise if an aboriginal set aside will be issued and if not could you provide the rationale for not issuing an aboriginal set aside.

ANSWER 5

This requirement is not destined primarily for Aboriginal populations, rather it supports the IT requirements of all Health Canada programs including Internal Services requirements. Health Canada is a strong supporter of the Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business and encourages all qualifying aboriginal businesses to submit a proposal for consideration. Canada does not anticipate issuing separate solicitations set-aside for aboriginal business for this requirement.

QUESTION 6

We have a Tier 2 supply arrangement and was wondering if there was an aboriginal set aside coming out for this RFP. In reviewing the RFP it address First Nations and Inuit Health initiatives, which would be great opportunity to be part of, as we are PSAB aboriginal supplier for the Federal Government. Can you please let me know if the aboriginal set aside will be coming out for these aboriginal initiatives that are outlined in the RFP?

ANSWER 6

See Answer 5.

QUESTION 7

Is there currently, or has there ever been, a contracting firm or contracting firms, delivering to the services solicited within this RFP? If so, who are the existing contracting firms, what is the dollar value of the contract or contracts, and when do they complete delivery?

ANSWER 7

Health Canada issues many individual TBIPS Tier-1 and some Tier 2 contracts, as well as one-off RFPs and contracts for as-and-when-requested informatics professional services for multiple resources categories. This requirement seeks to consolidate these requirements for many reasons, including reducing administrative burden associated with managing the procurement process and to increase efficiency and effectiveness through economies of scale. There are many incumbents, too numerous to identify. It is anticipated that this requirement will replace many of HC's current informatics professional services contracts by fiscal period 2015/16.

QUESTION 8

With regard to M1: Corporate Criteria; Streams 1 to 6; Please confirm the two (2) Government clients may also include U.S. Government including Federal, State and/or Local? (Local i.e. equivalent to Canadian Municipal)

ANSWER 8

Government clients must be from Government of Canada or Governments in countries subject to trade agreements with Canada as identified in Article 1.2(d) of the solicitation. The NAFTA agreement includes the United States therefore U.S. Government Federal, State or Municipal clients will be accepted.

QUESTION 9

With regard to M1: Corporate Criteria; Streams 1 to 6; Please confirm the two (2) Government clients may also include U.S. private sector references.

ANSWER 9

No, for the requirement for "Government clients", only these client references will be accepted, regardless of the country of the client. A private sector client is not considered a Government client and therefore will not be accepted for the Government client requirements. Note, the number of Government client references has been changed for some Workstreams. Please refer to solicitation amendment 001.

QUESTION 10

Please confirm resources may bid with more than one firm.

ANSWER 10

Yes, however the Bidder must meet the certification requirements detailed in Article 5.3 - Professional Services Resources and must not proposed the same individual for more than one Resource Category or for more than one Workstream.

QUESTION 11

We qualify for the many of but not all of the roles in stated requirements for each Workstream. If we did not qualify for one of the roles in a given Workstream does that mean that we cannot apply for that Workstream altogether or can we bid for the roles we did qualify for in that given Workstream.

ANSWER 11

See Answer 4. For each Workstream bid, Bidders must bid all resource categories identified in Attachment 4.1 for that Workstream.

QUESTION 12

Our organization has attained Reliability DOS clearance and has secured Document Safeguarding at Protected Level B. According to the last page in the solicitation, we may not need the Secret level clearance for Workstreams 1 to 4...is our understanding correct?

ANSWER 12

No, the Contractor/Offeror must meet the security requirements of the solicitation including Article 7.5 (a). The last page of the solicitation (Security Classification Guide) identifies the required "personnel" screening level for each category and Workstream because multiple levels of personnel screening are identified. This should not be confused with the required Contractor/Offer security level (FSC level of Secret) which is not the same as the Contractor/Offer

QUESTION 13

The Corporate Mandatory for each Workstream requires that the Bidder hold 3 contracts for IM/IT Services. Most large Tier 2 omnibus contracts, similar to this requirement, are awarded to multiple vendors on an "as and when requested" basis. PWGSC typically has rules that even the distribution of TA's to prevent 1 company from receiving all of the business and using their funds while other firms have large amounts of unused funds. As such, it is difficult for firms to have 15 simultaneous resources for a period of 12 months as firms typically don't receive multiple TA's at one time as they are distributed to the different firms and cannot control which TA they receive and the length of time the TA is for. Would the Crown consider changing criterion M1(d) to "The Bidder must have provided 15 different

ANSWER 13

No, Canada needs to ensure Bidders can consistently provide multiple resources during the contract and option periods, which could extend up to five years in total if all option periods are exercised by Canada. Bidders must demonstrate experience providing resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 months. Although the TA process described in the solicitation stipulates the distribution of TA's amongst Contractors within a given Workstream, Canada may require the level of effort described in the solicitation from each Contractor. Therefore, Bidders must demonstrate experience providing the number of resources as described in Criterion M1(d). Note, Criterion M1(d) has been amended for some Workstreams. See Amendment 001 for details.

QUESTION 14

On page 20 of 90 it says that each Workstream will be evaluated separately – Does the client want separate submissions for each Workstream?

ANSWER 14

Yes, Bidders should provide a separate bid for each Workstream in accordance with Article 3.1 - Bid Preparation Instructions.

QUESTION 15

There are 2 separate financial grids – one starting on page 57 of 90 and one starting on page 66 of 90 – Does the client want both submitted in Section II: Financial bid?

ANSWER 15

No. As stated in Article 3.3(a) Pricing, Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with Pricing Schedule provided in Attachment 4.2 of this bid solicitation. Attachment 4.2 begins on page 66, not page 57.

QUESTION 16

Regarding point (d) under Stream 2 – ERP Corporate Criteria, Providing 15 resources simultaneously for 12 months alone would result in around or over \$3M in revenue for most ERP skills and since the contract must be at least two years this would result in a contract value of \$6M which is far higher than the \$3M minimum stated in point (a). We request that either point (d) is removed since the contract values and lengths already imply multiple resources over a period of time OR it be modified to better reflect both the contract value of \$3M and the short term, non-simultaneous nature of TBIPS requests to “d) The Bidder must have provided at least 7 resources for a period of at least 6 months each within the last six years.”

ANSWER 16

No Canada will not change criterion M1(d) as requested. See Answer 13 and changes to M1(d) in Amendment 001.

QUESTION 17

Stream 2 Mandatory Criteria, for the 5.3.29 Role (SAP ABAP Level 3), on page 58. The client is asking for ten years' experience, within the last fifteen years, with SAP version ECC 6.0. IFMS only implemented ECC 6 in 2008 would the client consider changing this to 5 years within the last 10 years.

ANSWER 17

Canada will accept 7 years experience for M3 (SAP ABAP) Level 3. See amendment 002 for changes to this criterion. Canada has verified that ECC 6.0 was available in 2005 for customer release and general availability in 2006.

QUESTION 18

We are a qualified TBIPS Tier 2 supplier, however we are missing a couple Resource Categories in Workstreams 3, 4 and 6. Does this preclude us from bidding Workstreams 1, 2 and 5?

ANSWER 18

No, See Answer 4.

QUESTION 19

RE: 4.3 Financial Evaluation, (c), (ii), (B), last sentence in the paragraph, “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 4.4 Basis of Selection, (c), “In the event of identical Total Bidder Scores occurring, then the bid with the highest Total Technical Score will become the top-ranked bidder.” Would the Crown please reconsider the means of resolving the basis of selection in the event of identical Total Bidder Scores occurring? As this is a probable occurrence given there are no corporate rated and the maximum score for any given stream will be based on the scores for the resources, which has been attained by multiple Bidders on recent large bids, would the Crown please consider using the “Lowest Priced Bid based on the Bidder’s actual rates” as the tie-breaking mechanism to determine the three top-ranked bidders? Should there be more than two Bidders tied for the top spot this mechanism would allow the Crown to determine just the top three ranked bidders based on their individual bid prices for the stream.

ANSWER 19

No, Canada will not change the Basis of Selection as requested. The Firm Per Diem Rate Evaluation methodology applies to the rate for each category and level. Given the number of rated criteria in the Technical bid together with the quantity of unique categories and levels within each Workstream, and the combination of different rates anticipated between financial bids for each category and level, Canada believes it is unlikely that two bids will obtain the identical Total Bidder Score. In the unlikely event of identical total Bidders Scores, Canada will use the method described in sub-paragraph 4.4(c). However, in the event that there is still a tie, the Bidder with the resources who are first available in providing the required services upon award of a contract will be recommended for contract award.

QUESTION 20

Corporate Criteria, M1, Streams 1 to 6 Would the Crown please confirm that Bidder's will be able to use the same three contracts to meet the M1 requirement on each stream?

ANSWER 20

Yes, Bidders can use the same references for each Workstream provided the criteria for each Workstream are met.

QUESTION 21

Streams 1-6 M1, Corporate Criteria The Bidder must have been awarded at least three (3) Information Management, Information Technology (IM/IT) contracts, of which at least two were for a Government (Federal, Provincial, Municipal) Client. Can you please confirm that the Federal, Provincial, Municipal, refers to Canadian clients only.

ANSWER 21

No, please see Answer 8.

QUESTION 22

Reference RFP Page 16 of 90 - For Previous Similar Projects and Attachment 4.1 M1 The requirement For Previous Similar Projects refers to the Bidder using project references that have been "completed" by bid closing date, whereas in Attachment 4.1 M1 - there is no criterion specifying the project references having to be "completed" by bid closing date. Would the Crown consider the Bidder using project references that are on-going at time of bid closing.

ANSWER 22

For the purpose of Corporate Criteria M1, the contracts do not have to be completed by the bid closing date. Article 3.2(iv) - for Previous Similar Project has been removed from the solicitation See changes made in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 23

APPENDIX C OF ANNEX A - RESOURCE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RESPONSE TABLES Stream 1-6: M1 b), the Contract must have been awarded at least two years prior to the closing date of this solicitation and no later than six years from the closing date of this solicitation; Can the Crown please confirm that a Contract that has been amended/updated/extended, within the last 6 years will be accepted so long as the resources were delivered in the last 6 years from the closing date of this solicitation.

ANSWER 23

On-going contracts will be accepted provided they meet all the requirements of M1. See answer 22. Note, Appendix C of Annex A does not contain Corporate Criteria. This appendix will be used to assess additional resources after contract award once specific tasks are requested of the Contractor. The Technical evaluation criteria are described in

Attachment 4.1 - Bid Evaluation Criteria.

QUESTION 24

Please confirm whether vendors must respond to all 6 Streams in order to be compliant?

ANSWER 24

No, bidders are not required to submit a proposal for all six Workstreams. See answer 4

QUESTION 25

Ref: Corporate Criteria M1 (all streams): "Bidders are reminded that a Supply Arrangement or Standing Offer is not a contract and therefore any reference to this type of document will not be accepted for the purpose of evaluating contract experience.." For example if the Bidder references it's TBIPS SA number such as EN578-055605/XXX/EL for the purpose of demonstrating experience under the evaluation criteria, Canada will disregard this experience because it does not relate to a specific contract." While it is reasonable for Canada to exclude TBIPS from this criterion, please confirm our understanding that a Supply Arrangement issued by a specific department/agency under TBIPS would be acceptable. Most departments have made the strategic procurement decision to issue Supply Arrangements (usually to 3 vendors) rather than Contracts (which would usually be issued to a single vendor) for large procurements because it limits their committed exposure and retains the advantages of ongoing competition. However, the experience gained by the Bidder in such an arrangement is directly comparable to that required by Health Canada, and would be attested by the client reference contact. Please confirm that a departmental-specific supply arrangement would be

ANSWER 25

Certain commodities such as those procured through TBIPS, are mandated by Treasury Board to be procured through a PWGSC Standing Offer(SO) or Supply Arrangement (SA). Government departments do not have authority to create their own SA for these commodities. Furthermore, a SA cannot be issued by Departments/agencies under TBIPS. An RFP issued under the TBIPS SA (such as this requirement) can only result in a contract or multiple contracts. The fact that multiple contracts are issued as a result of an RFP does not result in the award of a Supply Arrangement, it can only result in the award of contract(s). Only contracts will be acceptable to satisfy Corporate Criteria M1.

QUESTION 26

As the same talent pool within the NCR of contractors in the many different categories requested within this RFP is used by all of the IT Professional Services firm, the crown will most likely be evaluating the same resources for each of the many bids received. This requirement does little to demonstrate the Bidder's ability to successfully deliver the services under a contract of similar size and scope. Therefore, would the Crown consider removing the resources from evaluation and perhaps introducing additional Corporate based criteria that requires Bidder's to demonstrate their past experience delivering resources in these roles.

ANSWER 26

Canada believes there is an adequate supply of qualified resources in the market to meet the requirement of this procurement. Given the scope and complexity of this procurement, Canada needs to ensure resources provided are qualified to perform the work. Not all categories and levels of resources will be evaluated as part of this bid solicitation. See criteria M2 in the Corporate Criteria of Attachment 4.1 for the list of the resource categories that must be proposed. Additional resources will be assessed after contract award in accordance with Appendix C of Annex

A, once specific tasks are requested. Canada will not remove the Resource Criteria.

QUESTION 27

Stream 1 contains more than 20 resource categories for similar resources at varying levels, with the only difference being the technologies. This makes both the evaluation of the proposals and the delivery of service un-necessarily complicated. Would the Crown please consider reducing the number of resource categories for similar roles?

ANSWER 27

Canada's needs are based on operational requirement. Only a certain number of resources will be evaluated as part of this bid solicitation. See Answer 26. Canada will not reduce the number of resource categories.

QUESTION 28

Can the Crown please clarify the potential utilization by identifying the estimated number of resources to be required by Health Canada within the first year, by stream and resource category?

ANSWER 28

The estimated level of effort by category and level is identified in Attachment 4.2 - Pricing Schedule, Column (c). This figure can be allocated across one to three contracts per Workstreams depending on the number of contracts awarded and the allocation of Task Authorizations as identified in the solicitation. Therefore, the estimated number of resources required is not available. To assist bidders with their planning, 240 days can be considered equivalent to one full time resource for one year for the purpose of this requirement. So, for example, if the Estimated Number of Days in Column (C) is 720, then that figure could be equivalent to 3 resources at 240 days (720/240), keeping in mind that that quantity could be allocated across one or more contracts within a Workstream.

QUESTION 29

Can the Crown please provide the vendor names and contract values for the vendors currently providing these services?

ANSWER 29

See answer 7.

QUESTION 30

The weighting factors applied to the Pricing Schedule for each of the Workstreams forces Bidders to propose lower rates in the most utilized categories. To help prevent Health Canada from having resulting contracts with rates below fair market value in the most critical categories, we ask that the Crown consider removing the weighting factors (Estimated Number of Days) from the financial evaluation method altogether.

ANSWER 30

The Estimated Number of Days is not a weighing factor but rather the anticipated level of effort required for each category and level of resource. Canada anticipates cost advantages for categories where volume is greater which could result in more competitive rates. Canada will not remove Column (C) of the Pricing Schedule.

QUESTION 31

As this RFP is subject to trade agreements allowing vendors from other countries to bid, please confirm that all mandatory and point rated criteria requiring experience in the public sector (Federal, Provincial, Territorial or Municipal Government or Crown Corporation) includes the same levels of government with respect to a country other than Canada.

ANSWER 31

Any level of Government will be accepted from countries subject to the trade agreements with Canada as identified in Article 1.2(d) of the solicitation. See answer 8 as well.

QUESTION 32

We request that M1 of the Corporate Mandatory Requirements be changed so that respondents are allowed to use any combination of individual contracts from within a master supply arrangement to demonstrate the 15 resources x 12 consecutive months requirement. A further enhancement of this requirement would be that a respondent must be able to show at least 30 consultants simultaneously on contract for a period of 12 consecutive months within the last six years, from within any one or two such government supply arrangements (minimum of 15 resources per supply arrangement). The other 15 simultaneous resources associated with the third project reference could come from either more TBIPS-type contracts, a specific government contract, or a private sector contract reference. Types of supply arrangements that would be permitted would include TBIPS, TSPS, THS, Ontario Vendor of Record, City of Ottawa Professional Services SA, etc.

ANSWER 32

Canada will not change the Corporate Criteria as requested however some changes have been made to Corporate Criteria M1. See amendment 001. See answer 25 as well.

QUESTION 33

M1 is unduly restrictive if it excludes our experience with departmental Supply Arrangements. These are very large arrangements (exceeding \$25 million over 5 years and competed under TBIPS), and demonstrate that we can meet Health Canada's requirements. Whether a department chose to issue a contract or a supply arrangement should not matter to Health Canada.

ANSWER 33

See answer 25.

QUESTION 34

For Stream 1, Resource Criteria 5.3.12 (L3), Software Architect Level 3, Rated Criteria R4, the requirement requests experience in the design and development of software for "Multi-Enterprise Integration (MEI)". Can the crown provide a definition for MEI as it is not a familiar term and we are unsure how we substantiate a response without a clear meaning of the term. Are you referring to IBM's Multi-Enterprise Integration Gateway?

ANSWER 34

"Multi-Enterprise Integration (MEI)" is also known as Business-to-Business integration (B2Bi) solution. B2Bi is an enterprise capability meant to facilitate the capture and sharing of electronic information between Government Departments and private enterprise using a common centralized integration model. The Bidder should be familiar with the limitations of the GoC infrastructure from a capability, security and technology perspective, and should have developed or provided functional software services within one or more of those environments.

QUESTION 35

For Stream 1, Resource Criteria 5.3.18 (L3), Programmer/Analyst – Level 3 (Oracle Forms), Rated Criteria R5 requests experience with Windows 7 Operating systems and 10+ years of experience is required to score any points. Windows 7 was released in Oct 2009 so 5 years would be the maximum experience possible. Are the tool sets/technologies listed at R5 cumulative for experience (Windows 7 OS, C/C++, Oracle Database, Oracle Developer Tools, SQL, PL/SQL, Visual Basic, Citrix, Client Server development)?

ANSWER 35

Yes, Canada will accept cumulative experience with Windows 7 Operating Systems, C/C++, Oracle Database, Oracle Developer Tools, SQL, PL/SQL, Visual Basic, Citrix, Client Server development.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME