

Various Level 3 Resources For IT Operation Support

REQUEST FOR PROPSAL

AMENDMENT NO. 2

This RFP amendment No. 2 is raised to;

- 1- Publish Canada's responses to Industry questions received during the question period.

1. Publish Canada's responses to Industry questions received during the question period.

Question	Answer
<p>Q20. In the RFP page 43- 44, under General Roles and Responsibilities, there is many duplicate bullets, such as 17 & 22, and 29 & 38.</p> <p>Please amend, so we do not have to demonstrate the equivalency of all of them for M1.</p>	<p>While SSC confirms that inadvertent duplication of activities exist under General Roles and Responsibilities, with respect to bidders comment regarding M1, Bidders are only required to provide descriptions that demonstrate experience "similar" to those listed in Annex "A" 2.0 (General Roles and Responsibilities) for each Categories of Personnel that they address. Note that the lists of responsibilities for each category are considered guidelines and as such, resources provided for substantiation must simply reflect the complexion of the listed items.</p> <p>Bidders do not need to address the activities listed under Annex "A" 1.2 (Scope of Work)</p>
<p>Q21. Would the Crown please provide the total points allocated for Rated 2 and a breakdown of how the points will be allocated. There are many different criteria within one rated requirement and the way the criteria is written now, it is misleading as to how a vendor will be awarded points.</p>	<p>Points will be allocated and awarded according to communication, completeness of idea, demonstrated knowledge and experience in subject area relevance to SSC's mandate.</p>
<p>Q22. Due to the level of detailed information required as well as the number of references which must be qualified, we respectfully request a two (2) week extension to the closing date of the subject solicitation.</p>	<p>The RFP closing date remains unchanged.</p>
<p>Q23. In order to increase the overall competitiveness of the SSC TBIPS Security solicitation, we are respectfully requesting that the SSC allow respondents to use reference(s) from their parent, affiliate or subsidiary for references to complete Mandatory requirements. Canadian companies, who are part of a global organization with a parent or affiliate outside of Canada, constantly leverage global skills, experience and best practices for Federal Government projects,</p>	<p>Yes, SSC will accept noted Corporate arraignments providing that delivery of referenced Contracts must be provided within Canada or the continental USA.</p>

<p>while still adhering to the Federal Government's requirements.</p>	
<p>Q24. Mandatory Requirement 1; item "C" as well as the second "Note" within the requirement, requests client name, project number and contact information to support the referenced contract.</p> <p>Due to the nature of work performed and the sensitivity around security projects of this magnitude, it is poor practice for a service organization to provide sensitive client information in a public bid process. Clients are also reluctant to agree to share this information in a public forum.</p> <p>Therefore, based on the above and the precedence set by Canada in past RFPs we respectfully ask that point "c" and the second "note" be removed and replaced with the following:</p> <p>"Provide the industry of the client reference at time of bid submission. Additionally, the following information must be provided within 48 hours of being requested by the contract authority: the name of the client organization and project as well as a client contact for each contract including name, title, telephone or email address."</p>	<p>Bidders may only withhold the referenced contact information that would be considered a privacy breach by the Government of Canada. In such cases the only information that can be withheld is contact name, phone number and email address. All other required reference information must be provided. Furthermore, should SSC believe that a reference check is advisable during evaluation and prior to award, it will ask the Bidder to provide the withheld contact details.</p>
<p>Q25. Mandatory Requirement 1 point "a" requires service providers to provide the name (first and last) of each resource that was billed under the reference contract in order to substantiate. This raises a number of issues including privacy for the individuals, intellectual property of the service provide as well as reasoning for this information.</p> <p>The RFP does not require the demonstration of the qualifications of the resources, but rather the qualification of the firm to demonstrate its ability to provide a high volume of on demand resources. By simply providing names, Canada is not able to cross reference any qualifications, not to mention the resources provided over the last seven (7) years may not be available to Canada for any number reasons. Furthermore, Service providers are demonstrating more than 16,000 billable days within the last 7 years validated by client, which would clearly demonstrate the organization's ability to deliver a high volume of on demand resources.</p> <p>As such, we respectfully request that the requirement for resource names (first and last) to be removed from the Mandatory requirement 1.</p>	<p>The purpose for requesting resource names is to ensure that their claimed billable time is not counted more than once on a given contract. To that end, Bidders may instead choose to use either unique numeric or alpha-numeric identifiers which can be cross-referenced to confirm accuracy, should SSC request such confirmation.</p>

<p>Q26. Given the security requirements of this requirement, facility clearance as well as personnel clearance, we respectfully ask that reference projects be eligible that were undertaken in Canada only. In addition to the security requirement, given the number of resources required and the potential volume of task authorizations through this solicitation, it would be critical to demonstrate a firm's record of high volume resource delivery to clients within Canada.</p>	<p>Canada has reviewed this request and the requirement remains the same.</p>
<p>Q27. There is considerable uncertainty with regard to M1 requirements which is greatly hindering our ability to prepare a complete response. As clarification, amendment 002 has been promised but not yet issued, therefore we respectfully request a one week extension to Friday June 3, 2016.</p>	<p>The RFP closing date remains unchanged.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS INVITATION TO QUALIFY
REMAIN UNCHANGED.

=====

Following is a summary of Amendments issued to date to this Request for Proposal (RFP)

Document Tracking	Date	Description
Amendment No. 001	May 05, 2016	Administrative changes and published responses to questions
Amendment No. 002	May 12, 2016	Published responses to questions