

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 (See original solicitation
document.)

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 Professional Services Tier 2 TBIPS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W6369-14P5GU/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W6369-14P5GU	Date 2014-12-04
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-380-28141	
File No. - N° de dossier 380zm.W6369-14P5GU	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-12-19	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Cook, Gail	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 380zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-2591 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: See Herein	

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

W6369-14P5GU/A

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

W6369-14P5GU

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

File No. - N° du dossier

380zmW6369-14P5GU

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

380zm

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

AMENDMENT NO. 001

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and to answer Bidders' questions.

RFP REVISIONS:

1. At Page 1 of the RFP, Solicitation Closes:

Delete: 2014-12-11

Insert: 2014-12-19

2. At Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria Workstream 2 - Support Services, 3.8 I.2 Database Administrator - Level 3, R3.8.1, Scoring:

Delete:

One point per year to a maximum of eight points.

Insert:

One point per year to a maximum of ten points.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Is there or has there been incumbents providing this service within the last 6 or 12 months? If there has been incumbents, please provide contract details including firm name, dollar value and contract duration.

A1. Informatics professional services for CCPS lifecycle application support are being provided under contract by Zylog Systems (Ottawa) Limited. The contract went into effect 30 April 2009 and expires 31 January 2015 with two one-month option periods ending 31 March 2015. Current contract value is \$18,628,036.28 not including GST/HST.

Q2. Ref: Annex A, Statement of Work, Workstream 1, Development Services, Section 5, Constraints, subsections 5.2 to 5.7; and

Ref: Annex A, Statement of Work, Workstream 2, Support Services, Section 5, Constraints, subsections 5.2 to 5.7.

These sections call for the Contractor to be responsible for the availability of the application.

a) Would Canada confirm that the 'availability' is for the 'application' only, and not the infrastructure and network (managed by DND and others) that support the application?

Given that Canada is determining the number and categories of resources, and the hours of work that the resources work, and on what they work, in our opinion, it is not possible for the Contractor to be responsible for the availability of the system.

b) Would Canada reformulate the RFP to be a fixed price per month for application maintenance services whereby the Contractor can be held responsible for the application availability? If so, the Contractor would have control over the number and category of resources deployed, and on what they are working. For development services, we would propose that a fixed price Task Authorization be issued for each work package, with the TA value being determined by the work plan and estimated effort by resource category x the per diem rates, which would result in a fixed price for the work package.

The advantage of this method would be that the risk for Canada is reduced as the Contractor assumes the estimating risk. Furthermore, Canada would be able to hold the Contractor to account for schedule delays caused by the Contractor.

c) Both Workstreams 1 and 2 have the same requirement for availability. In the event that two different Contractors are successful for Workstream 1 and Workstream 2, it would appear that there are overlapping responsibilities. Given the Workstream titles of Development Services and Support Services, it would appear that the logical assignment of availability would be in Workstream 2, Support Services. Would Canada confirm that the Workstream 2 - Support Services Contractor has the responsibility for availability and not the Workstream 1 – Development Services Contractor; and issue an amendment to that effect.

A2. a) Concur. "Availability" referred to is for the application only and not the system infrastructure and network which is managed by DND and/or SSC.

b) No. Canada will retain control over the number and category of resources deployed, and on what they are working.

- c) Concur that both Workstreams having the same requirement for availability constitutes overlapping responsibilities and that the responsibility for maintaining application availability should rest with one Workstream. However, as Workstream 1 contains the project management and developer resources, the successful bidder for Workstream 1 is in the best position to assure application availability.

Q3. Ref: Workstreams 1 & 2, Statement of Work, 6.7, Interfaces

Given the 20 complex CCPS to external system interfaces it would be prudent to include experience with system-to-system interfaces as a requirement. In our experience, a substantial number of non-conformities occur with system to system interfaces. Would Canada include experience with interfaces, where applicable, into the resource mandatory and/or rated requirements?

A3. The current mandatory and rated criteria provide a sufficient measure of qualification of bidders and proposed resources.

Q4. Ref: Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstream 1 – Development Services Resources:

- 3.6 A.1 Application / Software Architect – Level 3;
- 3.7 A.7 Programmer / Analyst - Level 3
- 3.8 A.7 Programmer / Analyst - Level 2
- 3.9 A.7 Programmer / Analyst - Level 1

Ref: Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstream 2 – Support Services Resources:

- 2.6 A.11 Tester - Level 3
- 2.7 A.11 Tester – Level 2
- 2.8 I.2 Database Administrator – Level 3
- 2.10 B.13 Operations Support Specialist – Level 2
- 2.12 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Level 3

Given that the technology suite in use for the Central Compensation Pay and Pension System (CCPS) is described in the both Statements of Work, section 6.1, is exclusively made up of IBM mainframe technologies, it is our opinion that the insertion of more generic requirements into the evaluation criteria is likely to result in considerably increased risk for DND in the transition to the new resources. In our experience, it takes many years working with a particular technology (1-3 years for a Level 1, 3 to 6 years for a Level 2 and 6+ years for a Level 3) to become competent. The skill sets, knowledge and experience are not generically interchangeable. For example, if a Unix/Linux Oracle database administrator (DBA) were hired to work on a mainframe DB2 system, it would take a year of coaching from an experienced mainframe DB2 DBA before the Oracle DBA could be self-sustaining; and even then would pose the risk of not-previously-experienced problems needing resolution. We would therefore highly recommend that the evaluation criteria be revised to focus on the specific technologies in use as a risk avoidance technique. For example, we would recommend that "*R4.10.1 Years of experience with batch job design and JCL or another scripting language.*" be revised to "*R4.10.1 Years of experience with batch job design using IBM JCL.*"

Will Canada revise all of the resource requirements (as listed above) where knowledge, skills and experience is needed with a particular specific CCPS technology to reflect the CCPS technologies to be supported?

[As an analogy, a person may be able to 'communicate' in 'language A'. This does not mean that they can necessarily communicate in 'language B'. CICS, TSO, JCL, ISPF, DB2, BMS, COBOL, Pacbase, Pacdesign are all specific 'languages' that have experience and skills cannot be directly used by resources that have experience with similar products from other software vendors.]

- A4. No. The current mandatory and rated criteria provide a sufficient measure of qualification of bidders and proposed resources.
- Q5. Ref: RFP Part 7 – Resulting Contract Clauses, 7.26 Implementation of Professional Services, states:
- “If similar professional services are currently being provided by another supplier or by Canada's own personnel, the Contractor is responsible for ensuring that the transition to the professional services it provides under the Contract is completed in a way that does not disrupt Canada's operations or users, and does not result in any interim degradation to the timeliness or quality of service. **The Contractor is solely responsible for any additional training required by its resources to perform the Work, and time spent by resources on that training or becoming familiar with the Client's environment must not be charged to Canada.** The transition will be considered complete once the Contractor has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Technical Authority, that it is ready and able to carry out the Work. **The transition must be complete by no later than 10 working days after the Contract is awarded.** All costs associated with establishing itself to provide the professional services are the responsibility of the Contractor.”
- Given that the Contractor is responsible to have fully trained resources no later than 10 working days after Contract Award, it is simply not possible for a resource who does not have experience with the IBM mainframe technologies required to support CCPS to be trained-up in those skills in 10 days. This further reinforces the request in Q4. above where we are requesting that all of the resource criteria be restated to have experience with the specific technologies employed in the CCPS.
- A5. The current mandatory and rated criteria provide a sufficient measure of qualification of bidders and proposed resources.
- Q6. In ATTACHMENT 4.1, BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, WORKSTREAM 1 – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, M1.1.3 CORPORATE COMMITMENT (p.110 of 141), the bidder is asked to provide references for two “successful” contracts. Can the Crown, please, define the term “successful”?
- A6. A contract is considered successful if it meets all the items stated in M1.1.3, i.e. “The contracts must each have involved a minimum of five resources, taken place over a period of six months or more, and have been driven by Task Authorizations (or a similar vehicle) resulting in sudden peaks of staffing. This implies higher staffing levels on short notice, not just reallocation of existing staff already on the contract.”
- Q7. **Rated criteria, R3.8.1, for the Database Administrator in Workstream 2 is as follows:**

3.8 Rated Criteria – I.2 Database Administrator – Level 3	Scoring	Max Score
R3.8.1 Years of experience in Data modeling using SilverRun or another modeling tool.	One points per year to a maximum of eight years.	10

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W6369-14P5GU/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

380zm

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

W6369-14P5GU

File No. - N° du dossier

380zmW6369-14P5GU

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Can you please clarify if the maximum points for this rated criterion is eight (8) or ten (10) points.

Can you then clarify the resulting total score that can be obtained by the Database Administrator.

- A7. The scoring for R3.8.1 is amended to state, "One point per year to a maximum of ten years."
The maximum score that can be attained is 10 points.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.

**NOTE: A BID ALREADY SUBMITTED MAY BE AMENDED PRIOR TO THE CLOSING DATE.
AMENDING CORRESPONDENCE MUST ADDRESS THE SOLICITATION NUMBER AND
THE CLOSING DATE AND MUST BE ADDRESSED TO:**

**BID RECEIVING
PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA
PLACE DU PORTAGE, PHASE III
MAIN LOBBY, ROOM 0A1
11 LAURIER STREET
GATINEAU, QUEBEC K1A 0S5**