

Various Level 3 Resources Enterprise Architecture

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

AMENDMENT NO. 1

This RFP amendment No. 1 is raised to;

- 1- Extend the RFP closing date from February 25, 2015 to March 04, 2015
- 2- Amend Page 65 – Annex A SOW of the EA RFP
- 3- Amend Page 8 - Part 2 Bidder Instructions – 2.4
- 4- Publish Canada's responses to outstanding Industry questions.

1- Extend the RFP closing date from February 25, 2015 to March 04, 2015

2- At Page 65 of the Enterprise Architecture RFP – M1

DELETE: Maximum of five (5) contracts

INSERT: Maximum of ten (10) contracts

DELETE: Value in excess of \$2M.

INSERT: Value in excess of \$1M.

3- At Page 8 of the Enterprise Architecture RFP – Bidder Instructions – 2.4

DELETE: Fourteen (14)

INSERT: Ten (10)

4- Publish Canada's responses to Industry questions received during the question period.

Question	Answer
<p>#01. Please identify whether there is or has been in the past, a company or individuals performing similar or related work? If so, through which company, what was the contract value, and how long were they performing the services under the contract (i.e.: length of initial contract and any extensions)?</p>	<p>Yes, there are companies performing this work. Canada will not divulge the name of the company and/or companies. Contract Value - Initial Contract Period, 2 years. Value @ \$4,449,375.00 with 3 additional 1 year options.</p>
<p>#02. With respect to the subject solicitation, the details in R2 appear to limit the ability of many qualified firms to put in a submission. In our opinion, R2 is unfairly restrictive and severely limits qualified firms from being able to bid. There is a long history of these solicitations resulting in a simple change of vendors – with the winning firms(s) providing many of the same subcontractors back to the crown that currently bill on the existing vehicle. If a multi-billion dollar global company that currently does</p>	<p>The requirements as outlined in the RFP will remain unchanged.</p>

<p>multi- million dollar, multi-year, multi-resource business with the crown in the NCR can't respond to the criteria in R2, is the crown willing to accept that it may not receive many valuable responses for evaluation?</p> <p>We strongly recommend that R2 be changed to :</p> <p>SSC believes that the most significant risk associated with this contract is that the Contractor will be unable to provide the required number of qualified resources or existing resources, within the timeframe specified in the Task Solicitation process. Bidders should supply a maximum of two (2) client contracts with contact references within the past 24 months encompassing multi-resource, multi-year contracts with a minimum billed value of 1 million dollars and one additional contract valued at over 5 Million where a minimum of 20 resources were transitioned from other service provider(s) within a 24 month period. Qualifying resources must have been on assignment for a minimum 6 consecutive months, and must have billed no fewer than 90 days during the 6 month period. Bidders to build and submit an excel spreadsheet document which will reflect a summarization containing the following information; To be considered, reference project information must include: · Client Organization Name · Client Contact name and Title · Client Contact Phone # · Client Contact Email Address · Start and end dates (yy/mo)</p>	
<p>#03. After reviewing this TBIPS we would like to suggest that you extend the Mandatory Corporate M1 to change "The experience must occur within the past 10 years.instead of 5 years prior to the RFP closing, similar to the last 5 to 6 TBIPS that SSC has sent out recently with similar requirements.</p> <p>Can it be changed?</p>	<p>The requirements as outlined in the RFP will remain unchanged.</p>
<p>Q4. The Corporate Mandatory Requirement M1 is very restrictive and will eliminate many capable companies who have been awarded architecture focused contracts in the last 2 years because of the requirement for the contracts to have a <u>billed value of over \$2Million</u>. Recent contracts are not likely to qualify as the billed value may not yet have reached \$2Million. Additionally, given the high value required, only contracts issued under TBIPS Tier 2 (contracts issued by PWGSC and recently by SSC) will be compliant. Further, the number of billed days required will simply eliminate most bidders. In order to make this procurement fair to a number of bidders that have the experience and the capability to supply these services, we request that the Crown consider making the following amendment to this criterion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1a) We request that the <u>billed value for the contracts be lowered to \$1Million</u> or more. This is in line with similar recent procurement. - 1b) We request that the number of contracts that can be used to meet M1 and R1 billable days requirement be <u>10 contracts instead of 5</u>. Again, this is in line with recent similar procurement. Given the <u>unusually high number of billable days</u> required to simply comply (total of 9,700 days billed) and to score full points on the rated (total of 19,400 days billed), it is practically impossible to have all of those days within 5 contracts. It would be more reasonable for bidders to have the possibility to use 10 contracts in order to gather up that many billed days. 	<p>Change request granted as outlined in the above amendment</p>

<p>Please consider amending M1 and R1 as suggested above to make this procurement ethical and fair.</p>	
<p>Q5. Ref: Page 65, Item 3. Mandatory Criteria, Mandatory Requirement M1 and page 67, Item 4. Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Rated Evaluation Criteria R1. The requirement states that the services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five (5) contacts and the same contracts must be used to substantiate R1 which increases the minimum billable days by 100% to score full points.</p> <p>Under this criterion, the client is asking Bidder's to provide billable days that are equivalent to 40 years of Enterprise Architecture, more than 36 years for Technology Architecture, and more than 10 years for Business Architecture experience.</p> <p>The volume of billable days required and the limitation of only five contracts within a five year period makes it difficult for any company (or pre-established JV) to have delivered enough services to meet the criteria within a five contract, five year window.</p> <p>We kindly request that the criteria for M1 and R1 be expanded to a maximum of ten contracts within a ten year window. This will benefit the client by increasing participation from Bidder's, resulting in more competitive and compliant choices for the client.</p>	<p>Change request partially granted as noted in the above amendment</p>
<p>Q6. Ref: Page 65, Item 3. Mandatory Criteria, Mandatory Requirement M1. The criteria states that "The work delivered by the Category of Personnel must include at least 70% of the associated general roles, responsibilities and tasks listed in the Statement of Work..." We understand the intent within this criterion is for Bidder's to substantiate that they are able to provide resources that meet and exceed the Mandatory and Rated Requirements for the Task Solicitation Process (page 49 to 78). We understand this to mean that 70% of the tasks listed on page 41 Item 2.0 General Role Responsibilities must be met in addition to 70% of each of the associated general roles (as found on pages 42, 43 and 45 of the RFP. This breaks down to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 2.1 I.11 Technology Architect Level 3 = 49 tasks · 2.2 P.1 Enterprise Architect Level 23 = 46 tasks · 2.3 B.2 Business Architect Level 3 = 24 tasks <p>If we compare the number of tasks to be demonstrated in M1 against the number of tasks within the Mandatory and Rated Requirements for the Task Solicitation Process (page 49 to 78) grids, there is a huge discrepancy between the tasks Bidders are being asked to validate and the actual tasks the resources will be performing at the time of Task Authorization. Additionally, the volume of tasks being asked to</p>	<p>Section 2.0 "General Roles, Responsibilities" is for reference purposes only. When providing substantiation for M1 and R1, bidders must demonstrate that they have performed a minimum of 70% of the listed tasks in each category of personnel listed. As such, project experience is accepted if it demonstrates at least 30 of the 42 bullets for Technology Architect, 27 of the 38 bullets for Enterprise Architect and 5 of the 7 bullets for Business Architect. Regarding the resource requirements listed in Appendix A to Annex A, the rated grids are for reference purposes only, which may be used to</p>

<p>demonstrate in M1 means that even incumbent Bidders will have difficulty meeting this criteria unless each Statement of Work issued against the Task Authorization clearly demonstrated the criteria illustrated on pages 49 to 78.</p> <p>To enable non-incumbent Bidders to bid on this RFP we kindly request that M1 criteria be amended to the following:</p> <p>"The work delivered by the Category of Personnel must include at least 10% of the General Role Responsibilities under Section 2.0 on pages 41 and 42, in addition to at least 15% of the Associated General Roles and Tasks listed in the Statement of Work of this bid solicitation for the Category of Personnel."</p>	<p>create resource evaluation grids at the task solicitation stage(after contract award), and are not to be incorporated into bidders RFP response.</p> <p>The requirements as outlined in RFP will remain unchanged.</p>
<p>Q7. The current due date requested by the client will pose a significant issue for Bidders given the volume of data mining and substantiation required. We understand the client has a timeline to adhere to and respectfully request if the client will please work with Bidders by granting a 4-week extension. This will benefit the client by increasing participation from Bidders and this will result in more compliant choices for the client.</p>	<p>A one(1) week extension has been granted as noted in the above amendment</p>
<p>Q8. 1) Is there, or has there ever been, an incumbent performing some or all of these services. 2) Can the client please identify the Vendors and disclose the contract start and end dates and the dollar values associated with the Contracts.</p>	<p>1) Refer to question 1. 2) Canada will not divulge the vendor's name. Contract Start Date: 18/02/2011 End Date: 31/10/2015</p>
<p>Q9. Can suppliers use references for projects completed in the U.S. to answer M1 (and by extension R1)?</p>	<p>This question will be answered in Amendment 02</p>
<p>Q10. Is there someone currently, or has there been someone in the past providing similar or relevant services? If yes, who has been providing these services, what is (or was) the contract value and what is (or was) the duration of the contract (including any extensions), and are they allowed to bid on this opportunity?</p>	<p>Refer to Question 1 and Question 8. Yes. They are allowed to bid on this opportunity.</p>
<p>Q11. Given the volume of RFPs that are currently out and given the amount of work required to respond to this solicitation will the Crown please consider extending the closing date to March 20, 2015 to allow bidders the time to develop a response?</p>	<p>Refer to Question 7.</p>
<p>Q12. With regards to R2 at page 68 of 78: it is requested that Bidders demonstrate corporate capability with recent large Task Based contracts by listing the number of resources on assignments under 2 contracts during the past 24 months. It is indicated that we must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource name, category and total number of applicable billed days (resource cannot be counted more than once) <p>Can you please confirm that the resource categories for the purpose of demonstrating R2 can be any TBIPS category?</p>	<p>Canada confirms that for the purposes of R2, all TBIPS resource categories will be acceptable.</p>

<p>Q13. In section 2.4 – Enquiries – Bid solicitation (page 8 of 78): it is stated: “All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority no later than 14 calendar days before bid closing.”. The Solicitation period is only 20 days so this means that bidders have only 6 days to asks questions. This means that the question period closes tomorrow, Feb. 11th. Meanwhile our question has not yet been posted and any other bidders’ question is still not posted. It is important for bidders to have the opportunity to ask questions with regards to amendments as well as with regards to the RFP. On all other TBIPS we have received, the question period closes 10 calendar days before RFP closing date.</p> <p>We are therefore assuming that this is a typo and that Section 2.4 should read “All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority no later than <u>10 calendar days before bid closing</u>.”. Can you please confirm?</p>	<p>Canada confirms this is a typo. Refer to this amendment.</p>
<p>Q14. Please advise if there are currently, or recently, within the last 12 months contractors working in these, or related positions? If so, what is the contracting company name, contract duration and value?</p>	<p>Refer to Questions 1, 8 and 10.</p>
<p>Q15. M1 requires that the bidder demonstrate 4000 billable days for the Technology Architect, 4500 days for the Enterprise Architect and 1200 days for the Business Architect, acquired within the past five (5) years. Restricting experience gained within this limited timeframe is extreme. There are very few companies who have acquired the magnitude of the billable days required in this limited timeframe, and favors large, System Integrator Companies and those vendors who have held recent contracts of similar scope. Our firm has the proven capability to provide these resource categories, having managed multi-million dollar contracts with the Federal Government for same and similar services. In order to ensure a fair, open and competitive procurement process, we respectfully request that billable days may be acquired within the last 15 years or, at the very least, within the last 10 years.</p>	<p>Refer to Question 4</p>
<p>Q16. Part 3 – 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions, b. Joint Venture Experience (Page 10 of 78), regarding M1 “Minimum Number of Billable Days. The services provided have been provided under a maximum of five (5) contracts”. Will the Crown accept contracts from more than one member of the joint venture to meet this criterion?</p>	<p>Bid responses that are submitted by a previously existing TBIPS joint venture entity may only use client reference projects that were delivered by the same joint venture entity. A joint venture bid will not receive credit for referenced projects that were delivered by an individual partner in the joint venture where billing occurred under a</p>

	different supply arraignment number.
<p>Q17.: With respect to Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation Criteria, mandatory requirement M1 (page 65 of 78), please confirm that the Category of Personnel should read “Architect” in lieu of “Architecture”.</p>	<p>Confirmed. It should read “Architect”</p>
<p>Q18. With respect to Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation Criteria, mandatory requirement M1 (page 65 of 78), it is unclear as to what specific items need to be mapped to the contract reference categories that we will be using to demonstrate the necessary billable days. Please provide us with an example of how the mapping should be done.</p>	<p>Bidders must use client reference projects to demonstrate that they have delivered relevant services. Client reference projects must include task based billed days that reflect 70 percent of bullets listed for each category of personnel in statement of work.</p> <p>The referenced projects' SOW's may be included and/or other factual project descriptions should be provided to substantiate the criteria.</p>
<p>Q19. Given the amount of effort to respond to M1 (to demonstrate the 70% mapping to SOW), we are requesting a three (3) week extension.</p>	<p>Refer to Question 7</p>
<p>Q20. The tasks listed for each of the three roles in Section 2 of the Statement of Work include a significant proportion that is SSC-specific. This creates a situation that limits competition and favors the incumbent, particularly when combined with the requirement in M1 that work delivered on referenced projects must include at least 70% of the tasks listed. We therefore request that the requirement in M1 be modified from 70% to 50%, consistent with other recent Government of Canada procurements, as a means of fostering competition to obtain best value for Canada.</p>	<p>SSC maintains that the non-limited tasks listed for each sought category of personal; Enterprise Architects (38), Technology Architects (42) and Business Architects (7) are not SSC exclusive but general tasks which senior resources should have familiarity and experience delivering including on none SSC initiatives. SSC's requirement of 70 percent demonstration of experience based on respective category listed task shall remain unchanged.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS RFP
REMAIN UNCHANGED.

=====

Following is a summary of Amendments issued to date to this Bid Solicitation:

Document Tracking	Date	Description
Amendment No. 001	February 13, 2015	Extend the RFP closing date from February 25, 2015 to March 04, 2015 Amend Page 65 – Annex A SOW of the EA RFP Publish Canada's responses to outstanding Industry questions. Amend Page 8 - Part 2 Bidder Instructions – 2.4