

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions  
- TPSGC  
Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0A1/Noyau 0A1  
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier  
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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution  
Shared Systems Division (XL)/Division des systèmes  
partagés (XL)  
4C1, Place du Portage Phase III  
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> ICEMS 2 APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> G7421-090186/C	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> G7421-090186	<b>Date</b> 2015-01-06
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XL-116-28251	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 116xl.G7421-090186	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2015-01-30</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Yang, Annie	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 116xl
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-1560 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 953-3703
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT CANADA 140 PROMENADE DU PORTAGE GATINEAU QC J8X 4B6 CANADA	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

G7421-090186/C

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

116x1

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

G7421-090186

File No. - N° du dossier

116x1G7421-090186

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

**Please see attached.**

**THE SOLICITATION AMENDMENT #002 IS RAISED TO MODIFY THE BID SOLICITATION  
AND TO ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM THE INDUSTRY.**

**MODIFICATION # 006**

**Reference:** Rated Requirement R6 in Form 2 - Bidder Response Form

**Modification # 006:**

Rated requirement R6 is hereby modified to read as follows:

1. The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed IT Architect has a Master's degree in Information Technology or Computer Science or Engineering or 10 years' experience as an IT Architect.
  - 1.1. 0 points will be awarded if a copy of the requested Master's degree is not provided or if 10 years of experience as an IT Architect cannot be substantiated in the submitted resume.
  - 1.2. 5 points will be awarded if a copy of the proposed IT Architect's Master's degree in Information Technology or Computer Science or Engineering is provided or if a minimum of 10 years of IT Architect Experience is substantiated in the submitted resume.

## MODIFICATION # 007

**Reference:** Rated Requirement R9 in Form 2 - Bidder Response Form

### **Modification # 007**

Rated requirement R9 is hereby modified to read as follows:

#### REQUIREMENTS

1. The Bidder should substantiate in the submitted resume that any of the proposed resources (IT Project Manager, Senior IT Architect, Senior Application Developer, or Senior Business Analyst) were:
  - 1.1 on any Exam Item Bank and Exam Management implementation project, AND
  - 1.2 Was responsible on that project for any one of the following:
    - 1.2.1 Specifying Item Bank functionality; OR
    - 1.2.2 Exam Management functionality; OR
    - 1.2.3 Writing related User Procedures.
- 2 The Bidder should substantiate in any of the submitted resumes and any of the submitted application development project descriptions in response to either: M7, R1 or R4 that any of the proposed resources (IT Project Manager, Senior IT Architect, Senior Application Developer, or Senior Business Analyst) were responsible for:
  - 2.1 Specifying Exam Management functionality; OR
  - 2.2 Writing User Procedures specific to exam item bank or exam management procedures.

#### CRITERIA

1. Up to 10 points will be awarded in the following way:
  - 1.1 0 points will be awarded if any of the proposed resources (IT Project Manager, Senior IT Architect, Senior Application Developer, or Senior Business Analyst) were not on any Exam Item Bank and Exam Management implementation project; AND/OR Was not responsible on that project for specifying at least one of the following:
    - 1.1.1 Item Bank functionality; OR
    - 1.1.2 Exam Management functionality; OR
    - 1.1.3 Writing related User Procedures.
  - 1.2 5 points will be awarded if any of the proposed resources (IT Project Manager, Senior IT Architect, Senior Application Developer, or Senior Business Analyst) was on any Exam Item Bank and Exam Management implementation project AND responsible on that project for specifying Item Bank functionality OR Exam Creation/Management functionality OR writing related User Procedures.
  - 1.3 An additional 5 points will be awarded if any of the proposed resources (IT Project Manager, Senior IT Architect, Senior Application Developer, or Senior Business Analyst) was responsible for specifying Exam Creation/Management functionality OR writing User Procedures specific to exam item bank or exam management procedures for a project description submitted in response to M7 or R1 or R4.

## MODIFICATION # 008

**Reference:** Appendix 9 List of Acronyms and Definitions of Annex A – Statement of Work (SoW)

### Modification # 008

Definition of Federal Government Working Days (FGWD) is hereby modified to read as follows:

Calendar days, except for Saturday, Sunday and the following holidays:

- 1) New Year's Day<sup>1</sup>;
- 2) Good Friday;
- 3) Victoria Day;
- 4) Canada Day<sup>1</sup>;
- 5) Labour Day;
- 6) Thanksgiving Day;
- 7) Christmas Day<sup>1</sup>; and
- 8) Boxing Day<sup>2</sup>

1: If this holiday occurs on a Saturday or Sunday, then the following Monday will be a holiday.

2: If this holiday occurs on a Saturday, then the following Monday will be a holiday. If this holiday occurs on a Sunday or Monday, then the following Tuesday will be a holiday.

## MODIFICATION # 009

**Reference:** Article 2.2 of M7 Criteria in Table A- Mandatory Requirements in Form 2-Bidder Response Form

### Modification # 009

Article 2.2 of Criteria in M7 is hereby modified to read as follows:

- 2.2 Projects where the Bidder supplied resources to projects which were the responsibility of other organizations qualify if the Bidder remained responsible for their own resources. Projects where the Bidder sub-contracted other resources but maintained responsibility for those resources qualify.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### Question # 021

<b>Reference: --</b>													
<b>Question:</b>													
For ICEMS 1, are there Production transaction statistics available including maximum # of users, hourly / daily transaction volumes and portal availability? If so, could we please get copies of those summary statistics?													
<b>Answer:</b>													
<b><u>ICEMS I Operations Statistics November 2013 to November 2014</u></b>													
	<b>Nov-13</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan-14</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov-14</b>
<b>Number of transactions per month</b>	10,002	11,823	19,142	14,264	26,641	9,954	13,665	19,561	14,112	4,170	17,963	19,560	19,844
<b>Monthly Application availability from 8:30 a.m. Newfoundland time to 5:00 p.m. BC time, on work days only</b>	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.99 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.97 %	99.99 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.94 %	99.99 %
<b>Monthly Internet access to the Application availability from 8:30 a.m. Newfoundland time to 5:00 p.m. BC time, on work days only</b>	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.67 %*	100.00 %
* Note: On October 2 <sup>nd</sup> 2014 the ICEMS 1 Internet access network supplier had an outage across Western Canada that caused this unavailability.													

### Question # 022

<b>Reference: --</b>
<b>Question:</b>
How is the current solution being hosted and where? What is the technology being used to host it and where is it located geographically?
<b>Answer:</b>
ICEMS 1 Production, Training and Test all run fundamentally on one server. 'The ICEMS 1 application is written in VB.6 (Visual Basic) and ASP (Active Server Pages). Please refer to question and response #005 in amendment 001 to this bid solicitation.
ICEMS 1 is currently being hosted at the Contractor's location in Canada.

**Question # 023**

**Reference:** --

**Question:**

What is your existing core HR system? We are asking because we are wondering if it interfaces to an HR system.

**Answer:**

ICEMS does not interface with any HR system.

**Question # 024**

**Reference:** Article 2.2 of M7 Criteria in Table A- Mandatory Requirements in Form 2-Bidders Response Form

**Question:**

The requirements for M7 in the Mandatory Table, specifically beginning at #2 in relation to the following sub-reference points 2.1 and 2.2, seem to be mutually exclusive. Clarification is sought.

**Answer:**

Please refer to modification 009 in this Bid Solicitation Amendment.

### Question # 025

**Reference:** Article 1.2b of M7 Criteria in Table A-Mandatory Requirement in Form 2 – Bidder Response Form

**Question:**

According to M7 1.2b it appears that the 'comparable' technologies must include MS SQL Server Database for both project references. Given that ESDC already has many corporate web applications using Oracle RDBMS, would ESDC consider Oracle RDBMS as a comparable database technology? Given that Oracle RDBMS is widely used throughout ESDC would you also consider Oracle as an acceptable RDBMS for the new solution upgrade?

**Answer:**

The Innovation, Information and Technology Branch (IITB) at ESDC has nothing to do with the ICEMS project, thus the relation of the departments use of Oracle RDBMS is irrelevant to this solicitation. ICEMS is not hosted at ESDC. As discussed in Question No 013, The Stakeholders include Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) and the Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship (CCDA). CCDA is comprised of representatives of Provinces/Territories and ESDC, as described in Annex A SoW Sections 1.1, 1.2, and 2.3.

Yes, as discussed in Question No. 009 and 010, Bidders are encouraged to suggest innovative solutions, which may be selected for use at Canada's sole discretion as described in Annex A SoW Sections 1.3.1, 3.2.1, and 3.3.1. Further, note that development and data base tools must be equivalent to the suggested solutions as described in Annex A SoW Section 10.4.2.

### Question # 026

**Reference:** Articles 7.6.6, 7.9.6, 7.10.5 of Annex A- SoW, and M29 Criteria in Table A-Mandatory Requirement in Form 2 – Bidder Response Form

**Question:**

It appears that MCITP and MCA certifications are being phased out. Assuming other Microsoft certifications are acceptable, would a certification as a MS Developer, Database Admin and/or a Server Admin be acceptable? Is one more applicable to the RFP requirements than the other?

<https://www.microsoft.com/learning/en-us/mcitp-certification.aspx>

**Answer:**

Yes they are acceptable. As discussed in Question No. 018, Canada is looking for professional certifications relevant to an IT Solution Architect. For a Microsoft solution, an example of an equivalent to a MCITP would be a Microsoft Certified Solutions Expert (MCSE). For a Java solution or an alternate solution proposed by the Bidder, certification relevant to the technology would be considered compliant equivalent.

There is no technologically relevant systems certification that is more applicable to the RFP requirements than another.

**Question # 027**

**Reference:** R6 Criteria in Table B - Rated Requirements in Form 2 – Bidder Response Form

**Question:**

For R6, we fail to understand why there would be an expectation that a Senior IT Architect resource with a Master's degree would be more qualified than a Senior IT Architect with 12+ years of qualified business experience in IT architecture. Given the degree / years of experience required by the Senior IT Architect to satisfy M24, M25 and M26, we would propose that R6 be modified from

'1. The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed IT Architect has a Master's degree in information technology or Computer Science or Engineering' to

'1. The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed IT Architect has a Master's degree in information technology or Computer Science or Engineering OR 12+ years of demonstrated IT architecture experience'.

**Answer:**

Canada has reviewed the request and has modified R6 to include qualified business experience in IT architecture.

Please refer to modification no.006.

## Question # 028

**Reference:** R9 Criteria in Table B - Rated Requirements in Form 2 – Bidder Response Form

### Question:

In our estimation, R9 is overly prescriptive and basically eliminates resources who have not worked specifically on exam-based web portals from being considered for this project. Exams and their associated management (i.e. business rules) are no different than other types of web-based file processing solutions that require business rules. It also penalizes respondents who did not have the senior BA working on their specific web portal project references if those references are not exam-based. Basically, if we do not have project references that involve Exam Bank preparation or Exam management, then our proposed BA will lose 5 points regardless. Therefore, we would propose that R9 be changed as follows:

1. The Bidder should substantiate in the submitted resume that the proposed Senior Business Analyst was:
  - 1.1 A Senior Business Analyst on a public sector national / provincial web portal records / file management project, AND
  - 1.2 A Business Analyst responsible on that project for any one of the following:
    - 1.2.1 Specifying Records Management functionality / business rules; OR
    - 1.2.2 Specifying File Management functionality / processing rules; OR
    - 1.2.3 Writing related User Procedures.
2. The Bidder should substantiate in the submitted resume and any of the submitted application development projects in response to either: M7, R1 or R4 that the proposed Senior Business Analyst was responsible for:
  - 2.1 Specifying web-based Records / File Management functionality / business rules; OR
  - 2.2 Writing User Procedures specific to web-based Records / File Management procedures.

### Answer:

Canada has reviewed the request and has modified R9 to include bonus points for subject matter expertise for a variety of Resources. Please refer to modification no.007

The business rules are very much influenced by the purpose for the application and the subject matter being supported. The rules around exam questions and exam management credential certification are essential to understanding the business requirements. Experience in other applications is of value but experience in examination certifications is extremely valuable.

There is a body of experience outside of ICEMS in Examination and Certification. Canada has not asked specific ICEMS, apprenticeship, or trades experience.

**Question # 029**

**Reference: --**

**Question:**

In the questions /answers provided on December 23rd, the answer to question 20 regarding incumbents and previous contracts links us to a government website where only the last 6 amendments to the long-standing incumbent contract are provided. In the interests of full disclosure, could we please get a summary of the original contract award and 19 amendments made prior to 2007?

**Answer:**

<b>Amendment No.</b>	<b>Award Date</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Total Contract Value</b>
000	2000/03/30	\$4,402,813.35	\$4,402,813.35
001	2000/08/14	\$160,500	\$4,563,313.35
002	2000/10/06	\$588,239.06	\$5,151,552.41
003	2001/03/28	-\$297,017.45	\$4,854,534.96
004	2001/03/30	\$275,000	\$5,129,534.96
005	2001/06/21	\$108,988.74	\$5,238,523.70
006	2001/07/20	\$150,000	\$5,388,523.70
007	2001/08/31	\$42,539	\$5,431,062.70
008	2002/04/30	\$890,985.92	\$6,322,048.62
009	2002/10/25	\$177,951.38	\$6,500,000.00
010	2003/04/14	\$388,592.44	\$6,888,592.44
011	2003/06/23	\$574,704.20	\$7,463,296.64
012	2004/03/11	\$58,826	\$7,522,122.64
013	2004/07/07	\$640,412.01	\$8,162,534.65
014	2005/06/30	\$680,412.01	\$8,842,946.66

015	2006/06/29	\$720,412	\$9,563,358.66
016	2007/03/27	\$491,803.00	\$10,055,161.66
017	2007/06/28	\$0.00	\$10,055,161.66
018	2007/06/28	\$701,901	\$10,757,062.66
019	2008/06/30	\$750,335	\$11,507,397.66

**Question # 030**

**Reference: --**

**Question:**

Given the Q&A's provided on December 23rd that indicated support for new technology solutions through the positive answers to questions 9 (open source solutions) and 10 (cloud-based solution), we feel that there are several platform / database alternatives that are more cost effective, scalable and better designed for web-based abort / recovery requirements. Therefore, we would request that the restrictions on target platform / database technologies (i.e. MS Windows Server and MS SQL Server) be removed from M7 (1.2b) and replaced with platforms and RDMS solutions that will support a secure national service delivery application like ICEMS.

**Answer:**

There are restrictions to database and technology platforms that may be required because of the multi-jurisdictional nature of ICEMS. The Provinces and Territories (P/Ts) may not be able to adapt to a new platform or a change in technical infrastructure. M7 (1.2b) will not be revised.

**Question # 031**

**Reference:** Questions 14 and 15 of Bid Solicitation Amendment 001

**Question:**

Given that the closing date has been extended to January 30th, we would request that ESDC reconsider its negative responses to questions 14 (ICMES demo) and 15 (bidder session) so that prospective bidders can better understand the ICEMS application functionality and get immediate answers to relevant proposal decisions based on client expectations for ongoing hosting / support of the ICEMS application and key priorities the ICEMS 2 solution?

**Answer:**

Canada has reviewed the request and will not hold an ICEMS demo or bidder sessions.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**