



**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**

**Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer**

**Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes**

National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)

Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

**Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Training and Specialized Services Division/Division de  
la formation et des services spécialisés  
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier  
10C1, Place du Portage  
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Lean Six Sigma Training		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-161617/A		<b>Date</b> 2016-03-07
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20161617		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 113zh.EN578-161617	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZH-113-29838		
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b>		2016-02-10
<b>Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale</b>		
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-03-30</b>		<b>Time Zone Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Reynolds(zh), Diane		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 113zh
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-1141 ( )		<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-9235
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>		
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> See Herein  Voir aux présentes		
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.		

**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>		

---

Amendment no. 002 is raised to provide a response to questions raised to date, as follows:

- Q1 Are Offerors required to submit an offer for each Region/Metropolitan Area?
- A1 No, Offerors should indicate in their offer which Region(s) and/or Metropolitan Area(s) where they can provide Lean Six Sigma training and ensure that in Attachment 1 to Part 3, Pricing Schedule, they quote a firm all inclusive price per participant for the Region(s) and/or Metropolitan Area(s) where they can provide Lean Six Sigma training.
- Q2 “Training” may be defined differently by various organizations, and may differ both in duration and in terms of value received. As such, in order to ensure consistency of the evaluation of the offer, would Canada please clarify:
- Is it expected that the participants will obtain a certification as a result of the training?
  - Are Offerors required to indicate what additional requirements participants must demonstrate to be “certified” at each belt level, for example passing an exam of x hours, use of the tools on a workplace project (versus a theoretical case study or no practical component at all), and/or formal presentation of the project storyboard?
  - Is it expected that the training will include a “practical” component, such as hands-on group exercises and facilitation experience?
  - Will Canada provide the minimum number of training hours expected per belt level?
  - What is the impact to the evaluation for Offerors that offer more comprehensive training? For example, how would Canada evaluate a “green” belt course that lasts only three days and provided through a Computer Based Training (CBT) course, versus a ten-day comprehensive “green” belt course.
  - That in order for training to count towards MT1 experience, should it be aligned with the American Society for Quality (ASQ) and/or AME/SME/Shingo/ASQ consortium standards?
- A2 Canada clarifies:
- Yes, after completion of each belt level, participants will receive a certificate;
  - No, participants must complete the course (including passing an exam, if applicable and/or doing formal presentation of project(s) as required to obtain the belt level);
  - Yes, classroom training must complete hands-on group exercises;
  - No, there is no minimum number of training hours expected per belt level, as long as participants complete the necessary training to acquire the belt certification;
  - Online training will only be for the white belt level. Please see amendment 001 to the RFSO;
  - All training must meet any recognized national standard for the quality of the training provided.
- Q3 As per mandatory technical criterion MT1: The Offeror must have a minimum of five years of demonstrated experience delivering Lean Sigma Six training as defined in section 1.3 of the Statement of Work to outside clients in both of Canada’s official languages within the last seven years as of the RFSO publication date. Would Canada please define how the five years would be evaluated? For example: how would Canada evaluate an Offeror that provides instructor-led Lean Sigma Six training on a consistent basis over a seven-year period, however, some days are done doing actual training, some days are done doing preparation work and other days may be done doing Lean projects working with clients directly. As compared with an Offeror that provides only CBT Lean Six Sigma training over a seven-year period. Would both Offerors meet MT1?
- A3 The Offeror that provides instructor-led Lean Sigma Six training on a consistent basis over a seven-year period would meet MT1. The Offeror that provides only online Lean Six Sigma training over a seven-year period would not meet MT1, see amendment 001 to the RFSO.

- 
- Q4 Annex A, section 4.0, fifth bullet, would Canada please confirm that the online training is to be instructor led and only the training materials and manuals are to be available 24/7? Would Canada also confirm if CBT courses are or are not acceptable?
- A4 Online training is to be self-directed and accessible 24/7; and is only for the white belt level. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.
- Q5 Attachment 1 to Part 3, Pricing Schedule, would Canada consider amending the pricing schedule to reflect classroom size instead of a firm all inclusive price per participant?
- A5 No, clause 7.4.1 was amended. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.
- Q6 Part 7B, Resulting Contract Clauses, clause 7.4.1 and section C in Annex D, there is a discount of 10% for 5 or more participants for each belt level, would Canada consider amending the discount to be based on classroom size versus discount per participant?
- A6 Clause 7.4.1 was amended. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.
- Q7 Attachment 1 to Part 3, Pricing Schedule, if training is offered at the client's site versus at a Contractor's place of business/facility, there could be cost savings that could be passed on to Canada. Would Canada consider amending the pricing schedule to reflect the options of the training conducted at the client's site versus training conducted at a Contractor's place of business/facility?
- A7 No, clause 7.4.1 was amended. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.
- Q8 Would Canada consider separating the requirement into two streams, one for classroom training and one for on-line training? The on-line training could be offered on a national level instead of by region/metropolitan area.
- A9 No, online training will only be for the white belt level. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.
- Q9 Would Canada define the on-line training requirements/specifications more clearly so that offerors understand what is required and Canada can ensure its needs will be met. The Offeror suggests limiting the online training to pure awareness-raising training, e.g. white belt as online training is ineffective at teaching hands on skills such as systems thinking, change management, changing mindsets and behaviours; the content of the upper belts.
- A9 Online training will be limited to awareness training for only the white belt level followed by online quiz.
- Q10 Would Canada consider separating the pricing for the classroom training and the on-line training to reflect the differentiation in value and margin between the two approaches, and to eliminate unintended incentives?
- A10 No, online training will only be for the white belt level. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.
- Q11 Would Canada consider adding a criterion to assess the Offeror's effectiveness/track record in delivering training AND facilitation in the Canadian public/government sector in order to obtain training services that will be effective in the federal public service. If an offeror itself does not have a track record of high achievement in government (e.g. reducing lead times by 50% plus, improving quality by 50% and sustaining the improvement over years) then it is highly unlikely to be able to instruct public servants to do so.
- A11 No.

Q12 Mandatory technical criterion MT1, would Canada please confirm that experience delivering training at any of the Lean Six Sigma belt levels (white, yellow, green, black, master black) will count towards the five years of experience?

A12 Mandatory technical criterion MT1 was amended. See amendment 001 to the RFSO.