

**FOR THE PROVISION OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR
THE DEFENCE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (DRMIS)
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE AND
FOR THE SIGMA SYSTEM FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT
SERVICES CANADA**

**SOLICITATION NO. W8474-126279/F
AMENDMENT 010**

This amendment contains the following sections:

1. Questions and Answers (Set 7)

Section 1: Questions and Answers (Set 7)

Note: Questions are numerically sequenced upon arrival at PWGSC. A question and its answer will be provided via BuyandSell as the response becomes available. Potential bidders are therefore advised that questions and answers may be issued via BuyandSell out of sequence. The following questions have been received. In accordance with Article 13 under 2003 Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements (2015-07-03) which has been incorporated into the RFP in accordance with Article 2.1 of Part 2 of the RFP, the questions and corresponding answers are provided to all potential bidders as set out below:

Q27. Bidder has retracted their question.

A27. N/A. Bidder has retracted their question.

Q50. In the last amendment questions 21 and 27 appear to be missing? Is this an administrative issues or are these questions still pending a client response?

A50. Please see amendment 004 addressing question 21. Question 27 has been retracted by the Bidder (see above).

Q54. As reflected in the response to question 34 and the revised RFP Part 1 to 8 revision 003 that was posted to the buyandsell.gc.ca, Canada has revised the discretionary audit clause 7.10(e) and 8.9(e). For section 8.9(e), we believe that the title should read "Discretionary Audit – Non-commercial Goods and/or Services (New Labour Categories and Subject Matter Experts)". Can Canada please confirm this title, in line with the clause 7.10(e)?

A54. Canada has considered the request. No changes to the RFP.

Q55. In light of the most recent amendment we respectfully request a 10 day extension to allow bidders to review the changes and adjust their responses.

A55. Per amendment 009, the bid closing date has been extended from February 12, 2016 to February 22, 2016.

Q56. Based on the material changes to Amendment 8 and Attachments 14 through 18, we are respectfully requesting an extension from the current submission date of February 12th, 2016, to February 26th, 2016. This additional time will ensure fairness for all respondents and give enough time to review the changes, examine additional qualified projects, provide better responses, and increase overall competition.

- A56. Please see response A55.
- Q57. Due to the significant changes in the Attachment A Rev 002 contained in amendment 008 issued by Canada, bidders will need to potentially make major changes to the proposal. We respectfully request a two week extension.
- A57. Please see response A55.
- Q58. Reference: Attachment A – Technical Evaluation Criteria. Given the RFP is limiting bidders to only 12 contracts total, we believe that any of the contracts that a bidder presents should be eligible to be used to demonstrate work performed in support of a military organization not just the M1 and M5 requirements. We would request that the Crown revise R6 and remove the restriction that allows points only to be awarded through demonstration of experience presented in M1 and M5.
- A58. Canada has considered the request. No. The requirement remains as-is. No changes will be made to this criterion.
- Q59. With reference to the Solicitation Close Date of 12 February 2016, we respectfully request the consideration of the Crown to extend the due date to 26 February 2016.
- A59. Please see response A55.
- Q60. At Attachment A, for R8 and R10, please confirm that Canada is asking that the Bidder demonstrate that it was successful on both reference projects (not just one) and adjust the scoring accordingly (i.e. 20 points per reference). This was a change made in Amendment 8 but it is in Canada's best interest to assess satisfactory performance on both contracts.
- A60. No. Only one contract reference provided in either M1a or M1b will be assessed and will receive 40 points if it meets the criterion.
- Q61. Amendment 8 introduced a change to allow submission of experience for services in which the Respondent did not contract directly with the ultimate recipient (i.e. "subcontractor" experience). This is a very unusual practice for Canada and was not in response to a direct vendor RFP question per the Q&A provided in amendments to date. It is our understanding, that the objective of the RFP evaluation process is to assess the Respondent's capabilities to deliver the DRMIS and SIGMA services based on past experience. A vendor's experience as a "subcontractor" does not demonstrate this capability but rather the capabilities of the prime contractor. For example, M5a allows experience as a "subcontractor" but also states that the Bidder demonstrate that it "was contracted and responsible for designing, developing and implementing a new integrated SAP solution.". It is a highly subjective requirement for a Mandatory criterion to demonstrate that the Bidder as a "subcontractor" was "responsible" as opposed to the prime contractor. How is it possible to demonstrate responsibility, as every situation will have its own unique requirements, challenges and governance? How will the Crown verify the Bidder's performance and that the Bidder was "responsible" when the subcontract was not directly with the end client (and conceivably could have been performed for a third party with whom the Bidder has a relationship). In addition there are other ramifications of this on other RFP criteria.

We request that the Crown address the subjectivity introduced into evaluation by removing "subcontractor" references.

- A61. Canada has considered this request. The Bidder must demonstrate its experience or the experience of a related organization (parent, affiliate or subsidiary), as a prime contractor or subcontractor, respectively, in meeting each individual mandatory criterion as indicated. Canada is allowing a Bidder's experience, or the related organization's experience, as a subcontractor if the demonstrated experience was under contract and the Bidder (or related organization) was

responsible for the identified work to a prime contractor. Note that article 3.2 (c) (iii) (C) and article 4.2 (d) (iv) were also amended to reflect this in amendment 008. No change will be made to the solicitation.

- Q62. Amendment 8 to the RFP introduced many significant changes. One of the more significant changes that was made is that previously, many Mandatory criteria references had to be on-site (i.e. "not in a delivery centre"). The Rated points for these Mandatory "on-site" projects was 305 (i.e. R1 through R6). As of Amendment 8, the Mandatory criteria removed the "on-site" requirement. An additional Rated criterion was added that awards 50 points if the references are on site. This is a significant scope change to a major RFP criterion and minimizes what had previously been an important qualification. We respectfully request that this be corrected to re-emphasize the Rated element of this criterion.
- A62. Canada has considered this request. The amount of points allocated to this new criterion is in line with Canada's overall requirement. No change will be made to the solicitation.
- Q63. Regarding Attachment A, R2, please confirm that consistent with M1a/M1b and M3a/M3b, the scoring is based on full time resources working concurrently and continuously for an entire 18-month-period or longer.
- A63. Yes, that is correct.
- Q65. Based on the release of revised requirements dated 3 February 2016, we kindly request an extension of two weeks to 26 February 2016.
- A65. Please see response A55.
- Q66. At Attachment A, R4 requests experience designing, developing, and implementing SAP modules/applications, however, limits the experience to the contracts provided in response to M5a/b and R3. Would the Crown consider allowing respondents to use any of the 12 projects that cover off the mandatory and rated requirements? This change will allow more competition, providing better overall value to the Crown.
- A66. Canada has considered your request. Canada's requirement remains as-is. No changes will be made to this criterion.
- Q67. We respectfully request an extension from the current submission date of February 12th to February 26th to allow respondents sufficient time to evaluate the changes made in Amendment 8 and formulate a quality response.
- A67. Please see response A55.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED