

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 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement

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
Services Procurement-Instruments Management
Division/Approvisionnement de services-Gestion des
instruments
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
11C1, Place du Portage III
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

| | |
|---|---|
| Title - Sujet PASS Renewal 2015 | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation E60ZQ-140002/B | Date 2015-02-11 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client E60ZQ-140002 | Amendment No. - N° modif. 003 |
| File No. - N° de dossier 006zq.E60ZQ-140002 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZQ-006-28304 | |
| Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement 2014-12-30 Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale | |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2015-02-24 | Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST |
| Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: de Leon, Philip | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 006zq |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6489 () | FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-2229 |
| Delivery Required - Livraison exigée | |
| Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: VARIOUS | |
| Security - Sécurité This revision does change the security requirements of the solicitation. Cette révision change les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation. | |

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Acknowledgement copy required | Yes - Oui | No - Non |
| Accusé de réception requis | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre. | | |
| Signature | Date | |
| Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie) | | |
| For the Minister - Pour le Ministre | | |

This Amendment 003 is raised to:

- respond to outstanding questions from Questions and Answers - Set 2;
- provide revised response to Q25 (French only) of Questions and Answers - Set 2; and
- provide and respond to newly submitted questions.

Questions and Answers - Set 2

| | |
|-----|--|
| Q34 | <p>For Stream 1 (Internal Audit), would the Crown please confirm that the Crown will accept the Certification in Risk Management Assurance (CRMA) designation from the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) for the Partner, Project Leader and Senior Auditor mandatory education requirements given its direct relevance to the Stream?</p> <p>The CRMA is focused on internal audit and specifically on how to provide assurance on core business processes in risk management and governance; educate management and the audit committee on risk and risk management concepts; focus on strategic organizational risks; and add value for the organization. All these focus areas align directly to the Policy on Internal Audit.</p> <p>The CRMA examination process includes key components of the CIA program (includes aspects of the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, responsibilities of the internal audit activity, independence and objectivity, governance concepts, risk identification and management, management controls, and audit planning) as well as governance aspects and principles of risk management assurance, in addition to appropriate assurance and consulting roles for internal audit professionals.</p> <p>In particular, the CRMA is specific to risk and assurance, aligning with the range of internal audits performed by the Government of Canada under PASS Stream 1 (operational, compliance, management controls, value-for-money and assurance audits across functional and programmatic areas) and other Stream 1 internal audit activities, such as the development of audit and assurance methodologies, formal risk analyses and control self-assessments.</p> <p>The CRMA examination process tests responsibilities of the internal audit activity, independence and objectivity, governance concepts, risk identification and management, management controls, audit planning, principles of risk management assurance and appropriate assurance and consulting roles for internal audit professionals.</p> <p>Given the direct relevance of the CRMA, it seems unclear from examining the certifications recognized on the PASS RFSA why the CRMA is not listed.</p> |
| A34 | Canada will not accept the CRMA designation at the RFSA stage. |
| Q38 | <p>For Annex A 2.4, if a project started before February 10, 2011 but was completed within the past 4 years, can it be counted as one of the forensic audit projects for our resource(s)?</p> |
| A38 | Yes, projects submitted in support of resource experience under Annex A 2.4 may have started prior to February 10, 2011, but need to have been completed within the past 4 years. |

| | |
|------------|--|
| | |
| Q39 | Are time frames allowed to overlap for the projects used in MT1, RT1a and RT1b? |
| A39 | Timeframes for projects used in MT1, RT1a and RT1b may overlap. |
| Q41 | For the PASS Renewal 2015 One of the mandatory technical requirements for Stream 5 – External Audits is that the Supplier must submit four completed projects within the past five years from the solicitation closing date, valued at more than \$40,000 for the relevant Stream. Are the projects required to be individually valued at more than \$40,000 or does the value of the four completed projects combined have to be more than \$40,000? |
| A41 | Each project submitted in response to MT1 must exceed the dollar thresholds indicated for the selected stream. |
| Q42 | Please confirm that the requirement for individuals at various levels to hold a “CPA” designation is the Canadian CPA designation. |
| A42 | The requirement for individuals to hold a “CPA” designation refers to the Canadian CPA designation. |

Questions and Answers - Set 3

| | |
|------------|---|
| Q43 | <p>We understand that a portion of the PASS SA procurement was set aside for aboriginal business.</p> <p>Can the Crown please provide information on what is the usage of the set aside portion of the PASS SA we are currently using? i.e. \$1M in the past 2 years etc.</p> |
| A43 | <p>No portion of the PASS RFSA, neither for the current (E60ZG-060004) nor for this Renewal solicitation, has been set-aside for aboriginal business. An aboriginal set-aside entails that an opportunity being competed, in whole or in part as applicable, is only open to appropriately-qualified aboriginal suppliers; For an RFSA, this would typically result in the creation and maintenance of a unique list of aboriginal suppliers. Neither is the case for this RFSA. The sections of this RFSA making reference to set-asides (e.g. Clause 1.2.10) apply to the bid solicitations issued during the SA Period.</p> <p>Since no portion of the current PASS SA (E60ZG-060004) was set-aside for aboriginal business, the amount is \$0.00.</p> |
| Q44 | We have conducted multiple Practice Inspections since 2011, the majority of which have been conducted for federal government departments/agencies. In all cases, we have used resources either only at the Partner/Managing Director or in some cases one Partner/Managing Director and one Project Manager/Leader. In no cases, was an Audit Senior used. The basis of the Practice Inspection comes from the IIA quality assessment approach which expects that the project be led by a Partner level or former CAE. It is our experience that an audit senior is not experienced enough to conduct this work, which is typically intended for the DM and the DAC member levels. Therefore, we |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | would ask that the requirement for an audit senior level be removed, or at a minimum reduce this to one audit senior, rather than 3. |
| A44 | Response to be provided in a future amendment. |
| Q45 | For Streams 2 and 7, given that Auditor and Junior Auditor categories do not exist (please refer to Annex A – Statement of Requirements), can the Crown confirm that submitting 1 Partner, 1 Project Leader, and 1 Senior Auditor profiles (rather than 5 profiles) would be appropriate for MT2 for these two streams (as opposed to 5 corporate profiles). |
| A45 | Response to be provided in a future amendment. |
| Q46 | When does the Crown anticipate posting answers to the outstanding questions noted in Amendment 001? Some of the questions (including that above) affect resource selection and level of effort to completion of a compliant PASS SA 2015 Refresh hardcopy response. Is the Crown issuing an extension to the due date given the delay in clarifications? |
| A46 | Responses to outstanding questions from Questions & Answers - Set 1, and an extension, were provided in Amendment 002. |
| Q47 | Can you confirm that we must prepare one (1) technical proposal for all streams we wish to qualify for, addressing the mandatory and rated requirement per each stream? Or are we required to prepare a separate technical proposal per each stream? |
| A47 | As amended in RFSA Amendment 001, Part 3 of the RFSA states that suppliers are <u>requested</u> to provide their arrangements in 2 Sections: a Technical Arrangement and an Online Response Template. The Technical Arrangement “ <i>should explain and demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements</i> ” for each Stream the supplier wishes to qualify. |
| Q48 | If an organization believes that they can show relevant and substantive experience responding to a particular Stream, without providing resume(s), do they still need to be provided? |
| A48 | Response to be provided in a future amendment. |
| Q49 | <p>MT2 is requesting the corporate profile of five (5) resources per Stream, which is a total of forty (40) resources if bidding on every Stream.</p> <p>If bidders are required to provide “the position (e.g. Director) and the work unit (e.g. Division, Directorate) within the client organization to whom the services were delivered as a minimum,” for MT2 that would be a very intensive process. For each of the forty (40) resources, we would need to go back to hundreds of client references (in most cases as far back as 10 years), which would take weeks, and in some cases, would not be possible. To determine whether a resource meets the mandatory requirements per Stream, this information is not required.</p> <p>We understand why this client information is required for both MT1 and RT1a at the</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>corporate level, as is the usual process for PASS RFPs, however requiring this information for MT2 at the resource level seems unnecessary.</p> <p>Can the Crown confirm that “the position (e.g. Director) and the work unit (e.g. Division, Directorate) within the client organization to whom the services were delivered as a minimum,” are required for both MT1 and RT1a, but not MT2?</p> |
| A49 | Response to be provided in a future amendment. |
| Q50 | Is the RFP document available in Word format, so we don't have to re-type the front page or Supplier Statement (Attachment C)...by hand---(or fill it in by hand), or the tables. When having to re-type there is more chance of errors being made. |
| A50 | A copy of the RFSA document is not available in Word format. |
| Q51 | <p>We are writing to seek clarification with respect to the response to Q11 of Question and Answers - Set 1, in relation to the disclosure of client contact information, wherein you replied as follows:</p> <p><i>"For Corporate (MT1 and RT1a) and Resource (MT2) level references, Suppliers should provide the position (e.g. Director) and the work unit (e.g. Division, Directorate) within the client organization to whom the services were delivered as a minimum. The name, phone, and email of references should also be provided in the arrangement if the information is current (e.g. on-going project or client contact information is still accurate)"</i></p> <p>We respectfully request clarification with respect to the following:</p> <p>1) Stream 4 - Forensics entails investigations surrounding allegations of fraud and illegal activities. In order to maintain the confidentiality surrounding these matters, it is the utmost of importance that we refrain from disclosing names in documents. Therefore, we request confirmation that we can maintain the confidentiality of the client's name in our written submissions but acceptable to releasing them through other avenues i.e. contacting our General Counsel.</p> <p>2) In relation to providing the client references to meet the MT2 requirements, we request confirmation that this in relation to providing the client contact and reference information solely with respect to meeting the minimum project experience requirements and NOT for every single project to demonstrate years of experience.</p> |
| A51 | Response to be provided in a future amendment. |
| Q52 | If a firm is pursuing award of a new Supply Arrangement under PASS, for MORE than ONE Work Stream, do they have to submit a Separate Proposal (Arrangement) 'Document' for each stream, or may they submit ONE Proposal Arrangement document with SEPARATE SECTIONS for EACH stream being pursued so long as the streams are separately addressed along with the Mandatory and Rated Requirements for each? Please clarify. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| A52 | See the response to Q47. |
| Q53 | Under Part 6 it discusses the required Supplier and Personnel security clearances. With regards to the Personnel security clearance, must the personnel proposed for MT2 have security clearance at the time of the PASS Renewal submission, or would it be acceptable for these individuals to have their clearance in process with the CISD/PWGSC? |
| A53 | Security clearances, whether at the organization level or at the personnel level, are only required prior to supply arrangement award. |
| Q54 | As per the RFSA Statement of Requirements, Stream 7 (Internal Control Training) will require the services of professionals to deliver Internal Control Training and this training services may include, but is not limited to, internal audit; financial management; financial reporting; financial policy and accounting. Would the Crown please confirm that training surrounding auditing and accounting standards offered to external participants can be used to support experience for Workstream 7 in terms of mandatory and rated requirements (Firm and resources). |
| A54 | Response to be provided in a future amendment. |

All other terms and conditions remain the same and shall apply.