



**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 Division / Division  
des services professionnels en informatique  
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier  
3C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TBIPS - Professional Services requi	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 21120-158459/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 007
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 21120-15-2088459	<b>Date</b> 2016-02-12
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-615-29745	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 615zm.21120-158459	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-02-23</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Barbu, Ana-Maria	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 615zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6282 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

**AMENDMENT NO. 007**

**This amendment is raised to modify the Request for Proposal (RFP) and answer Bidders' questions:**

**RFP MODIFICATIONS:**

1. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream I – Business Applications Services, 2.6.1 – A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle), Level 3 (Core Category), Mandatory Criteria – M1.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

Mandatory Criteria		Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle), Level 3 (Core)		
<b>M1</b>	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of 10 years of experience within the last 15 years working as an ERP Technical Analyst by providing the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the client;</li> <li>2. The total number of years of experience performing the above mentioned tasks;</li> <li>3. The start and end dates of the assignment(s);</li> <li>4. Details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the assignment(s) including deliverables;</li> <li>5. A customer reference that can attest to the proposed resource's experience.</li> </ol>	

2. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream I – Business Applications Services, 2.6.1 – A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle), Level 3 (Core Category), Mandatory Criteria – M3.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

Mandatory Criteria		Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle), Level 3 (Core)		
<b>M3</b>	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of 5 years of experience as an ERP Technical Analyst working with Oracle relational database management system (RDBMS) v9 or higher in conjunction with Oracle Financials v11i or higher by providing the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the client;</li> <li>2. The total number of years of experience</li> </ol>	

	performing the above mentioned tasks; 3. The start and end dates of the assignment(s); 4. Details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the assignment(s) including deliverables; 5. A customer reference that can attest to the proposed resource's experience.	
--	--	--

3. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream I – Business Applications Services, 2.7.1 – A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (CRM), Level 3 (Core Category), Rated Criteria – A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (CRM), Level 3 (Core), R1.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

#	Rated Criteria A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (CRM), Level 3 (Core)	Max Points	Scores to be assigned based on the following	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
R1	Demonstrate that the proposed resource holds the following Microsoft certifications by including a copy of the certification/ designation with their bid.  (a) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Customization and Configuration  (b) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Applications  (c) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Deployment  (d) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Extending Microsoft Dynamics	/10	5 points per certification up to a maximum of 10 points.	

4. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream I – Business Applications Services, 2.8.1 – A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core Category), Rated Criteria – A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core), R1.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

#	Rated Criteria A.6 Programmer/Software Developer Level 3 (Core)	Max Points	Scores to be assigned based on the following	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
R1	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience developing applications using a .Net 4.0 framework, with all of the following:</p> <p>(a) Windows Presentation Foundation (WPF);  (b) Windows Communication Foundation (WCF); and  (c) Oracle 11g or higher database.</p> <p>By providing the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the client</li> <li>2. The total number of years of experience performing the above mentioned tasks;</li> <li>3. The start and end dates of the assignment(s);</li> <li>4. Details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the assignment(s) including deliverables;</li> <li>5. A customer reference that can attest to the proposed resource's experience.</li> </ol>	/10	2.5 points per year of experience up to a maximum of 10 points.	

5. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream III – IMS Business Alignment, 6.3.1 – B.3 Business Consultant, Level 3 (Core), Rated Criteria – B.3 Business Consultant, Level 3 (Core), R1.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

#	RATED CRITERIA B.3 Business Consultant, Level 3 (Core)	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
---	---	---------------	---	--

#	RATED CRITERIA B.3 Business Consultant, Level 3 (Core)	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
R1	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource has the following certifications/designations by including a copy of the certification/designation with their bid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Certified Management Consultant (CMC)</li> <li>(b) Master of Business Administration (MBA); and</li> <li>(c) Professional Engineer (P.Eng)</li> </ul> <p>For resources that are required post-contract award, the Bidder may be requested to provide a copy of the certifications/designations as proof of education.</p>	/30	15 points per designation up to a maximum of 30 points.	

6. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream III – IMS Business Alignment Services, 6.4.1 – B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist Level 3 (Core), Rated Criteria - B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist Level 3 (Core), R1.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

#	RATED CRITERIA B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist Level 3	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV

#	RATED CRITERIA B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist Level 3	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
R1	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource has the following certification(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Certified Business Resilience Professional (CBRP)</li> <li>(b) Certified Business Continuity Capability Maturity Assessor (BCMM); and</li> <li>(c) Master Business Continuity Professional (MBCP)</li> </ul> <p>By providing a copy of the certification/designation with their bid.</p> <p>For resources that are required post-contract award, the Bidder may be requested to provide a copy of certification/designation as proof.</p>	/30	15 points per certification up to a maximum of 30 points.	

7. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream III – IMS Business Alignment Services, 6.1.1 – B.1 Business Analyst, Level 3 (Core), Rated Criteria - B.1 Business Analyst, Level 3 (Core), R4.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

#	RATED CRITERIA B.1 Business Analyst, Level 3 (Core)	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
---	---	---------------	---	---

#	RATED CRITERIA B.1 Business Analyst, Level 3 (Core)	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	Statement of Compliance and Cross Reference to Written Proposal /CV
R4	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience within the last 15 years authoring technical documentation in either official language (French or English) for GoC application development projects by providing the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the client;</li> <li>2. The total number of years of experience performing the above mentioned tasks;</li> <li>3. The start and end dates of the assignment(s);</li> <li>4. Details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the assignment(s) including deliverables;</li> <li>5. A customer reference that can attest to the proposed resource's experience.</li> </ol>	/20	5 points per project up to a maximum of 20 points.	

8. At Attachment 4.1 – Resource Criteria for Workstream II – Project Management & IT Security Services, 4.6.1 – P.9 Project Manager, Level 3 (Core), Rated Criteria – .9 Project Manager, Level 3 (Core), R5.

**DELETE:** In its entirety.

**INSERT:**

#	RATED CRITERIA P.9 Project Manager, Level 3 (Core)	MAX POINTS	SCORES TO BE ASSIGNED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING	INSERT PAGE # OF RESUME
R5	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed resource holds any the following certifications by including a copy of the certification/designation with their bid:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Master of Project Management (MPM)</li> <li>2. Prince2</li> <li>3. ITIL Foundation</li> <li>4. COBIT</li> <li>5. PMP</li> <li>6. MBA</li> </ol> <p>For resources that are required post-contract award, the Bidder may be requested to provide a copy of certification(s)/designation(s)) as proof of education.</p>	/20	5 points per certification up to a maximum of 20 points.	

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**Q1. Workstream II** - Prior to TBIPS solicitation EN578-055605/E, requirements for specialized security resources were procured through the Cyber Protection Supply Arrangement (CPSA). In 2013 when the CPSA was sunset and a new Cyber Protection Services stream was added to TBIPS, vendors, who were not previously qualified on the CPSA, were required to provide references for 9 of 17 IT security categories to qualify for Tier 2. These categories, being so highly specialized, made it difficult for new vendors to qualify. Workstream II of this RFP is for different types of professional services, not all related to Cyber Security. Including categories from the Cyber Protection Services stream of TBIPS Tier 2 will exclude capable vendors from competing. Since only those vendors holding a TBIPS SA for Tier 2 in the National Capital Region under EN578-055605/E are eligible to compete, would the Crown please consider removing the IT Security TRA & C&A Analyst category from Workstream II?

**A1.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the requirement for Workstream II of this RFP.

**Q2. All Workstreams, resources' client references** - The RFP requires bidders to provide client references and contact information for all projects referenced by proposed resources within the mandatory and rated criteria, in some cases for 10+ years of projects. In our experience gathering references for this many projects has been problematic for resources because their contacts have moved on, retired, etc. Would the Crown please amend the requirements to allow all resources being evaluated to provide three recent client references?

In every resource evaluation grid, each criterion asks for a customer reference that can attest to the proposed resource's experience. In many cases, the Crown is seeking experience within the last 10 or 15 years. Given that it will be difficult for every proposed resource to provide customer references for projects dating back more than 10 years, will the Crown accept that for projects cited in the resource evaluation grids which were completed prior to January 2006, that no customer reference will be required?

**A2.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise these criteria. The requirement remains the same, the bidder must provide the contact information for the references as specified in the evaluation criteria. However if the contact information for the references are not provided by bid closing, Canada reserves the right to request the references through the Evaluation Procedures described in section 4.1 (c) (ii), Requests for Further Information and section 4.2 (d) Reference Checks of Part 4 in the RFP.

**Q3. Workstream I - A.1 Application/Software Architect – Level 3, M2** requires three projects where the resource performed all of the listed tasks. Would the Crown consider amending this requirement to 60% of the listed tasks to allow for more qualified resources to be bid?

**A3.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the requirement. The listed tasks in M2 represent 50% of the tasks listed in SOW for this category and level.

**Q4. Workstream I - A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle) – Level 3, M1** requires 10 years of experience working as an Applications Database Administrator. Could the Crown please confirm if this is an error, and should read 'working as an ERP Technical Analyst'?

**A4.** Canada confirms that this is an error. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q5. Workstream I - A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle) – Level 3, M3** requires experience working as an Applications Database Administrator. Could the Crown please confirm if this is an error, and should read 'working as an ERP Technical Analyst'?

**A5.** Canada confirms that this is an error. Please see RFP modifications #007

**Q6. Workstream I - A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (CRM) – Level 3, R1** awards 2.5 points per each of the following certifications:

- (a) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Customization and Configuration
- (b) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Applications
- (c) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Deployment
- (d) Microsoft Certified Technology Specialist (MCTS): Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 or 2013 Extending Microsoft Dynamics

Since it's uncommon for resources to possess all four designations, it will be difficult for resources to meet the pass mark of 21 out of 30 points. Would the Crown consider removing this requirement to allow for more qualified resources to be bid? Or, award the full 10 points for R1 for \*any\* of the listed designations?

**A6.** Canada will revise to 5 points per certification to a maximum of 10 points. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q7. Workstream I - A.6 Programmer/Software Developer Level 3 (Core), R1** requires 5 years of experience for full points. Considering that the .Net 4.0 framework was released in April 2010, to obtain full points would essentially mean that any proposed candidate would have been performing the tasks in this criteria non-stop for the last 5 years. Given that many organizations, chiefly Federal Government Departments are late adopters of new technologies, it is unlikely that a potential candidate would have 5 full years of experience. Please adjust the scoring so that 3 years of experience with this criteria would score full points.

**A7.** Canada will revise the points to allow full points for 4 years of experience. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q8. Workstream II – C.3 IT Security TRA, C&A Analyst, Level 3 (Core), R1** – Of the three certifications required to score full points, the GSNA certificate is proprietary to Global Information Assurance Certification; not as common as an ITIL or CISA, therefore, the potential pool of candidates for this position would be limited – please amend this requirement so that possessing any two of the three listed certifications would be given full points.

**A8.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the criterion. This Criterion is a rated criterion and doesn't impact reaching the minimum score.

**Q9. Workstream III – B.3 Business Consultant, Level 3 (Core) – Rated Criteria R1** – We fail to see the relevance to this project of a Professional Engineer (P.Eng) designation. Considering that in Mandatory Requirement M1, a proposed resource can hold a diploma or degree in Science, Commerce or Business Administration, please remove the Professional Engineer (P.Eng) designation from criteria R1 and adjust the scoring of each remaining certification/designation to 15 points.

**A9.** Canada will revise rated criterion R1 for the Business Consultant Level 3 under Workstream III to award 15 points per professional designation and have 2 out of 3 score the full 30 points. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q10. Workstream III – B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist, Level 3 (Core) – Rated Criteria:** These criteria rely heavily on certifications (40/100 points) and in essence become mandatory requirements as the minimum score for this resource is 70/100. Please decrease the point

value of the certifications to ensure that the Crown receives a more experienced resource that will have extensive experience as opposed to relying on certifications.

**A10.** Canada will revise R1 to 15 points per certification for a maximum of 30 points, which will allow scoring full points by demonstrating two out of three certifications listed in the criteria. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q11. Workstream I, II and III, Corporate Criteria, R3** indicates that a bidder will receive full marks by demonstrating that the client representative has over 8 years' experience on contracts for which the Bidder was the Prime Contractor. In today's marketplace resources will progress through their career by changing firms or acting as independent consultants. If the requirement is to show that a firm has over 8 years' experience providing client representatives, then the requirement should be altered to request demonstration of deploying client representatives on contracts where the bidder was the prime. However, if the requirement is to demonstrate the experience of the individual, who may in the Crown's own words be "(A) Proposed resources may be employees of the Bidder or employees of a subcontractor, or these individuals may be independent contractors..." then this requirement should be amended to remove "on contracts for which the Bidder was the Prime Contractor.

Additionally, requiring that a resource provide customer references that can attest to the Client Representative's experience for a period of over 8 years is unrealistic. A project that a resource worked on as a client representative for a federal government department in 2008 may no longer have senior resources in that department who can attest to the experience. Further, it is unusual for rated resource requirements to include customer attestations at time of bid submission. As per most procurements, standard practice is that references for the resources are required if PWGSC chooses to conduct reference checks for any given rated or mandatory requirement. If so, PWGSC will request references from the bidder and it will check the references for that requirement for all bidders to be recommended for contract award.

We respectfully request that the requirement for a customer reference that can attest to the Bidder's experience be removed from all of the rated requirements.

**A11.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the criterion. The corporate criterion is to determine that the Bidder has the internal capacity and stability, i.e. they have employees, not independent contractors, who have the demonstrated experience with the bidder, required to effectively manage contracts of this nature. In order to determine in a timely fashion, should Canada choose to perform a reference verification, that the experience the Bidder claims for their client representation experience is accurate, Canada requires that the Bidder provide contact information in their bid for each reference provided for this criterion.

**Q12. Workstream I, A.5 ERP Technical Analyst (Oracle), Level 3(Core), R6-** states Demonstrate that the proposed resource holds a certification in Oracle Business Accelerators(OBA) for E-Business Suite by including a copy of the certification/ designation with their bid. OBA's were designed for "green field net new implementations" of Oracle E-Business suite to accelerate the implementations through the use of templates for CRP1, as stated in Oracle's documentation. Since the client, Correctional Services Canada is an already implemented E-Business client, this certification would not be applicable in any work undertaken. We believe this requirement should be removed as it would not apply to any work undertaken by CSC.

**A12.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the criterion. This certification demonstrates architectural knowledge that will continue to apply to future work under this requirement.

**Q13. Workstream II, P.2 Enterprise Architect Level 3, R1-** given that the statement of work for the Enterprise Architect does not reference ITIL we find it extremely restrictive for the Crown to ask for an ITIL certificate. The inclusion of this rated criterion eliminates a large group of candidates who are qualified to perform the tasks in the matrix and SoW. Would the Crown consider removing the requirement for an ITIL certificate or reducing the number of points allocated to that criterion? An otherwise well-qualified and experienced Enterprise Architect, meeting the rest of the mandatory and rated requirements but not

having an ITIL certification does not meet the pass mark of 70%, which essentially makes the possession of an ITIL certification a mandatory requirement.

**A13.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the criterion. The knowledge of IT Service Management principles and practices is important to the role that Enterprise Architect Level 3 of Workstream II will be performing.

#### **Q14. All Workstreams – Corporate Mandatory and Rated Criteria**

This requirement sets out parameters for three contracts of \$10 million each. We understand the desire/need of Correctional Services to have suppliers that can handle large volumes of resource requirements, but the advent of TBIPS has seen the number of suppliers with contracts of that size reduced to a handful. Further, the dollar values seem to be in excess of what a supplier should be expected to be able to substantiate if it is not pursuing all streams. We would like to suggest that Correctional Services can still ensure they are getting a vendor of suitable size/capacity if they were to change M1 to the following parameters:

- A minimum cumulative dollar value of \$20 million using a maximum of 3 contracts where at least \$15 million has been invoiced as of bid submission
- Each contract must have invoiced for a minimum of \$1 million each within the past 10 years as of bid closing
- The bidder must have collectively provided a minimum of 35 resources across the referenced contracts
- The bidder must have acted as the Prime Contractor on each referenced contract

These changes would reflect a dollar value that is more consistent with the value of a Stream, still ensure that suppliers are able to meet large volume demands, and unlike the current requirements that are specific to contract value, it would ensure that a supplier has actually had to deliver on the requirements by proving that services have already been invoiced, rather than relying on contract values where services provided may be very light.

**A14.** Corporate criteria for all Workstreams was revised to 3 contracts of \$5M each. Please see RFP modifications #004.

#### **Q15. All Workstreams – Corporate Rated Requirement R2**

This requirement sets out parameters for two additional contracts of \$5 million each to achieve maximum points. In combination with M1, this means that vendors must provide 5 contracts with a minimum of \$40 million in contract value in order to meet the requirements and achieve a maximum score on this requirement. The number of contracts in excess of \$5 million that would have been awarded to any individual company creates for a very restrictive competitive scenario that uses arbitrary values to determine whether a supplier might be a suitable supplier. We would like to suggest that Correctional Services can still ensure they are getting a vendor of suitable size/capacity if they were to change R1 to the following parameters:

- A minimum cumulative dollar value of \$10 million using a maximum of 2 contracts where at least \$7.5 million has been invoiced as of bid submission
- Each contract must have invoiced for a minimum of \$1 million each within the past 10 years as of bid closing
- The bidder must have collectively provided a minimum of 20 resources across the referenced contracts
- The bidder must have acted as the Prime Contractor on each referenced contract
- The bidder may use contracts that were used for M1, but in all cases the dollar value and number of resources must be in excess of the minimums required for M1, eg. one contract worth \$30 million would satisfy the requirement for a minimum of \$20 million on M1 and support the additional \$10 million required for R2.

- The contracts must have been for clients in the National Security Portfolio

**A15.** Corporate criteria M1 for all Workstreams was revised to 3 contracts of \$5M. Please see RFP modifications #004.

**Q16. All Workstreams – Core resources Level 3**

With respect to each of the representative roles within the RFP, could the Crown please clarify that only the mandatory/rated requirements for the "core" level 3 roles need to be profiled? In addition, could you also please confirm that only one (1) representative resource needs to be profiled for each of the "core" roles?

**A16.** Yes, please provide CV's for the 'Core' resource categories identified in the RFP, one representative resource per Core category.

**Q17.** Is there currently, or has there been recently in the past 6 months, a contractor performing the functions as outlined in the RFP? If so:

- a) what company is currently performing these services?
- b) how long has the contract been in place?
- c) what is/was the contract value?
- d) Are there resources in place under this contract currently? If so, how many resources are there for transition at contract award?

**A17.** Please see solicitation question and answer #1 of Amendment No. 004.

**Q18. Workstream III – B.1 Business Analyst, Level 3 (Core) – Rated Criteria R4:** "authoring technical documentation in both official languages for GoC application development projects" We assume CSC is looking for a resource who has authored technical documentation in English and has delivered each the original English version as well as a French translated version of the documentation, and that it is not expected that the Business Analyst must be bilingual? Please clarify.

**A18.** The Business Analyst does not need to be bilingual. Authoring technical documentation in either official language is acceptable. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q19. All Workstream and Categories:** Would CSC also consider opening the requirement further to include qualified candidates with Degrees or Diplomas other than IT or Business?

**A19.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the criterion, the education requirements are related to IT and/or Business.

**Q21. All Workstreams – Corporate Mandatory and Rated Criteria**

To make the bid fairer would you kindly consider lowering the dollar amount to \$5 million? \$10 million is very restrictive.

The Bidder must have worked on 3 contracts for IM/IT services within the last 10 years with a Government of Canada (GoC) department or Agency, Crown Corporation or Provincial/Territorial Government department or Agency.

Note: Admissible GoC Crown Corporations and Agencies are found in the following links:

<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/gov-gouv/rc-cr/links-liens-eng.asp> <http://www.canada.ca/en/gov/dept/>

- Each referenced contract must have been worked on in the last 10 years (as of bid closing date), and if the contract is currently valid, it must have been in place for a minimum of 6 months prior to the bid closing date;
- Each referenced contract must have had a minimum value of \$10 million (options exercised and taxes included);
- Each referenced contract must have been with an organization with a user-base of at least 5,000 users;
- The Bidder must have provided a minimum of 15 resources for each referenced contract; and

- The Bidder must have acted as the Prime Contractor on each referenced contract.

**A21.** Corporate criteria M1 for all Workstreams was revised to 3 contracts of \$5M each. Please see RFP modifications #004.

**Q22. All Workstreams, Corporate Criteria, M1** One other point that makes it very difficult to compete is the number of resources required...i.e 15 per contract. Would it be possible to make it 7-9 resources per contract?

**A22.** No, Canada is not prepared to change the criterion.

**Q23. Amendment #004 Q&A**

It is stated in Answer # 1 of amendment 4 that that there is currently an incumbent company providing the services through 3 contracts and that these contracts end in March or February 2017. Can you clarify, if this means that contracts resulting of the current solicitation will not be starting until April or March 2017? This is very important information when selecting candidates for each of the position and securing their availability.

**A23.** Canada will award up to 3 contracts, one contract per Workstream, with starting date of contract award.

**Q24. Workstream II, P.9 Project Manager, Level 3, R5,** it is very difficult to find a resource who possesses all 4 certifications/designations listed, and because each one is worth 5 points, an otherwise well-qualified resource who possesses only one or two is at a disadvantage. Would the Crown consider revising the points allocated to this criterion to 2.5 per certification for a total of 10 points for R5? Also, would the Crown consider adding a Masters of Business Administration to the acceptable list of certifications/designations?

**A24.** Canada will remove M1 and revise R5 to include PMP, MBA and MPM with scoring of 5 points per certification up to a maximum of 20 points. Please see RFP modifications #007.

**Q25. Correction to text of Question and Answer #19 of Amendment No. 006:**

Question # 19 of Amendment No 006: Due to the fact that our submitted questions have not been answered and responses to these questions are material to our proposal preparation, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the bid due date to enable us to incorporate any changes and prepare a quality bid to the Crown.

This is a very large bid requiring a lot of preparation. Would you please extend the closing time by 1 week?

With the recent change to the mandatory criteria lowering the project value from 10M to 5M, some bidders may now have the ability to submit a proposal. Given the significant number of requirements and resources across the streams would the Crown please provide an additional 3 weeks for responding, changing the date to February 22nd.

With respect to the above noted solicitation, we kindly request an additional 2 week extension. Many of our previous questions have gone unanswered and a response to these questions is urgently needed in order to submit a compliant proposal response.

**A25.** Answer # 19 of Amendment No. 006

The closing date has been extended by two week; the new closing date is February 23, 2016 @ 2:00 PM EST. Please see RFP Modifications 006 of solicitation # 21120-158459/B.

**ALL OTHERS TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**