

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> PASS Renewal 2015	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> E60ZQ-140002/B	<b>Date</b> 2015-02-27
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> E60ZQ-140002	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 007
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 006zq.E60ZQ-140002	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZQ-006-28304	
<b>Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement</b> 2014-12-30 <b>Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale</b>	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2015-03-03</b>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> de Leon, Philip	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 006zq
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6489 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 997-2229
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> VARIOUS	
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> 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**

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b>	<b>No - Non</b>
<b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
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)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

This Amendment 007 is raised to:

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

#### **Questions and Answers - Set 6**

Q72	<p><b>Per Q&amp;A 62, the Crown's change in mandatory timelines for qualifying project citations from solicitation closing date to solicitation release date is inconsistent with fair procurement practices, which we do not believe was the Crown's intent. In particular, Bidders have had two months to prepare project references that qualify with the RFSA terms. A material change to the qualifying criteria of these project references the afternoon before submission due date is unreasonable. By making this amendment, the Crown may prejudicially limit the competition, contrary to the intent of this modification.</b></p> <p><b>Specifically, Q&amp;A 62 materially changes the content of our response and we have invested much time and effort to meet the (previous) February 26 closing date in accordance with the RFSA requirements. Providing alternate projects to meet this material change is costly and prejudicial to bidders who met the February 26 deadline.</b></p> <p><b>We ask that this modification be removed, to be consistent with fair procurement practices.</b></p>
A72	<p>The intent was to provide a fixed period during which project references would be considered valid given that the requirement as originally worded resulted in that period changing in the event of any extensions, as per the context given in the originally submitted Q62. Upon further review, the requirement has been amended below; The change addresses concerns raised in Q62 and those above, as it will provide a fixed start date (5 years from the date of original posting) but also allow for more recently completed projects to be provided as references.</p>
Q73	<p><b>With regard to the changes made in Amendment #1 and #5 we have significant concerns with the answer to Questions 20 and 62 and the recent change in the Technical Requirements.</b></p> <p><b>We understand the relevance of having a project completed within the last 5 years but do not see the significance of whether the project also started within the last five years. Many projects, in particular for Stream 4 – Forensic, can involve investigations or litigation that proceed through the court system and require a number of years to complete.</b></p> <p><b>The ultimate consideration should be as to whether a significant amount of the work required was completed in the last 5 years.</b></p> <p><b>We have already spent a significant amount of work doing case write-ups and contacting references to provide the firm experience necessary to qualify. This change will or may require the identification and substitution of a case or two for bidders and potentially does not provide enough time to identify other such projects. We have seen many RFPs over the years where the requirement called for a completed project in the last five years but none where the start date also fell within the five year window.</b></p>

	<b>We ask that PWGSC consider amending this requirement back to the original requirement of having the project being completed within the last 5 years regardless of the start date. This should at least be the case for Stream 4.</b>
A73	Please see the response provided to Q72. Furthermore, the requested change to Stream 4 is accepted - see amendments below.
Q74	<b>In MT1, it states “Four (4) projects started and completed within the past five (5) years from the solicitation closing date, valued at more than \$40,000.00 for the relevant stream”. Workstream 5 relates primarily to financial statement audits which are completed on an annual basis but usually are awarded in 2,3 of 5-year terms under one contract. Does the \$40,000 threshold relate to the annual audit fee or the contract value? For clarity, would a contract to perform three annual financial statement audits over three years at \$30,000 per year (\$90,000 contract value) be considered to meet the \$40,000 threshold?</b>
A74	Similar to the response provided to Q55, the thresholds specified for Workstream 5 (and this also applies to the relevant thresholds specified for all other Workstreams) relate to individual audit values as opposed to contract values (i.e. the example provided would not meet the established threshold). Based on the available data, the average value of projects under Stream 5 is above the \$40,000 threshold stipulated, as such, the requirement remains unchanged.
Q75	<p><b>This question directs back to Q&amp;A 11, which triggered another firm to issue Q 49, to which you responded the ‘same’ answer...pointing back to answer to Q 11.</b></p> <p><b>There is an issue. The answer you have provided so far seems not to AGREE with the RFSA (Original or Amendments). It could seriously impact / impede many, if not most, companies.</b></p> <p><b>In the RFSA, MT1, RT1a and RT1B----are CORPORATE experience for the streams. Suppliers must provide 4 (four) Project Summaries etc, AND for RT1a and RT1b, the information in the summaries is to include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>-Name of organization;</b></li> <li><b>-Name, phone and email address of client reference;</b></li> <li><b>-Scope, size in dollars and resources, and project timeframe (from-to dates in month/year);</b></li> <li><b>-Level of Effort in professional days</b></li> <li><b>-Objective and Outcome of the project; and</b></li> <li><b>-Description of the supplier’s role(s) and responsibility(ies) in the project</b></li> </ul> <p><b>FOR MT1, RT1a and RT1b---the answer makes sense, that we (as usual) must provide project details AND project reference coordinates information. This is standard.</b></p> <p><b>HOWEVER, you keep answering the question by ADDING this is ALSO required for MT2.</b></p> <p><b>THE RFSA ...MT2, THE PROPOSED NAMED RESOURCES, asks that we show THAT each named resource meets the educational/certification AND YEARS of experience as detailed in the SOR (for each applicable stream). It does NOT ask for ‘project</b></p>

	<p><b>references' for EVERY project it takes for a person to achieve that amount of experience. As the supplier in Q49 indicated this would amount to:</b></p> <p><b>Dozens if not hundreds of references, going back 10 years.</b></p> <p><b>Again, nowhere in the RFSA did it ask for project reference information for the RESOURCES for MT2. ONLY for MT1, RT1A and RT1b.</b></p> <p><b>Please confirm / clarify. AND, if companies do need to provide a project reference (and coordinates) for every single resource listed in we would need a significant extension.</b></p>
A75	<p>The Crown <b><u>requests</u></b> that the bidders identify the position title (e.g. Director) <b><u>and/or</u></b> the work unit (e.g. Division, Directorate) within the client organization to whom the services were delivered for MT2. Names of specific individuals do not need to be included if not available; however, information should be presented in a manner that allows the Crown to verify the work experience submitted for the named resources.</p>
Q76	<p><b>I Noted an amendment # 5 posted February 25 on PWGSC Buy and Sell website for the PASS Renewal 2015 – Solicitation E60ZQ-140002/B Amending Mandatory Technical Requirements 1 and 2 (MT1 and MT2) to require 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) replacing the original requirement of “completed projects within the past five (5) years from the solicitation closing date”.</b></p> <p><b>I request that PWGSC consider accepting projects completed from the solicitation closing date. We have completed our submission to meet the original closing date of February 26, 2015 and incurred significant effort to document and obtain references for compliant projects which have been completed prior to the solicitation closing date as per the original solicitation requirement. An arbitrary change at the last minute of project end date will render our completed submission non-compliant and require that we must rewrite our proposal and incur significant effort within a short extension.</b></p>
A76	<p>Please refer to the response provided to Q72.</p>

**The solicitation is amended as follows:**

**At Attachment B, Supply Arrangement Technical Evaluation Criteria,**

**DELETE:** Mandatory Technical Requirement 1 (MT1 and MT2) its entirety.

**INSERT:** Amended Mandatory Technical Requirement 1(MT1) 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:

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

E60ZQ-140002/B

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

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

---

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

Stream 4 - Forensic:

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

Stream 6 - Financial Accounting Services:

Four (4) projects\* started and completed within the period from five (5) years from the Date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-30) up to the solicitation closing date, 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 period from five (5) years from the Date of the Original Request for Supply Arrangement (2014-12-30) up to the solicitation closing date, 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.**

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