

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/Approvisionnements 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 2015-02-23
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client E60ZQ-140002	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
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 2015-03-03	
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 005 is raised to:

- respond to outstanding and newly submitted questions;
- extend the closing date; and
- amend the solicitation accordingly

Questions and Answers - Set 2

Q40	As I perceive to understand PASS is looking to award this particular vehicle to true accounting and audit firms or firms who have internal resources who offer these services as indicated in Streams 1 to 8. How will the Crown determine that the resources submitted by bidder's comply with the requirement to have internal resources therefore employees of the firm or Joint Venture? When you refer to internal resources can they be consultants who work for the bidder on contract? Please provide clarification as it is not clear.
A40	Canada considers a resource to be internal to the Supplier when the Supplier is solely responsible for the day-to-day management of their work, including verifying the quality of deliverables.

Questions and Answers - Set 3

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	As this Stream (nor Stream 7) does not require suppliers to provide resources at the Auditor or Junior Auditor levels, MT2 shall be amended (see below).
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	See response provided to Q44.
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	Please refer to the response provided to Q36 in Solicitation Amendment 002, Questions and Answers - Set 2.

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 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	<p>As per the original response given to Q11 in Solicitation Amendment 002, Questions and Answers - Set 1, the position (e.g. Director) and the work unit (e.g. Division, Directorate) within the client organization to whom the services were delivered should be provided as a minimum for MT1, MT2 and RT1a.</p>
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	The Crown requests at a minimum that the bidders identify the position title (e.g. Director) and the work unit (e.g. Division, Directorate) within the client organization to whom the services were delivered for MT1, RT1a and MT2. For Stream 4, information should be presented in a manner that allows verification without disclosure of specific names and/or client information.
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	For Stream 7, training provided to clients external to government may be used to support mandatory and rated requirements provided it meets the expectations of services to be provided as outlined in Section 2.7 of Annex A.

Questions and Answers - Set 4

Q55	For Section B3.1 Mandatory Technical Requirements MT1) Stream 8 – Recipient/contribution audits, can we please have clarification as to the \$40,000 requirement for firm projects. Does this refer to the overall contract amount we have with a specific department for a project, or does this refer to the individual audits within the contract that we perform. E.g. Would a \$90,000 overall contract with a department that has us conduct 3 audits for \$30,000 each qualify as a firm project? If this given scenario would not qualify, then we find the \$40,000 requirement very high and we would like to request to reduce it to \$15,000.
A44	The thresholds specified relate to individual audit values as opposed to contract values (i.e. the three audits at \$30,000 each would need to be presented, however they would not meet the established threshold). Based on the available data, the average value of projects under Stream 8 is above the stipulated \$40,000 threshold, as such, the requirement remains unchanged.
Q56	I appear to be encountering issues with the Supplier module of CPSS. In the “Mandatory Criteria” section, I am required to select the Streams for which I wish to qualify. After doing so and saving, I expected the categories to appear but nothing happens. Please advise.
A56	Please refer to the response provided to Q7 in Solicitation Amendment 001, Questions and Answers - Set 001.
Q57	Please confirm the documents and sections that are required to be submitted with the hard copy. The Supplier Declaration is required, but are we also required to submit the project descriptions as well as our resource descriptions?
A57	Further to the response provided to Q47 from Solicitation Amendment 3, Questions and Answers - Set 3, the hard copy of the Technical Arrangement should include the documents and sections that explain and demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements for

	each Stream the supplier wishes to qualify. This would include the project and resource descriptions.
Q58	On the CPSS submission for PASS, it only allows us to enter information for one former public servant. How do we proceed if we need to declare more than one individual? We are also experiencing the same issue for declaring individuals under the Workforce reduction program.
A58	The policies requiring former public servants and those subject to the Workforce Reduction Program to provide appropriate declarations are only applicable to subsequent contracts awarded from the resulting SAs and not to the RFSA qualification phase (this is also the case for the Federal Contractor's Program for Employment Equity). Unfortunately, the CPSS System currently does not allow for these certifications to be removed. In the scenario where a Supplier consists of multiple former public servants (i.e. those with an "ownership" stake in the organization submitting an arrangement), the Supplier can provide the information for one individual or, alternatively, provide a response of no to the appropriate certifications in CPSS.
Q59	As per Q/A47 in Amendment 003 suppliers are requested to provide their arrangements in 2 sections - a technical arrangement and an online response template. For the technical arrangement, the supplier is expected to provide 3 copies (as per Addendum 001). Can you please clarify if we are to submit a technical arrangement per Stream (i.e. if bidding on 8 streams, a total of 24 copies) or if we are required to submit one technical arrangement which encompasses all streams (i.e. if bidding on 8 streams, a total of 3 copies). The answer that was provided for the original Q47 is not clear. Please respond outlining the number of technical arrangements PWGSC is expected to receive from each proponent.
A59	Suppliers can submit a Technical Arrangement per Stream (i.e. if bidding on 8 streams, a total of 24 hard copies) or one technical arrangement which encompasses all streams (i.e. if bidding on 8 streams, a total of 3 hard copies), as long as the documentation submitted explains and demonstrates how they propose to meet the requirements for all of the Streams it wishes to qualify.
Q60	Would Canada please consider extending this solicitation by 4 weeks to allow firms ample time to respond to the requirements? There are multiple reasons for this. Firstly, all companies have to requalify for the vehicle, which is a considerable investment in terms of time and effort for respondent firms. Secondly, all firms will need more time to contact references due to the evolving requirements that were only amended in Amendment 2 at the beginning of February. Additionally, 6 questions in the most recent amendment issued on February 12th have been responded to by stating "Response to be provided in a future amendment." The Crown has still not responded to some questions. Due to the tight timelines required to gather all corporate and resource information, last minute outstanding amendments could negatively impact each firm's response.

A60	Given that the RFSA has been posted since December 30, 2014 and any requested changes to the solicitation have either confirmed the originally identified requirements or resulted in reductions to the requirements, an extension up to March 3, 2015 will be provided.
Q61	Given that responses to questions submitted are still pending, it is the February 18th and the closing date is February 24th, will an extension be provided?
A61	Please refer to the response provided to Q60.
Q62	Based on PWGSC's prior response to Q&A #20, the timelines for qualifying project citations are governed by the proposal submission date being - started and completed within the past 5 years from solicitation closing date. We recognize the requirement and importance for granting extensions; however, seeing that the content of the Bidder's proposal is directly tied the solicitation closing date, changes to the closing date have a detrimental effect in terms of: (1) efficiency surrounding the completion of the Bidder's proposal; and, (2) prejudicial in terms of which projects qualify as the closing date will be extended. Therefore, we respectfully request that PWGSC consider amending the answer previously issued for Q&A as follows: "...started and completed within the past 5 years from the date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-31)..."
A62	The change is acceptable to Canada and the solicitation will be amended.
Q63	It is February 19th. There are still no answers posted on Buy and Sell to address the questions that were not answered in the February 12th amendment. This means that they will not be up on Buy and Sell until tomorrow morning, February 20th, at the earliest. This requalification is due on Tuesday the 24th and critical questions that impact our bid have not yet been addressed, such as Question 49 regarding whether or not resources are still required to be submitted as per MT2. This effectively leaves us with two business days to incorporate the answers to the questions not yet addressed as well as any new answers issued with the forthcoming amendment into our bid. Can you please confirm whether Canada will be extending this solicitation?
A63	Please refer to the response provided to Q60.
Q64	Amendment 3, released on February 11, 2015 had a number of questions to the crown. The responses to those questions will have a material impact on our project references. Given the fact that the responses to those questions remain outstanding, we respectfully request a two (2) week extension to the close date of March 10, 2015, so that we may have sufficient time to prepare a complete and compliant proposal.
A64	Please refer to the response provided to Q60.
Q65	The due date is Tuesday Feb 24, but there are still numerous questions that are still pending responses, as noted in the last set of Q&As issues Feb 11, 2015. The responses that we are waiting for have an impact on being able to complete our response.

	Will the Crown please provide an additional 2 week extension to allow us to review the responses and enable us to complete our responses.
A65	Please refer to the response provided to Q60.

The solicitation is amended as follows:

At Page 1, Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin,

DELETE: 2015-02-26

INSERT: 2015-03-03

At Attachment B, Supply Arrangement Technical Evaluation Criteria,

DELETE: Mandatory Technical Requirements 1 and 2 (MT1 and MT2) in their entirety.

INSERT: Amended Mandatory Technical Requirements 1 and 2 (MT1 and MT2) as follows:

MT1) For each Stream for which an arrangement is being submitted, the Supplier must submit project summaries with the dollar value for each Stream as follows:

Stream 1 - Internal Audit Services;

Stream 3 - Information Technology and Systems Audits;

Stream 5 - External Audits; and

Stream 8 - Recipient/Contribution Audits:

Four (4) projects* started and completed within the past five (5) years from the Date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-30), valued at more than \$40,000.00 for the relevant Stream.

Stream 4 - Forensic:

Four (4) projects* started and completed within the past five (5) years from the Date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-30), valued at more than \$50,000.00 for the relevant Stream.

Stream 6 - Financial Accounting Services:

Four (4) projects* started and completed within the past five (5) years from the Date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-30), valued at more than \$20,000.00 for the relevant Stream.

Stream 2 - Practice Inspections; and

Stream 7 - Internal Control Training:

Two (2) projects* started and completed within the past five (5) years from the Date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-30), valued at more than \$10,000.00 for the relevant Stream.

***Suppliers must indicate the start and end dates of each project. Projects must be completed by the firm, as opposed to the individual resources.**

MT2) For Streams 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 the supplier must provide a corporate profile demonstrating that they have five (5) named internal resources as follows:

1 Partner/Managing Director;

1 Project Manager/Leader;

3 at Senior Auditor or Auditor levels.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

E60ZQ-140002/B

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

006zq

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

E60ZQ-140002

File No. - N° du dossier

006zqE60ZQ-140002

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

For Streams 2 and 7, the supplier must provide a corporate profile demonstrating that they have five (5) named internal resources as follows:

1 Partner/Managing Director;

1 Project Manager/Leader;

1 Senior Auditor; and

2 additional resources at any of the Partner/Managing Director, Project Manager/Leader or Senior Auditor levels.

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