

**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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution  
Informatics Professional Services - EL  
Division/Services professionnels en informatique -  
division EL  
4C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Informatics Professional Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN869-150202/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20150202	<b>Date</b> 2015-01-19
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-633-28229	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 633el.EN869-150202	<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 2015-01-28</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes	
<b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Mentor, Michel	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 633el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-0230 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

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> (type or print) <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

---

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT No. 005**  
**RFP No. EN869-150202/A**

**The following amendment 5 is raised to provide answers to questions received from potential bidders.**

**Q1. We would like a clear understanding of M2/R1 requirement for the 24 month period.**

**Amendment #2, Q11 indicates that the resource must have billed for a total of 24 months.**

**Amendment #3, Q1 indicates that there is no requirement for the same 24 month period between contracts**

**Amendment #8, Q8 indicates that the number of billable days must be proven over no greater than 24 months and the 24 months need not be consecutive.**

**Question 1A:**

**Appendix A of Attachment B (RFP Billable Days Response Table) allows for only one billing period per contract. Are we correct in assuming that to respond to M2 and R1, Bidders are to take one 24 month period (or window) per contract. All applicable resource billable days under that contract must have occurred within the 24 month period (or window)? We understand that the 24 month period (window) need not be the same timeframe between contracts as long as all contract fall within the past 5 years.**

*Answer 1A:*

*Resources for each category must have their resource billable days listed from a maximum 24 month period identified from one of the possible 10 contracts billing period (which can be a maximum of 24 months).*

*Each contract can list a maximum of one 24 month period.*

*The 24 month period can be different for each contract.*

*For example, the Applications Software Architect row may list 528 days from contract A (24 month period listed as 01/01/11 to 01/01/13), AND Programmer/Software Developer row may list 1250 days in contract B (01/06/11 to 01/12/12) , AND Programmer/Analyst row may list 965 days from contract A (01/01/11 to 01/01/13), etc.*

*Please also see example form Appendix A of Attachment B attached.*

**Question 1B:**

**Should Amendment #2, Q11 be retracted as it is not the resource that must have billed for a total of 24 months but rather the resource must have billed time during the selected 24 month period (window) for the particular contract?**

*Answer 1B:*

*Yes, 24 months is the maximum, but it could be less.*

**Question 1C:**

**Regarding Amendment #3, Q8, please explain further what is meant by the “24 months need not be consecutive”? Is this in relation to the resource billing at different times during the selected 24 months period (window) for a particular contract or is it meant to indicate that the selected contract’s 24 month period (window) does not need to be consecutive? For example: Project 1 could have two time periods (or windows), January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 and February 1, 2012 to January 31, 2013. If the latter is correct, then Appendix A of Attachment B would require numerous billing periods per contract?**

*Answer 1C:*

*This in relation to the resource billing at different times during the selected 24 months period (window) for a particular contract.*

**Question 1D:**

**Amendment #3, Q8 states that the number of billable days must be proven over no greater than 24 months. Since M2/R1 are based on the cumulative billable days of all contracts, are we correct in assuming that, for example, a contract of a 22 month period may be used as long as the cumulative billed days between all contracts meets the mandatory requirement per resource category?**

*Answer 1D:*

*Yes*

**Q2. Re: AMD003, Revised Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria, item M1**

**M1 requires bidders to demonstrate three contracts which were awarded to them within the last five years with a value of over \$5M, and Bidders must have billed more than \$5M in professional services within the last five years.**

**As most large-scale professional service contracts of this size are long-term multi-year contracts, can the Crown please confirm that it would be acceptable for a Bidder’s contract to have been awarded prior to January 2010, as long as \$5M or more was billed for professional services that were delivered within the last five years.**

**A2. No.**

**Q3. In Annex A – Statement of Work, Application/Software Architect (Level 1), the first bullet for the task list is unnumbered (i.e. “Develops and documents technical...and application requirements;” should be 4.1.1). This impacts the numbering of the remainder of the 4.1 sub**

---

**bullets. Would Canada please correct this so that we can accurately reference the tasks done by our resources on the referenced projects?**

A3. *This is a typo. Add 4.1.0 and leave the rest of the numbering as is.*

**Q4. In Annex A – Statement of Work, bullets 4.16.1 and 4.16.2 are identical. Would Canada please delete one of these, and re-number the other bullets so that we can accurately reference the tasks done by our resources on the referenced projects?**

A4. *This is a typo – delete and renumber accordingly.*

**Q5. In Annex A – Statement of Work, bullets 4.17.1 and 4.17.2 are identical. Would Canada please delete one of these, and re-number the other bullets so that we can accurately reference the tasks done by our resources on the referenced projects?**

A5. *Please refer to Amendment # 4, A5.*

**Q6. Amendment 003, Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria (Revision 2), M2 (page 2 of 9; PDF page 15/22) has 15 rows / categories AND requires the completed Appendices A and B of Attachment B.**

**M2 Has 15 Categories or lines:**

**However, the form – Appendix A of Attachment B – RFP Billable Days Response Table has 17 Categories or lines:**

**Detailed examination shows that:**

- Database Admin Levels 2 & 3 (row 9 in the M2 table), is split into two lines, and the
- Database Analyst / IM Administrator Levels 2 & 3 (row 10 in the M2 table), is split into two lines.

**Thus there is an inconsistency between what is the requirement (M2) and the reporting table (Appendix A of Attachment B – RFP Billable Days Response Table).**

**We have researched our response based on the criteria in M2 and to have to begin the research again would be time consuming and, in our opinion, of little value to the evaluators.**

**Accordingly would Canada revise Appendix A of Attachment B – RFP Billable Days Response Table to use the same rows / categories as M2?**

A6. *Reporting table should be modified to combine DB Administrator 2 and 3 AND DB Analyst 2 and 3.*

**Q7. In the Annex A - Statement of Work, section 4.10 appears to be incomplete. The final sub-bullet, 4.10.9, ends with “and,” implying that there was/is another bullet in the task list for that category. Can PWGSC confirm if that the list is complete or provide the wording for the missing task or deliverable in the list?**

A7. *Remove the “and”.*

**Q8. The remaining duration for bid preparation is six calendar days of which our firm still has outstanding questions which will directly impact our response. We request a week extension in order to evaluate forthcoming questions/answers and to incorporate any necessary changes and clarification into our response?**

A8. *The RFP has been extended to January 28th, 2015. Refer to amendment 4.*

**Q9. R2–R6 - Reference Amdt 002, pg 3, Q7,a. – answer states ‘a. If a contract covers multiple systems, points would be given for each’  
R2–R6 – Reference Amdt 003, pg 9, Q27 – answers states ‘... however, multiple resources of the same Contract reference number could only satisfy one of the references in R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6’**

**The above amendments appear to contradict each other and are very ambiguous. Amdt 002/Q7 appears to allow for the same contract to be used for more than one system reference (R2, R3, R4, R5 and/or R6). Conversely, Amdt 003/Q27 infers that if one contract supports more than one system – R2, R3, R4, R5 and/or R6 – then it could be used for only a single reference. Please clarify.**

A9. *If a contract covers multiple systems, one point would be given for each system.*

*Multiple Task Authorizations (TAs) under the same contract reference number could only satisfy one of the demonstrated contract references for each system, 1 for R2, 1 for R3, etc. The point here was that multiple TAs under a single contract reference number, could not get multiple contract reference credit in R2, or multiple contract reference credit in R3, etc, but could get 1 (one) contract credit reference for each system the contract reference covered.*

**Q10. M2-R1 – Reference Amdt 002, pg. 4, Q11 – answer states ‘the 24 month period does not have to be the same 24 month period for resources within each resource category but, rather, that they must each have billed for a total of 24 months.’  
M2-R1 – Reference Amdt 003, pg 2, Q2 – answer states ‘... need not be the same 24-month period for all contract experience the Bidders reference to meet M2.’**

**The above amendments are confusing and do not correlate to the table provided for substantiating M2 (and, by association, R1). The Headings on Appendix A of Attachment B show a single line item to illustrate the ‘from’ and ‘to’ billing period. Given this format, it would seem that the resource categories within a given contract must have billed over the same 24 month period whereas above amendments explicitly state otherwise. Please clarify.**

A10. *See answer to Q1 above.*

**Q11. We have unanswered questions and have not received any further amendments that, until clarification is received, have required us to place our bid response on hold. Given this, we request a minimum two week extension to the bid closing date.**

A11. *The RFP has been extended to January 28th, 2015. Refer to amendment 4.*

**Q12. Reference Amdt 003, Pg. 3 and Pg. 6, APPENDIX A OF ATTACHMENT B – This Table at Pg. 6 provides separate line items for Database Administrator (Level 2), Database Administrator (Level 3), Database Analyst/IM Administrator (Level 2) and Database Analyst/IM Administrator (Level 3). This infers that both level 2 and level 3 for both of these categories must be supported. However, the criteria for M2 at pg. 2 provides only a single line item and corresponding billable days for Database Administrator (Level 2 or 3), and Database Analyst/IM Administrator (Level 2 or 3).**

**Please confirm that, as a minimum, only one line item – level 2 or level 3 - requires supporting billable days at Pg. 6.**

*A12. Please refer to amendment 4, A14.*

**Q13. In Amendment 4, A19 it is indicated that for R2 - R6 references, it is sufficient to provide name, telephone number, and if available, the email address of a contact person who is receiving or has received the services.**

**In Amendment 4, A20 it is indicated that for R2 - R6 references, the Bidder must fill out Appendix B of Attachment B for M2, which includes the additional information of Bidder Contract Reference #; Government Client (Yes/No); Address; Fax; Contract Value; Award Date; and Expiry Date.**

**Can the Crown confirm that the Bidder is expected to provide the following information in response to R2 - R6:**

- **Client Organization Name;**
- **Client Contact Name;**
- **Client Contact Telephone Number;**
- **E-mail address (if available);**
- **Start Date Date (Month, Year);**
- **End Date (Month, Year);**
- **Description of Requirement/Services.**

*A13. Please refer to amendment 4, A19*

**Q14. Re: Annex A – Statement of Work; 4.0 Tasks; 4.1 Application/Software Architect**

**The first task in the listing under Application/Software Architect was not assigned a number. This affects the SOW cross-reference under in Section 3 RFP Contract Reference Response Form. Should Bidders consider this first task item 4.1.1 and re-sequence the numbers for rest of the list? Or should bidders assign a different unique number to this first task?**

*A14. Please see A3 above.*

**Q15. Ref Amendment 004.**

**Q4 (B) states: Are client reference contact details (i.e. name, title, telephone number and email address) required for each of the reference projects included in R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6.**

**A4 (B): states: No.**

**Q19 states: The answer to Question 26 is not clear – the question is about the Rated Requirements, and the answer says “Please refer to Revision 2 – Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria, M1 (2)” Can you please confirm that this means, to answer R2-R6 suppliers are to include the same information that is required in M1 (2) “(2) The name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who is receiving or has received the services under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder.”**

**A19 states: Confirm. To answer R2-R6, suppliers are to include the same information that is required in M1.(2)**

**Further, M1.(2) states: The name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who is receiving or has received the services under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder.**

**A4 and A19 are in conflict. Given that the RFP has not been changed, would Canada confirm that the interpretation provided in A19 is correct and by extension, that A4 is incorrect and should be replaced by “Yes”?**

*A15. Confirmed. A4 should be changed to ‘Yes’.*

**Q16. There appears to be a contradiction between 2 questions asked and answered in this amendment 4:**

- **Q 4 (B) asks:**
  - "Are client reference contact details (i.e. name, title, telephone number and email address) required for each of the reference projects included in R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6."
  - A 4 (B): "No"
- **Q 19 asks:**
  - 
  - "The answer to Question 26 is not clear – the question is about the Rated Requirements, and the answer says “Please refer to Revision 2 – Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria, M1 (2)”

**Can you please confirm that this means, to answer R2-R6 suppliers are to include the same information that is required in M1 (2) “(2) The name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who is receiving or has received the**

**services under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder.” ”**

- **A 19: "Confirm. To answer R2-R6, suppliers are to include the same information that is required in M1 (2)"**

**The information referred to in A 19 refers to the same "name, title, telephone number and email address" referred to in Q 4.**

**Of the 2 conflicting answers to questions 4 & 19, which is the correctly intended answer?**

*A16. Please refer to A15.*

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

**EXAMPLE**

**APPENDIX A OF ATTACHMENT B**

**RFP BILLABLE DAYS RESPONSE TABLE**

Bidder Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Company A \_\_\_\_\_

By providing a response, the bidder certifies that billable days provided occurred during the billing period indicated above for ALL of the resource categories listed.

RESOURCE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS								Total	
	Gross Reference to Contract Reference # _A_	Gross Reference to Contract Reference # _B_	Gross Reference to Contract Reference # _C_	Gross Reference to Contract Reference # _____						
Applications Software Architect (Level 2)	Billing Period: 01/01/11 (dd/mm/yy) To 01/01/13 (dd/mm/yy)	Billing Period: 01/06/11 (dd/mm/yy) To 01/12/12 (dd/mm/yy)	Billing Period: 01/01/12 (dd/mm/yy) To 01/01/14 (dd/mm/yy)	Billing Period: _____ (dd/mm/yy) To _____ (dd/mm/yy)	528					
Programmer/Software Developer (Level 2)										1250
Programmer/Analyst (Level 2)										965
Systems Analyst (Level 2)			1225							1225
Tester (Level 2)										520
Web Developer (Level 2)			2000							2000

