

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
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

Title - Sujet TBIPS for the Physical Resources	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 08324-130123/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 14-73881	Date 2015-03-19
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-606-28536	
File No. - N° de dossier 606el.08324-130123	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2015-04-14	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Mansour, Silvana	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 606el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-3519 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-5925
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

This document includes questions received from potential bidders with the corresponding answers and an amendment.

Question 11

Programmer Analyst - M2.3 States – “The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience developing solutions that address network latency issues in a global network environment.”

We interpret this requirement as a need to support out-of-country points-of-service which may have limited networks and Internet access. The same problem exists in some parts of Canada and North America where remote offices (i.e. Yukon, Nunavut, etc.) require support through bandwidth with limited Internet speeds. Would the client consider experience developing solutions for national networks with latency issues as equivalent to “global network environment”?

Answer 11

Canada will consider the experience of developing solutions for National Networks with latency issues in remote locations in parts of Canada and North America as demonstrated where bandwidth and throughput has been a major part of the resource’s experience, including experience with Land lines, microwave and satellite feeds, as equivalent to “global Network Environment”.

We want to be sure the resources have the experience to deal with latency issues that we encounter globally with Land Lines (not consistent), wireless (intermittent) and Satellite feeds (where a minimum of 800ms, one-way latency, is observed). Our applications must be able to work in these environments with minimal delays, so we build applications that can handle this type of issue.

Question 12

For R1.3 - Application/Software Architect

The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience developing, implementing and deploying applications using:

- MS Team Foundation;
- Buildit;
- NDoc;
- Rational XEP
- FXCop
- CodeSmith

When you mention “Rational XEP” can you please clarify if you meant to say “Rational RDE”? If not please clarify.

Answer 12

There was a spelling mistake on the RFP and subsequently in solicitation amendment 002, Q & A #8, where iTextSharp was accepted as an equivalent. Rational XEP should read Rational XDE. An acceptable equivalent must be an Enterprise UML Modeller such as Rational Rose. iTextSharp is not an Enterprise related application, therefore will not be accepted as an equivalent. The RFP is amended, please see amendment below.

Question 13

In relation to Point Rated Requirement R1.2 - Application Architect, according to the CSLA's creator, Rockford Lhotka, CSLA .Net VB is not recommended for production environments. He states "CSLA .NET VB is almost completely feature-compatible with CSLA .NET for Windows.

Given the fact that this product is not recommended for production use, it is unreasonable and highly restrictive for the Crown to request that individuals have 5 years of experience with this product.

This requirement also provides up to 5 points for 5 years of experience with CSLA.Net (4.X). CSLA.NET 4 was officially launched on July 23 of 2010. It is therefore not possible that a resource has gained 5 years' experience with this product.

We do understand this role will be best served by individuals that have expertise with CSLA and would therefore ask the Crown to consider amending and simplifying this requirement to provide 2 points per year to a maximum of 5 years for experience building distributed object oriented business software using CSLA.

Answer 13

Canada has reviewed the request and the RFP is amended, however Canada cannot accept just a blanket CSLA experience. See amendment below.

Question 14

In relation to Application Architect, R1.3, the Crown asks for experience developing, implementing and deploying applications using Rational XEP. Upon investigation, it has come to our attention that this product does not exist and therefore it is impossible to have experience with this technology. Considering this fact, will the Crown eliminate this requirement from R1.3 ?

Answer 14

There was a spelling error to this requirement. Please refer to Question and Answer 13 above and the amendment below.

Question 15

With regard the mandatory requirement M1.1 for the Application/Software Architect, Level 3, would the Crown accept 20+ years of experience as equivalent to a degree in Computer Sciences or Systems Engineering?

Answer 15

Canada has reviewed the request, however the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 16

Reference 4.3, Financial Evaluation. For evaluation purposes, it appears that financial points are allocated to only 3 of the 7 categories (see Table 1 – Maximum Points Assigned and Table 4 – Maximum Points Assigned). Also, at (c) (ii), it states that for each period and each Resource Category points will be allocated as follows ... – again, accommodating for only 3 resource categories. Please confirm that only Level 3 Programmer Analyst, Level 2 Database Analyst and Level 3 Project Manager will be used for the financial evaluation? If not, please clarify.

Answer 16

There was an error on the tables. All 7 resources will be used for the financial evaluation. Points will be allocated for each period and each Resource Category as indicated in the RFP. See amendment below.

Question 17

Due to the complexity of the requirements and the considerable amount of work involved in putting together our response, we respectfully ask for a 2 week extension.

Answer 17

An extension to the closing date is granted, see amendment below.

Question 18

M.5.1 The bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a post-secondary degree or diploma in Computer Sciences, or Computer Engineering or Computer Technology from a recognized Canadian academic institution or an international academic institution recognized by the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials.

Since this is a Level 2 position, would the Crown accept a candidate that has a minimum of 10 years' experience as a DataBase Analyst to be the equivalent of a degree or diploma in Computer Sciences, or Computer Engineering or Computer Technology? OR

Would the Crown consider an Information Technology Diploma from the Information Technology Institute as the equivalent of a degree or diploma in Computer Sciences, or Computer Engineering or Computer Technology?

Answer 18

Canada will not accept 10 years experience in lieu of the degree, however will accept an Information Technology Diploma from the Information Technology Institute as an equivalent.

Question 19

M.1.1 The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a degree in Computer Sciences or Systems Engineering from a recognized Canadian University or an equivalent international academic institution recognized by the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials.

M2.1 asks that The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a post-secondary degree or diploma in Computer Sciences or Computer Engineering, or Computer Technology from a recognized Canadian academic institution or an international academic institution recognized by the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials, **or minimum of 10 years' experience as a Programmer/Analyst.**

Would DFATD accept a candidate that has a minimum of 10 years' experience as an Application/Software Architect? OR

Would the Crown consider a Degree in Science from an equivalent international academic institution as the equivalent of a degree or diploma in Computer Sciences, or Computer Engineering or Computer Technology?

Answer 19

Canada has reviewed the request, however the requirement remains unchanged.

Amendment:

At page 1:

DELETE: The solicitation closes at 2:00 p.m. EDST on March 25, 2015

INSERT: The solicitation closes at 2:00 p.m. EDST on April 14, 2015

At Attachment 4.1, Resource Point Rated Requirements**1. APPLICATION/SOFTWARE ARCHITECT - LEVEL 3****DELETE:**

R1.3	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience developing, implementing and deploying applications using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS Team Foundation; • Buildit or its equivalent MS Build/TFS Continuous Integration; • NDoc or its equivalent Visual Studio Generate XML Documentation File; • Rational XEP or its equivalent iTextSharp; • FXCop; and • CodeSmith 	18	<p>One point per application per year up to a maximum of 3 points each</p> <p>0 points = 0 experience</p>	
-------------	---	-----------	---	--

INSERT:

R1.3	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience developing, implementing and deploying applications using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS Team Foundation; • Buildit or its equivalent MS Build/TFS Continuous Integration; • NDoc or its equivalent Visual Studio Generate XML Documentation File; • Rational XDE or its equivalent an Enterprise UML modeller such as Rational Rose; • FXCop; and • CodeSmith 	12	<p>One point per application per year up to a maximum of 2 points each</p> <p>0 points = 0 experience</p>	
-------------	---	-----------	---	--

At Attachment 4.1, Resource Point Rated Requirements

1. APPLICATION/SOFTWARE ARCHITECT - LEVEL 3**DELETE:**

R1.2	The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience building distributed object oriented business software using: a) CSLA (VB.NET) b) CSLA.NET (4.x)	10	One point per application per year up to a maximum of 5 points each 0 points = 0 experience	
-------------	--	-----------	--	--

INSERT:

R1.2	The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience building distributed object oriented business software using CSLA.NET (4.x)	16	Four points per year up to a maximum of 16 points 0 points = 0 experience	
-------------	---	-----------	--	--

At Part 4.3 Financial Evaluation, (c) Financial Evaluation – Method A**(ii) Step 2 – Points Allocation****DELETE:**

Table 1 – Maximum Points Assigned

INSERT:

TABLE 1 - MAXIMUM POINTS ASSIGNED					
RESOURCE CATEGORIES	INITIAL CONTRACT PERIOD	OPTION PERIOD 1	OPTION PERIOD 2	OPTION PERIOD 3	TOTAL POINTS
Project Manager - Level 3	120	120	120	120	480
Programmer Analyst - Level 3	220	220	220	220	880

Database Analyst - Level 2	200	200	200	200	800
Application/Software Architect – Level 3	120	120	120	120	480
Programmer Analyst – Level 2	220	220	220	220	880
Web Developer – Level 2	120	120	120	120	480
Quality Assurance Specialist – Level 2	100	100	100	100	400
TOTAL	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	4,400

At Part 4.3 Financial Evaluation, (d) Financial Evaluation – Method B

(ii) Step 2 – Points Allocation

DELETE:

Table 4 – Maximum Points Assigned

INSERT:

TABLE 4 - MAXIMUM POINTS ASSIGNED					
RESOURCE CATEGORIES	INITIAL CONTRACT PERIOD	OPTION PERIOD 1	OPTION PERIOD 2	OPTION PERIOD 3	TOTAL POINTS
Project Manager - Level 3	120	120	120	120	480
Programmer Analyst - Level 3	220	220	220	220	880
Database Analyst - Level 2	200	200	200	200	800
Application/Software Architect – Level 3	120	120	120	120	480

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

08324-130123/A

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

14-73881

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

003

File No. - N° du dossier

606e108324-130123

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

606e1

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Programmer Analyst – Level 2	220	220	220	220	880
Web Developer – Level 2	120	120	120	120	480
Quality Assurance Specialist – Level 2	100	100	100	100	400
TOTAL	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	4,400

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED