

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. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client HT218-143802	Date 2014-12-04
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 2014-12-16	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.

007

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 7

Purpose:

To provide responses to various inquiries.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 38

Due to the small pool of resources and the large number of firms invited, would the Crown permit subcontractors to bid with more than one vendor?

ANSWER 38

See Q&A 10.

QUESTION 39

Would the crown accept a resource security clearance that has expired but was submitted to CISD for renewal prior to its expiration and is currently in the process of being renewed?

ANSWER 39

The security requirements described in article 6.1(a) of the solicitation must be met before award of a contract.

QUESTION 40

Is there currently, or had there recently been a vendor(s) providing services similar to those identified within the SOW for this solicitation? If yes, could the Crown please identify the vendors and their associated contract values?

ANSWER 40

See Q&A 7.

QUESTION 42

Are the requested services for the above referenced solicitation currently being provided or have they been provided previously? If so, please identify the means by which such services have been supplied (e.g., direct and or term employee, personal services contract, or contracted services through a company). If the services were contracted through a company, please provide the name of the contractor and the duration and dollar amount of the contract(s).

ANSWER 42

See Q&A7.

QUESTION 43

RE: Part 1 – General Information, 1.2 Summary, (b) Can HC please confirm that bidders can bid on multiple streams; and, that bidders can submit proposals for any number of streams (i.e. a bidder can bid on all 6 streams or just 1 one stream)

ANSWER 43

Yes, see Q&A 3

QUESTION 44

RE: Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions, 3.2 Section I – Technical Bid, (vi) Customer Reference Contact Information Can HC please confirm that the required reference information applies to the Corporate Criteria in each stream and not to the proposed resources in each stream?

ANSWER 44

Customer References identified in 3.2(vi) refer to references to be provided in the bidders bid for Corporate Criteria M1. See Change 3 in Amendment 004.

QUESTION 45

Will the Crown accept Corporate Mandatory references from Federal or Provincial Crown Corporations?

ANSWER 45

Yes.

QUESTION 46

As a current provider of professional services at HC as well as a Tier 2 vendor, we strongly feel that the corporate criteria M1 is restrictive to small and medium size firms such as ours. To that point, Health Canada has not issued any contract for professional services that exceeded the Tier1 2,000,000.00 threshold in the past few years and as such we cannot use our current Health Canada references. It seems odd to us that corporate references we have built over the past two years at Health Canada would not allow us to qualify under any of the 6 streams. As it stands with the current M1 criteria, only Tier2 contract references can be used to satisfy M1 which clearly is limiting this RFP to large system integrators. To that effect, we are recommending the following changes to M1 while at the same time taking into account the client requirement for firms that can provide services on a “as and when requested” basis.

M1 – Recommended changes

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.

For each contract identified:

The cumulative contract value must be at least \$2,000,000.00

The contract must have been awarded no later than six years from the closing of this bid solicitation.

The contract must have a duration of at least one year within the last six years (note: duration does not include option periods that have not been exercised); and

The bidder must have provided at least 7 resources simultaneously for a period of at least 3 consecutive months within the last six years

ANSWER 46

Please refer to Amendment 001 and Q&A13 in Amendment 003. Canada will not change Corporate Criteria M1 as requested.

QUESTION 47

For M1, Corporate criteria, all streams, can 1 of the 3 requested individual IM/IT contracts be for a Government Client versus 2 of the 3 requested individual IM/IT contracts? This would allow for greater competition amongst pre-Qualified TBIPS Tier 2 suppliers. For M1, Corporate criteria, all streams, can you decrease the number of simultaneously provided resources from fifteen (15) to 10 (ten) resources which seems more in keeping with the

estimated resource usage within the RFP streams?

ANSWER 47

See Amendment 001. Canada will not change the Corporate Criteria M1 as requested.

QUESTION 48

We would kindly and respectfully request that the Crown take the appropriate steps with this solicitation by removing all additional corporate requirements from this RFP. If in fact the Crown is able to demonstrate respect for their own efforts in the creation of this SA, then removing these requirements should be simple. However, if the Crown feels the need to create a new SA, as would be evidenced through the retention of the additional and unnecessary requirements, we would suggest that a stand-alone RFP be presented to Industry instead of using the TBIPS SA. Doing so would open the door to Joint Venture efforts and would certainly assist the Crown in receiving a stronger price per point result while demonstrating no impact upon their evaluation process.

ANSWER 48

This requirement is not a Supply Arrangement; it is a solicitation that is issued in accordance with the TBIPS Supply Arrangement that is anticipated to result in the award of contracts.

Bidders must have the expertise to provide quality resources for a requirement similar in size to this requirement. Eliminating the Corporate evaluation requirements would not demonstrate the required expertise. The scope was broken down into 6 individual Workstreams and subsequently the Corporate criteria were developed with a reduced qualification requirement in mind. This was based on the anticipated level of effort being spread across multiple Workstreams instead of one consolidate Workstream of informatics professional services. Bidders have the option to bid on one or more Workstreams. Bidders can also use the same corporate references if bidding on more than one Workstream provided the references meet the individual corporate criteria for each Workstream. This strategy results in smaller requirements with less stringent qualifications which are favourable to smaller businesses.

TBIPS supply arrangement holders have not been pre-qualified for this scope of work nor have the individual resources, thus the need for Corporate and resource evaluation criteria to evaluate the Bidders ability to provide quality resources. Since the required services fall within the scope of an established method of supply (TBIPS), the use of this method of supply is a requirement for this procurement.

Canada will not remove the Corporate evaluation criteria or cancel this solicitation and reissue it as stand-alone solicitation.

QUESTION 49

Since the implementation of TBIPS, the contracts needed to substantiate Corporate Requirement M1 have been awarded less frequently. The vast majority of TBIPS contracts are Tier 1 with a contract limitation of \$2m, which prevents achieving the \$3m minimum threshold. From a recruiting and management perspective, when you group a large number of Tier 1 contracts, they require no less capability than a company that provides resources under a single large contract.

The RFP states there will be three (3) winners per Stream. The criteria for M1 favours a smaller number of companies, which may or may not be beneficial to the Crown. This is exclusionary rather than inclusionary, and may prevent Health Canada from realizing a superior solution to their business needs. We strongly feel that one of the three requested changes outlined below will not compromise Health Canada's business objectives and demonstrates a willingness to evaluate the abilities of a more diverse group of companies to arrive at a superior outcome.

The restriction on not being able to selectively group contracts for M1 essentially restricts possible respondents to

past winners of omnibus solicitations and/or large national suppliers that may not have a delivery capability in Ottawa. As a firm that focuses on the Federal Government and has had over 150 IT consultants simultaneously on contract for at least 12 consecutive months, the criteria excludes us from responding and yet we are ideally suited to meet the needs of Health Canada.

We request one of 3 possible options as an amendment to the M1 Corporate Requirement for all streams: As opposed to requiring three individual contract references, change M1 to require a respondent to demonstrate at least 90 consultants (2X what is currently required) simultaneously on contract in the National Capital Region for a period of at least 12 consecutive months, whereby the contracts were awarded at least 2 years ago and services invoiced were within the last 6 years. Proof must be provided in the form of invoices plus client contact information to support substantiation requirements.

Note: This is a consultant count that is 2X what is currently required and does not diminish the requirement for a respondent to show broad strength of its capabilities. If anything, it shows an organization that has the service capacity to address a wide range of skills and has the necessary financial capacity.

2. Allow the contracts to come from any mix of Clients, so long as the vendor can demonstrate they have provided no less than 90 contractors (2X what is currently required) simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months, whereby the contracts were awarded at least 2 years ago and services invoiced were within the last 6 years.

3. Allow contracts such as federal TBIPS, SBIPS, TSPS and comparable provincial/municipal Vendor of Record (VoR) Agreements to be rolled up whereby each such Agreement counts as one (1) contract for the purpose of the response. Each respondent may only use each Agreement rolled up as one contract. If they decide not to roll them up under one Agreement (as a single reference) then they can use each contract under the Agreement as individual contracts but they can't have it both ways. Each rolled up Agreement must have a minimum aggregate of \$3m. Proof must be provided in the form of invoices plus client contact information to support substantiation requirements.

Note: For example, a respondent has a single TBIPS contract of 20+ resources and other individual contracts. In this situation, they could not count the 20+ resource contract as one contract reference and also roll up the remainder of their other TBIPS contracts to serve as the second Government contract reference. Only individual contracts can be used, or a roll-up of the entire collection of contracts under the TBIPS Agreement, but not a mix of both.

In any of these options, Health Canada is still protected by the minimum revenue levels set out in TBIPS to meet Tier 2 status. This ensures there is the service capacity and financial capability to meet the needs of Health Canada. These options confirm a vendor is capable of responding to a high volume of requirements servicing the demands of its Clients.

ANSWER 49

See changes in amendment 001. Canada will not change Corporate Criteria M1 as requested.

QUESTION 50

In relation to ALL streams, M1 (and applicable to sub items a. through d. where required) please reference the following criteria "The Bidder must have been awarded at least three (3) ... contracts, of which at least two were for a government (Federal, Provincial, Municipal) Client." Health Canada has issued an RFP to secure vendors to provide multiple concurrent resources on an 'as and when requested' basis through the Task Authorization process. In our experience of concurrently staffing thousands of resources for both private and public sector clients across Canada, there are very few differences between Government and Private Sector contracts of this size and scope. The main difference is that a vendor must possess the ability to clear resources through a Security Clearance process which varies from client to client in both the public and private sector. We respectfully request that Health Canada amend the main criteria of M1 to the following "The Bidder must have been awarded at least three (3) ... contracts, of which at least one was for a government (Federal, Provincial, Municipal) Client." In doing so, Health Canada will guarantee

increased participation from vendors, resulting in more choices for the client, which will support PWGSC's published mandate to enhance "... access, competition and fairness" and Health Canada and Public Health Agency of Canada's IM/IT Strategic Plan core goal to "provide flexible and responsive service delivery".

ANSWER 50

Canada will not change Corporate Criteria M1 as requested. See amendment 001.

QUESTION 51

Reference Corporate M1. Due to Security and Policy contractual constraints of the project, the GoC organization name and contact information cannot be provided as part of our response. It has been an acceptable to omit this information for these reasons for other similar GoC procurements and alternative methods can be leveraged as requested by Canada. Please confirm this will be acceptable.

ANSWER 51

Since Canada will have no way of verifying the information required for Corporate Criteria M1 without including the organization name and contact information, we cannot accept a contract reference without the required information being provided in your bid. As an option, you may wish to consult with your customer to see if they will allow the release of the required information to PWGSC in confidence and as part of your response to the subject solicitation. Please note that such an arrangement must be undertaken by the Bidder. PWGSC will not be involved in any arrangements or discussions regarding this criteria.

QUESTION 52

reference Mandatory Criteria M2 for the Programmer/Software Developer Level 3 – Oracle Forms on page 829 of 984 (Attachment 4.1 – Bid Evaluation Criteria), IBM Websphere falls under application and integration middleware and has no relation to Oracle Forms development. Please clarify how this experience is applicable to a Senior Oracle Forms Programmer/Software Developer.

ANSWER 52

The requirement for IBM Websphere has been removed from this evaluation criteria. See amendment 002 and 004.

QUESTION 53

Reference Rated Criteria R4 for the Programmer/Software Developer Level 3 – Oracle Forms on page 832 of 984 (Attachment 4.1 – Bid Evaluation Criteria). Please clarify how this experience is applicable to a Senior Oracle Forms Programmer/Software Developer.

ANSWER 53

The requirement for experience working as a Business Analyst has been removed from this criterion. See amendment 002.

QUESTION 55

With the corporate projects references for each delivery stream set to 3 projects valued at \$3 Million in order to bid any stream, this effectively reduces competition to a select set of companies that don't necessarily have consulting resources in Ottawa-Gatineau and also eliminates qualified Canadian companies based in Ottawa-Gatineau because they have not had the opportunity or the international exposure to win three large SA projects because there hasn't been many of these opportunities within our region. In the interests of making this opportunity more competitive and allowing SME's to partner in order to meet the bid requirements, we would ask that Health Canada change the

corporate project references to allow companies to form Joint Ventures with a prime bidder in order to combine their corporate project references to meet the following requirements:

- a. Three corporate project references of at least 2 years duration in the past six years each worth \$1.5 Million.
- b. Confirmation that each project used for a given delivery stream has provided 3+ consulting resources relevant to the delivery stream.

ANSWER 55

Canada will not change the Corporate Criteria M1 as requested. Please see changes in amendment 001 and Answer 48 in this Amendment.

QUESTION 56

Under the Programmer / Analyst – Level 3 (Oracle Forms) category, under rated criteria R4, the crown asks for experience “as a business analyst”. We believe this is a typo- can you remove?

ANSWER 56

There is no requirement for a business analyst under R4 for Programmer / Analyst – Level 3 (Oracle Forms). However the requirement for Business Analyst under the category Programmer/Software Developer Level 3 (Oracle Forms) has been removed. See amendment 002.

QUESTION 58

Re: Corporate Mandatory Criterion M1 – All streams

M1 is unreasonably restrictive as it is not aligned with public sector contracts issued within the last six years. As a top provider under TBIPS we feel that most TBIPS qualified Bidders would be unable to demonstrate experience to meet the multiple elements of this requirement. To promote fair competition and ensure that more than just a couple of very large vendors can bid, would the Crown please consider making at a minimum the following modifications to M1 in all of the Work Streams:

due to the low number of public-sector contracts of similar size and scope awarded within the last 6 years - change requirements for “within the last six years”, to accept “within the last ten years” (for both elements a & b);

demonstrating the provision of 15 resources simultaneously for a period of 12 consecutive months (in element c) equates to a burn rate of more than \$2M per year under a single contract. With an as and when required definition and given that this RFP is awarding up to 3 contracts per stream, this requirement is not aligned with the potential value of a resulting contract and therefore is extremely excessive. We request that this requirement be decreased to be more reflective of the estimated number of days provided in the pricing schedule assuming allocation between 3 vendors (e.g. 10 different resources being provided within a 24 month period each with a min of 3 months billed, NOTE: remove “simultaneously” and “consecutive”); and,

as most public sector contracts of similar size and scope are in fact Supply Arrangement Contracts not Master Agreements such as the TBIPS SA Master Agreement – please clarify that the Crown will accept Supply Arrangements with a committed contract value (e.g. a Supply Arrangement within a specific Department to deliver as and when required services for a specific sub-set of resource categories over a per-determined time-frame).

ANSWER 58

Canada will not change Corporate Criteria M1 as requested. However please refer changes in amendment 001 and a clarification in amendment 003 answer 25 regarding Supply Arrangements.

QUESTION 59

Re: Mandatory Criterion M4 – Stream 4 – Business Process Re-engineering Consultant – L3, ITIL certifications include only the following: Foundations Certification, ITIL Service Manager Certification; ITIL Expert Certification; and ITIL Master Certification. There is no certification referred to as “Essentials”. Can the Crown please clarify which ITIL Certification is required?

ANSWER 59

Canada will accept Foundations Certification. See amendment 002.

QUESTION 60

Re: Mandatory Criterion M2 – Stream 4 – Business Consultant – L3, we find the requirement confusing as written. Was the requirement meant to be written as such: “The Contractor must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of five years’ experience in performing business analysis, or of information management or information technology concepts, practices and methodologies.”? If not, can the Crown please clarify specifically what experience is being sought to satisfy this requirement?

ANSWER 60

Canada agrees to change criterion M2 of category 5.3.50 Business Consultant Level 3. As follows:

“The Contractor must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of five years’ experience in performing business analysis, of information management or information technology concepts, practices and methodologies.”

QUESTION 61

Re: Mandatory Criterion M1 – Stream 1 – Programmer/Software Developer – L3 Cognos, IBM Cognos 10 has only been publicly available for less than 4 years (released October 2010). Therefore it is impossible for a resource to demonstrate 10+ years of experience migrating to this version. Would the Crown please modify this requirement to reduce the required number of years from 10 to 3 years? Alternatively the Cognos version number could be modified to accept the pre IBM version of Cognos Series 7+, or the IBM Cognos 8 (note: as 8 was released in 2005 this would also require a change to the number of years).

ANSWER 61

Canada will accept the pre-IBM version of Cognos 7 or 8 or 10. See amendment 004.

QUESTION 62

For the resource Programmer / Analyst (Level 3) Cognos BI the crown asks for 14/15 years with cognos 10 in R1/R3 (stream 1). The software for Cognos 10 wasn’t released until 2010, making this requirement contradictory. Can you clarify or amend the stated criterion?

ANSWER 62

R3 was deleted in Amendment 002 because the criterion was a duplicate requirement. And for R1, the rating was adjusted in amendment 004 based on similar questions.

QUESTION 63

For the resource Programmer / Software Developer (Level 3) Java (stream 1) the crown requests experience building applications using WebSphere, running on a Linux server. Will the crown also accept other application servers such as weblogic or Jboss?

ANSWER 63

Canada will accept Weblogic but not Jboss, see amendment 004.

QUESTION 64

Would Canada consider reducing the experience required to score full points to 10 years for R4? It is unlikely for candidates to have experience with OO coding n-tier applications outside of the last 15 years (when the internet gained wide popularity). For R4, would Canada please define the other OO tools it deems to be acceptable? For example, would SDLC, Agile, and MS Visio be considered to be acceptable?

ANSWER 64

Canada's needs are based on operational requirements. Canada will not change this criterion as requested. Canada will not accept SDLC, Agile, and MS Visio.

QUESTION 65

For R5, would Canada please consider reducing the number of years to score full points from 13 to 11? Canada is essentially asking for this experience to have been gained since 1998, when the Java plug-in for web browsers was released. Would Canada please define acceptable Java web frameworks?

ANSWER 65

The number of years have been reduced as requested See changes in amendment 002. Canada will accept any experience in using or supporting web frameworks in Java.

QUESTION 66

Under Technical Architect Level 3, in stream 5, in R5, the criterion reads "The Bidder should demonstrate that the resource has experience, mentoring, coaching and providing guidance for". Can you elaborate? Part of the sentence seems to be missing here.

ANSWER 66

This text for this criterion has been corrected. See amendment 002.

QUESTION 67

Would Canada consider amending R6 to read as follows? The reasoning is that it is impossible for Programmer/Analysts to have used JSF for 14 years because JSF was only released in 2004:

"The Contractor should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience creating design and developing computer program(s) using any of the following: applets, HyperText Markup Language (HTML), Servlets and JavaServer Pages/ JavaServer Faces (JSP/JSF)."

ANSWER 67

Yes, see changes in Amendment 004.

QUESTION 68

Would Canada please reconsider reconfiguring the scoring methodology for R7 to require 10 years for full points, as it is nearly impossible for resources to demonstrate 14 years with the use of J2EE because J2EE was released in 1999 (14 years ago). Would Canada please consider amending R7 to read as follows, because it is not likely for Programmer/Analysts to have used all of the listed technologies in every single project for 14 years:

"The contractor must demonstrate that the resource has experience in designing, building and supporting Java 2 Platform, Enterprise Edition (J2EE) application(s) using ANY of the following: JSP, servlets, Enterprise Java Beans (EJB), Extensible Markup Language (XML) and web services."

ANSWER 68

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However, Canada has reduced the number of years to 12. See Amendment 002. R7 has also been changed in Amendment 004 to allow "...ANY of the following..."

QUESTION 70

With regards to M1, Oracle Forms 9i was released in 2003, which is only 11 years ago. Due to the fact that it is unlikely for candidates to have worked for 10 years in the last 11 years unless they have remained with one organization, would Canada please consider reducing the requirement to require 5 years of experience?

ANSWER 70

No, however Canada has decreased the number of years to 7. See changes in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 71

R2 requires experience building and supporting multiple versions of Oracle Forms and Reports and/or Oracle APEX. Oracle APEX was only released in 2004, therefore it is impossible to demonstrate more than 14 years with it. For this reason, would Canada please consider reducing this requirement so that the maximum amount of points can be achieved in 10 years of experience

ANSWER 71

Canada will not reduce this criterion as requested. However the criterion has been reduced in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 72

With regards to R3, it is impossible to have over 14 years with a number of these technologies, including:

- Rational System Architect as it was acquired by IBM in 2008
- Golden Software seems to be a software company with their recent software releases since the early 90s coming in 2004.
- JDeveloper, which was first officially released by Oracle in 2005

Due to the fact that a number of the named technologies have not been released for 14 years, would Canada please amend the requirement to lessen the number of years to receive full points to 10 years and only require experience with two of the listed technologies?

ANSWER 72

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made in amendment 002 and 004 for this criterion.

QUESTION 73

For R5 it is impossible to have over 14 years with a number of these technologies and improbable that an Oracle Forms Programmer/Analyst would have experience with some of the technologies, including:

- Windows 7, which was only released in 2009

- C/C++, since R3 is asking for experience with JDeveloper, it does not seem probable that an Oracle Forms developer would have experience with Java AND C/C++
- Visual Basic, since R3 is asking for experience with JDeveloper, it does not seem probable that an Oracle Forms developer would have experience with Java AND VB

As it is unlikely, and in some cases, impossible, for Oracle Forms developers to have 14 years of experience with all of the technologies listed in R5, would Canada please consider amending the requirement to:

- Lessen the number of years to receive full points to 10 years
- Allow any version of Windows
- Remove C/C++ and VB from the requirement
- Only require experience with two of the listed technologies?

ANSWER 73

Canada will not change the criterion as requested. However please see changes made to this criterion in Amendment 004.

QUESTION 74

R6 has a number of inconsistencies and changes that we request that Canada consider, including:

Oracle Forms 9i was released in 2003, which is only 11 years ago. Due to the fact that it is unlikely for candidates to have worked for 10 years in the last 11 years unless they have remained with one organization, would Canada please consider reducing the requirement to require 7 years of experience to receive maximum points?

The Statement of Work in Section 5.3.18 asks for the Level 3 resource to have experience with everything in Level 2 and, by extension, Level 1. The Oracle Forms Programmer/Analyst would likely not have 14+ years of experience with BI/EDW, because not every application they work on is going to have those specifications. Likewise, it is possible for candidates to gain valid experience that's not in the Federal Government.

For these reasons, would Canada please amend this requirement in the following ways:

a) "The Contractor should demonstrate that the proposed resource has additional experience, in excess of Mandatory Criteria M1, creating and modifying code and software in a variety of languages including at a minimum Oracle Forms & Reports; and designing and building applications using Oracle Forms & Reports (9i, or 10g, or 11g) and has experience, including experience in a Federal Government department or agency, performing at least 50% of the tasks detailed in section 5.3 (5.3.18) of Annex A (SOW)

b) Reducing the number of years to score full points in R5 to 7 years as Oracle Forms and Reports 9i was only released 11 years ago.

ANSWER 74

Canada agrees to change this criterion as stated in a). See Amendment 004. Canada will not change this criterion as requested in b).

QUESTION 75

R7 requires over 14 years of experience with Oracle Discoverer, BI to score full points. Oracle BI Discoverer was only released as a component of Fusion Middleware and therefore more widely used upon this release. Would Canada please consider rescoring this requirement to enable candidates who have 5 years of experience with this software to score full points?

ANSWER 75

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 76

- For M1/R1 it is impossible to have 10 to over 14 years of experience with most of these technologies, as follows:
- Cognos 10 was released in 2010
- GQL was only released in 2003
- Cognos 8 was only released in 2005

Due to this, would Canada please consider rewording the requirement for M1/R1 as follows:

"The Contractor must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of 5 years' experience in analysing and developing Business Intelligence system designs and specifications and migrating or rewriting existing BI applications into IBM Cognos"

ANSWER 76

Canada will not change the criteria as requested. However please see changes made in Amendment 004.

QUESTION 77

For M2, it is impossible to have 10 years of experience with Cognos 10 as it was released in 2010. Advanced Business Insight, likewise, was released in 2010. Would Canada please change this to "Cognos BI"? and only require 10 years of experience with two of the products?

ANSWER 77

Canada will not change the criterion as requested. However please see changes made in Amendment 004 to this criterion.

QUESTION 78

For R3, it is impossible to have 10 to over 14 years of experience with most of these technologies, as follows:

- Cognos 10 was released in 2010
- GQL was only released in 2003
- Cognos 8 was only released in 2005

Due to this, would Canada please consider rewording the requirement for R3 as follows:

"The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience analyzing business requirements and migrating or rewriting existing BI applications"

ANSWER 78

This criterion is a duplicate. It has been removed in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 79

M2 asks for 10 years of "experience designing applications using IBM Websphere Application Server running on Linux." Similarly, R2 asks for 13 years with this experience. Would Canada please consider making the following changes to M2 and R2:

a) Rewording M2 to:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of ten years' experience, in deploying applications to an application server."

b)Rewording R2 to:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has additional experience, in excess of the Mandatory Criteria M2 in deploying applications to an application server."

c) Reducing the number of years to score full points in R2 to 11 years.

ANSWER 79

Canada will not change this criteria as requested. However, please see changes in amendment 002 and 004.

QUESTION 80

For R7, would Canada please consider reconfiguring the scoring methodology to require 10 years for full points as JavaScript was not widely accepted as an industry standard until 1999?

ANSWER 80

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made to this criterion in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 81

For R8 would Canada please consider also allowing other iterative SDLC frameworks including RUP? The reasoning for this is that Canada is asking in R3 for over 14 years of RUP, and in this requirement for over 10 years of Java. This is a combined 24 years of experience, which is impossible to achieve with both of these frameworks, as Agile was only first released in 2001.

ANSWER 81

Canada's needs are based on operational requirements. Canada will not change this criterion as requested.

QUESTION 82

For M1, it is extremely difficult to have 10 years of experience with Oracle 10g as it was released in 2004. Would Canada please consider allowing experience with other versions of Oracle?

ANSWER 82

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 83

M2 asks for 10 years of "experience designing applications using IBM Websphere Application Server running on Linux."

Would Canada please consider rewording M2 to:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of ten years' experience in deploying applications to an application server."

ANSWER 83

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However see changes made in Amendment 002 and 004.

QUESTION 84

For R1, Oracle Forms 9i was released in 2003, which is only 11 years ago, so Candidates are unable to demonstrate 14+ years of experience. Would Canada please consider allowing any versions of Oracle Forms and reducing the requirement to 10 years for full points?

ANSWER 84

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made to this criterion in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 85

With regards to R2, it is impossible to have over 14 years with a number of these technologies, including:

- Rational System Architect as it was acquired by IBM in 2008
- Golden Software seems to be a software company with their recent software releases since the early 90s coming in 2004.
- JDeveloper, which was first officially released by Oracle in 2005

Due to the fact that a number of the named technologies have not been released for 14 years, would Canada please amend the requirement to lessen the number of years to receive full points to 10 years and only require experience with two of the listed technologies?

ANSWER 85

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made to this criterion in Amendment 002 and 004.

QUESTION 86

R3 requires experience designing, building and supporting multiple versions of Oracle Forms and Reports and/or Oracle APEX. Oracle APEX was only released in 2004, therefore it is impossible to demonstrate more than 14 years with it. For this reason, would Canada please consider reducing this requirement so that the maximum amount of points can be achieved in 10 years of experience?

ANSWER 86

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes made to this criterion in Amendment 002.

QUESTION 87

R4 requires over 14 years of experience working as a Business Analyst. This is not relevant to the requirement for Oracle Forms. Would Canada please remove this requirement?

ANSWER 87

This criteria was updated in amendment 002 to remove Business Analyst experience. See also Q&A 56.

QUESTION 88

For R5 It is very highly unlikely for a Programmer/Software developer to have over 14 years working in UNIX/Linux environments. These operating systems are not necessarily in every client environment. Would Canada please reduce this requirement so that 5 years will score full points?

ANSWER 88

Canada will not change the criterion as requested. However please see changed made in Amendment 002 and 004.

QUESTION 89

For R6, would Canada accept other Oracle certifications to score full points due to the lack of available resources with Oracle Forms Certifications?

ANSWER 89

Canada will accept a "Certified Oracle Developer" Certification if the Contractor can demonstrate that the certification includes some Oracle Forms training as it is a generic certification with many potential specializations. See changes made to this criterion in amendment 004.

QUESTION 90

In the Programmer-Analyst Level 3 (Cognos BI) (5.3.18), the scoring grids for R1, R2, R3, and R4 refer to "months" in some cases; please confirm these should be "years".

ANSWER 90

Canada has made corrections. See amendment 002.

QUESTION 91

In the Application Architect (5.3.12), the R4 requirement asks for experience with "...Multi-Enterprise Integration (MEI)" for 10 to 15 years. Very few resources can meet this minimum threshold and losing 5 points would render everyone almost non-compliant; was it intended to be 1 to 5 years? We recommend adjusting the rated scoring to 1 to 5 years.

ANSWER 91

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. Please see changes to this criterion in amendment 002.

QUESTION 93

In the Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18), the R2 requirement lists a number of development tools. IBM Rational System Architect is a modelling/CASE tool that is listed; however, several of Oracle's tools are not. Please confirm our assumption that Oracle Designer (and other similar CASE tools such as ERWin, Silverrun, etc.) would also

ANSWER 93

Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18) does not include the criteria listed in the question above. Therefore the requested changes cannot be made.

QUESTION 94

In the Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18), the R5 requirement is a list of operating systems, development tools, programming languages and architectures; is Canada really expecting a minimum of 10 years with all these tools? Many of these tools are not used by Oracle Forms & Reports Developers and would be highly unlikely to be in the technical environment for this type of Developer. We recommend that this requirement is removed.

ANSWER 94

Canada will not remove this criterion as requested. However please see changes to this criterion in Amendment 004.

QUESTION 95

In the Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18), the R5 requirement asks for a minimum of 10 years of experience with many tools, including Windows 7. Given that Windows 7 was only released in July 2009, it is impossible for any resource to satisfy this requirement. Please adjust.

ANSWER 95

See changes have been made in Amendment 004.

QUESTION 96

In the Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18), the R5 requirement asks for a minimum of 10 years of experience with C/C++. It is highly unlikely that any Oracle Forms & Reports Developer would also have C/C++ coding experience. We recommend that this requirement is removed.

ANSWER 96

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However, please see changes to this criterion in amendment 004.

QUESTION 97

In the Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18), the R5 requirement asks for a minimum of 10 years of experience writing Visual Basic code. It is highly unlikely that any Oracle Forms & Reports Developer would have this type of coding experience. We recommend that this requirement is removed.

ANSWER 97

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However, please see changes to this criterion in amendment 004.

QUESTION 98

In the Programmer/Analyst - Oracle Forms (5.3.18), the R6 requirement allocates full points for over 14 years of experience with Oracle Forms & Reports version 9i or higher. Since the Oracle 9i Developer Suite was only released in 2002, it would be impossible for any resource to achieve full points on this criterion.

In addition, on Page 6 of the RFP, under "Programming Languages" in section 4.2 Technical Environment, Health Canada's environment includes Oracle Developer 6-10. As such, we recommend this requirement is adjusted to include Oracle Forms & Reports 6i.

ANSWER 98

See changes in amendment 004. Statement of Work section 4.2 page 6 does not list Oracle Developer 6-10. Oracle Forms & Reports 6-10 is listed in this section of the SOW and version 6i is included in versions 6 to 10. Please note that the technologies listed in 4.2.3 are inclusive but are not limited to these technologies.

QUESTION 100

In the Programmer/Analyst - Cognos (5.3.18), M1 requires 10 years of experience with IBM/Cognos 10. Given this suite was only released in 2010, it is impossible for any resource to satisfy this criterion; please adjust to a maximum of 4

ANSWER 100

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes to this criterion in amendment 004.

QUESTION 101

In the Programmer/Analyst - Cognos (5.3.18), M2 requires 10 years of experience with IBM/Cognos 10. Given this suite was only released in 2010, it is impossible for any resource to satisfy this criterion; please adjust to a maximum of 4

ANSWER 101

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes to this criterion in amendment 004.

QUESTION 102

In the Programmer/Analyst - Cognos (5.3.18), R1 requires a minimum of 10 years of experience with IBM/Cognos 10 before points are allocated. Given this suite was only released in 2010, it is impossible for any resource to satisfy this criteria. Please adjust.

ANSWER 102

Canada will not change this criterion as requested. However please see changes to this criterion in amendment 004.

QUESTION 103

In the Programmer Analyst - Java (5.3.21), the M2 and R2 requirements ask for WebSphere Application Server running on Linux; however on Page 6 of the RFP, under 4.2 Technical Environment, multiple Linux and UNIX versions are listed under the "Platform Dependent OS". Many qualified resources have only used WebSphere running on UNIX. Please confirm that it would be acceptable for a resource to have experience with WebSphere on Linux OR UNIX

ANSWER 103

5.3.21 refers to the Programmer/Software Developer Level 3 category. Yes Canada will accept WebSphere on Linux or UNIX or Windows for this criterion. See changes in Amendment 002 and Amendment 004.

QUESTION 104

In the Programmer/Software Developer - Oracle Forms (5.3.21), M1 requires 10 years with PL/SQL in an Oracle 10g environment or higher. Given that Oracle 10g was only released in late 2003, we recommend that this requirement is adjusted to include older versions of Oracle (i.e. 8i, 9i).

ANSWER 104

See amendment 002.

QUESTION 105

In the Programmer/Software Developer - Oracle Forms (5.3.21), M2 requires experience "...building applications using IBM WebSphere Application Server...". Typically, Java applications are developed on this platform; it would be highly unlikely that a Oracle Forms & Developer would have experience building applications using WebSphere. We recommend that this requirement be removed.

ANSWER 105

Canada will not remove this criterion as requested. However, please see changes in Amendment 004.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME