



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

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY REQUIREMENT / DOCUMENT CONTIENT DES EXIGENCES RELATIVES À LA SÉCURITÉ

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 EC IT Professional Services - TBIPS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 05005-150334/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 05005-150334	Date 2016-05-31
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-634-30180	
File No. - N° de dossier 634e1.05005-150334	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-06-15	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Durigan, Angela	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 634e1
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4990 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

The Request for Proposal (RFP) Amendment 006 is raised to answer Bidders questions, amend the RFP and make corrections to the RFP.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 13:

Reference Attachment 2 - Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstreams 1 to 8:

Question: RFPs of this nature requiring 10's of thousands of billable days per stream typically allow for a longer period of time in which to count billable days, especially when there are a limited number of contracts that may be used. Given the variety and number of roles and the time restrictions of "within the past five years", we respectfully request the timeframe for the M1 criteria of ALL Workstreams to be extended to "within the past 7 years" to allow additional billable days to be included.

Answer 13:

No. The requirement remains unchanged.

Question 14:

Reference Workstream 1, M1 and R1:

Question: The ratio of billable days for the roles in this stream appear to be inconsistent with a typical project team. For example, there are more days being requested for Technical Writers than there are for the Testers. In addition, Technical Writers tend to be short-term roles, which would require more contracts to prove the number of billable days that are required by the RFP. Given the unique combination of roles required in this workstream and the nature of the typical contracts, we request that this stream allow for the use of up to 10 contracts.

Answer 14:

No. The criteria remains unchanged.

Question 15:

Reference: Workstream 6, M1 and R1, item 1) category "Risk Management Specialist" - "The billable days must have been for the delivery of Architecture Services":

Question: The Risk Management Specialist SOW is generic and is part of the Project Management Services Stream under TBIPS, and generally only associated with Project Management Services. However, the Risk Management Specialist billable days are required to be associated with the provision of Architecture Services. This stands out as an exception and is requiring the use of contracts that do not support any of the other Architect roles. We request that the billable days for the Risk Management Specialist category be allowed to come from contracts that are simply for the more general "IT Professional Services".

Answer 15:

No. The criteria remains unchanged.

Question 16:

Reference: Workstreams 1 to 8, M1 and R1, item 4)

Question: This item requires bidders to demonstrate that the consultants used for billable days meet at least 60% of the Elections Canada SOW resource category tasks rather than the typical 50% of TBIPS SOW tasks for comparable roles. This adds to the amount of time required to produce a compliant response by mandating that respondents map all of their candidates to the Elections Canada SOW tasks as opposed to other RFPs where resources billed in a TBIPS role are considered to have met the requirements of that TBIPS role, without needing to be cross-mapped to the tasks. For any respondent

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

working on multiple streams this is a large logistics effort, especially in light of how many resources are required in order to prove the full number of billable days. We respectfully request an extension to the deadline to allow more time for the preparation of cross-mapping of resources.

Answer 16:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Question 17:

With reference to the subject RFP, Part 3, Bid Preparation Instructions, we have the following question:

If bidding on more than one Workstream, do bidders have to submit one bid including all Workstreams or do they have to submit separate bids for each Workstream they are responding to?

Answer 17:

A single bid may contain bids to be awarded a contract in one or more Workstreams. However, a bid may not contain a bid from the Bidder, including related entities to be awarded more than one contract in any given Workstream. See amendment to RFP below.

Question 18:

In reviewing Amendment # 004 we noted an anomaly that may favour an incumbent while limiting competition all the while making no sense at all. The amendment addresses an Industry member suggestion and states, in part, the following:

1. At Attachment 2, BID EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Insert:

Note: For all mandatory and point-rated evaluation criteria for each Workstream, the Bidder must have been the prime contractor, rather than a subcontractor. This means that the Bidder contracted directly with the customer of the work. If the Bidder's contract was to perform work which another entity had itself first contracted to perform, the Bidder will not be considered the prime contractor. For example, Z (customer) contracted with Y for services. Y, in turn, entered into a contract with X to provide all or part of these services to Z. In this example, Y is a prime contractor and X is a subcontractor.

The Crown has not indicated anywhere in the solicitation that referenced contracts must be for Crown specific work. Any reference contract work submitted by an Industry member as referential material would, by extension, demonstrate a "prime contractor" posture. All of our contracts between ourselves and our client, regardless of who they are, position our organization as the prime contractor while the client would always be the "customer of the work". How the resources are utilized by our customer would not change that fact.

Would the Crown kindly confirm, contrary to amendment #004, that any contract between any bidder and their own client (*regardless of who their client might be*) would be acceptable as it clearly positions that bidding organization as the prime contractor for work delivered under contract?

Answer 18:

No. The amendment to Attachment 2, BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, in solicitation amendment 004 remains unchanged.

Question 19:

With respect to "Workstream 1 – Business Services", Mandatory Evaluation Criteria M1, 3), on page 92 of 155 in Attachment 2, requires that "the billable days must have been provided under a maximum of eight contract references". Given the breadth of resources required, and given that for several of these resource categories contracts tend to be of a shorter duration, we respectfully request that the number of

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

contract references be increased from eight (8) to twelve (12) in order to provide a larger pool of qualified respondents to Elections Canada.

Answer 19:

No. The requirement remains unchanged.

Question 20:

In Amendment 005 the text for the System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall) still contains the wording "during general elections and by-elections" Please update accordingly.

3. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.7 Workstream 7 – ITOPS Delivery Services, 1.6 System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall):

Delete:

1.6 System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall)

provide on- and off-hour support during general elections and by-elections as required by the Technical Authority

provide on and off-hour on-call support during general elections and by-elections as required by the Technical Authority

Insert:

1.9 System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall)

provide on- and off-hour support during general elections and by-elections as required by the Technical Authority

provide on and off-hour on-call support as required by the Technical Authority

Answer 20:

Please see amendment to RFP below. The correction has been made.

Question 21:

The RFP asks Bidders to potentially provide up to 64 Corporate References and the compilation of billable hours for 50 resource categories should the bidder wish to respond to all 8 streams. This is an enormous effort which cannot be completed in the current time frame provided. In order to prepare a compliant response we are requesting a 3 week extension to the close date.

Answer 21:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Question 22:

Regarding Attachment 2 Bid Evaluation Criteria: in M1 of each Workstream, it states "(3) The billable days must have been provided under a maximum of eight contract references". Please confirm that the limitation of 8 contracts is per category within any given Workstream, and not for the entire Workstream as a whole.

Answer 22:

Please refer to Attachment 2.1, Corporate Technical Requirements and Bidder Response Templates, Response Template – Billable Days (For Criteria M1 and R1) for each Workstream. The Bidder can provide up to 8 contract references for each resource category within a Workstream.

Question 23:

Re: Attachment 2.1 – Bidder Response Template for Corporate References on Page 133 of 155:

Please confirm that for the Client Reference Form for M1, it would be acceptable to modify the table in order to present the information under **Resource Category Substantiation** in columns rather than

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

rows? We believe this would make it easier to cross-reference the relevant tasks and also allow for multiple categories from the same contract to be mapped within one table.

Answer 23:

Confirmed.

Question 24:

We would like to clarify the Joint Venture requirements in this solicitation. On Page 17 of 155 section 3.1 (e) item iii. it states:

“Joint venture members cannot pool their abilities with other joint venture members to satisfy a single technical criterion of this bid solicitation. However, a joint venture member can pool its individual experience with the experience of the joint venture itself.”

When we respond to TBIPS as a JV, we MUST pool experience between the JV members in order to meet various components of the TBIPS requirements. In keeping with the spirit of TBIPS JV allowances, we are respectfully requesting that the Crown therefore remove the above point (e) item iii. and allow JV members to pool their abilities to satisfy any single mandatory and rated requirement.

Answer 24:

No. The clause remains unchanged.

Question 25:

Question and Answer #11 identified tasks within the Statement of Work which were specific to the Elections Canada environment and therefore favours incumbent firms who were already performing the work. There are several more bullets within the statement of work which reference “Elections Canada” or “EC.” For example, Workstream 6 Application/Software Architect (page 73):

“evaluate EC’s existing procedures and methods for application/software development...” Would Canada please confirm that bidders may replace “EC” with “the organization” to use a generic placeholder? This would ensure that the requirements are fair and balanced for all bidders, not only incumbent firms who have been performing work within EC.

Answer 25:

See amendment to RFP below.

Question 26:

Will Canada please confirm that bidders may use any Government of Canada, Government of Ontario, or Private Sector vehicle to demonstrate experience in any of the required categories as long as the experience reflects 60% of the bullets for the statement of work in that category? This is to say that the category titles may not be the same as long as the duties are reflected.

Answer 26:

Bidders may use any Government of Canada, Government of Ontario, or Private Sector contract. Other vehicles will not be accepted.

Question 27:

Regarding all requirements where it is referenced that contracts must reflect 60% of the statement of work, it is our understanding that if we are using the same TBIPS category to demonstrate the required number of billable days that we do not need to show equivalency. Please confirm that we only need to demonstrate how a category is equivalent (60% of the statement of work) if it is not the same category under TBIPS.

Answer 27:

Regardless of whether or not the resource category name is reflective of TBIPS, the Bidder must certify that each resource category includes at least 60% of the associated tasks listed in the Statement of Work at Annex A for that resource category.

Question 28:

Would Canada please consider extending by another 2 weeks? The requirements for this RFP represent an immense level of effort. If a bidder were to bid on all 8 streams they would need to contact and obtain permission to use a total of 64 client references to satisfy 8 contracts for R2. The ability to reach references to confirm their willingness to act as a reference is not always in the bidder's control due to vacations, leaves of absence, etc. Bidders cannot strategize which references to use before they strategize which contracts to use to meet the requirements, which requires analyzing the billable days and invoices against each contract – a very detailed and long task. Additionally, bidders need to prove that each category description matches 60% of the statement of work for the resource category in the RFP, which adds another layer of analysis and effort that bidders must undertake.

Answer 28:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Question 29:

Amendment 4's Question and Answer 8 significantly changed the original RFP requirements for contract references by not allowing subcontracting work. Due to the change in complexity, and the recent holiday weekend which caused some information delays, would Elections please consider an extension to 22 June?

Answer 29:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Question 30:

With regards to the Client Reference Form for M1 (page 133 of 155), the template only provides cells for demonstration of one resource category. Contracts being used for M1 can have billable days covering multiple resource categories. Please confirm that vendors can add rows to the bottom of the table to demonstrate each resource category; therefore, providing only one form per contract.

Answer 30:

Confirmed.

Question 31:

In regards to the combination of Mandatory and Rated Requirements (M1, M2, R1 and R2), we understand that Canada is attempting to identify organizations with large contract references by which to substantiate the ability to deliver teams of resources with a range of specialized skills. However, we would suggest that Canada may wish to re-consider its position in regards to the requirements in order to allow/encourage a larger pool of potential bidders. We are a significant provider of these resources under a wide range of contract vehicles. Nonetheless, we cannot meet the mandatory requirements in most of the streams and can only submit for a limited number of Workstreams based on the minimum Rated requirements.

As such, we would recommend that Canada remove the Rated requirement at R2 iii):

- "The contract must have included the provision of a team of three or more of the resource categories identified in M1 at the same time and for at least six months.", for Workstreams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

- “The contract must have included the provision of a team of two or more of the resource categories identified in M1 at the same time and for at least six months.”, for Workstreams 7 and 8.

Answer 31:

No. The criteria remains unchanged.

Question 32:

The first task for Database Administrator under Stream 8 reads as follows:

“conduct web application development using:

- Oracle version 10g
- PL/SQL”

We wish to ask the following questions:

- a. Could you confirm that Oracle version 10g or higher will be accepted for the purposes of task mapping?
- b. Will reference projects or resources that worked with non-Oracle databases be accepted if they involved work with a similar database system?

Answer 32:

- a. Confirmed. Please see amendment to RFP below.
- b. No.

Question 33:

One of the tasks for the Programmer/Analyst .NET under Stream 2 reads as follows:

“establish an automated application build process using TFS’ Build Service, involving multiple configurations and targeting multiple environments”

Please confirm if other build automation software similar to TFS’ Build Service will be accepted for the purpose of task mapping?

Answer 33:

No. TFS is EC’s required build tool.

Question 34:

One of the tasks for the Programmer/Analyst .NET under Stream 2 reads as follows:

“perform source code management, track tasks using Work Items, produce automated builds and track defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server (TFS)”

Please confirm if other defect tracking software similar to TFS will be accepted for the purpose of task mapping?

Answer 34:

No. TFS is EC’s required defect tracking software.

Question 35:

One of the tasks for the Programmer/Analyst .NET under Stream 2 reads as follows:

“develop or maintain data access components connecting to Oracle databases”

Please confirm if other types of databases will be accepted for the purpose of task mapping?

Answer 35:

No.

Question 36:

One of the tasks for the IM Architect under Stream 6 reads as follows:

“make strategic recommendations to senior management (i.e. written strategy documents for the use of senior management in the Government of Canada environment)”

Please confirm if making recommendations to senior management in the private sector be accepted for the purpose of task mapping?

Answer 36:

Yes.

Question 37:

One of the tasks for the Enterprise Architect under Stream 6 reads as follows:

“develop technical architectures, frameworks and strategies to meet the business requirements and long term enterprise goals which include:

- SOA framework/principles
- application architecture standards based on J2EE
- data architecture standards based on Oracle databases”

The listed sub-bullets are specific to Elections Canada’s long term enterprise goals and will not necessarily be aligned to the goals of the reference projects. Would Elections Canada consider removing these sub bullets to allow for more straightforward task mapping?

Answer 37:

Yes. See amendment to RFP below.

Question 38:

In Amendment 5 the Crown revised several tasks for Stream 7 specific to Elections Canada and general elections to allow for more straightforward task mapping. Could you confirm these types of changes will also apply to the tasks in the other streams? For example:

Stream 1 – B.6 Business System Analyst, Levels 2 and 3
- evaluate EC’s existing business procedures and methods

Stream 2 – A.7 Programmer/Analyst (.NET) Levels 2 and 3
- participate and assist the Elections Canada Technical Authority with security code reviews of .NET code

Stream 6 – A.1 Application/Software Architect, Levels 2 and 3
- evaluate EC’s existing procedures and methods for application/software development, identify and document database content, structure and application subsystems and develop data dictionaries

Stream 8 – I.4 Database Modeller / IM Modeller, Levels 2 and 3
- apply EC’s and/or industry best practices for standard naming conventions and coding practices to ensure consistency of data models

Answer 38:

See amendment to RFP below.

Question 39:

1. Workstream 2 Web Application Services	Workstream 6 Architecture Services	Workstream 8 Database Services
---	---	---

Category	Number of Billable Days Required to Meet M1	Category	Number of Billable Days Required to Meet M1	Category	Number of Billable Days Required to Meet M1
Tester	1,510	Technical Architect	230	Database Administrator	1,800
Web Developer	1,000	Technology Architect	200	Database Analyst/IM Administrator	600
Programmer/Analyst - .NET	2,500	IM Architect	370	Database Modeller/IM Modeller	1,150
System Analyst	1,200	Risk Management Specialist	500	Application/Software Architect	600
Technical Architect	500	Enterprise Architect	450		
Technology Architect	500	Application/Software Architect	600		
System Administrator	1,000				
Application/Software Architect	1,650				

The number of billable days required to meet M1 for the Architecture Categories contained within Workstream 2 is excessive and not reflective of the work typically done within the workstreams. In the above table, we have highlighted that Workstream 2 requires over double the billable days in the categories of Technical Architect, Technology Architect and Application Software Architect than Workstream 6, which is excessive for the Web Application Services Stream. Additionally, the Database Services Stream requires over 600 billable days under the Application/Software Architect Category, which does not fit with the skillset in the other categories. The Architecture Categories and the other categories within Workstream 2 and Workstream 8 are not typically paired together on contracts. Asking for this large number of billable days within these streams favours incumbents who have currently been providing these services to Elections Canada. In order to encourage a greater number of bidders to bid who can provide more value to the crown, would Canada please consider removing the categories of Technical Architect, Technology Architect and Application/Software Architect from Workstream 2 and the category of Application/Software Architect from Workstream 8 and consolidating these under Workstream 6?

Answer 39:

No. The Workstreams identified under this procurement were set up to reflect the requirement of Elections Canada. Resource categories were chosen for each Workstream based on the needs of the areas that would manage the resulting contracts. The number of billable days is reflective of EC's requirement for each resource category. The criteria remains unchanged.

Question 40:

Would Canada please consider removing the requirement in M1 for all Workstreams for the billable days to be gained across a maximum of 8 contracts? It does not matter how many contracts a bidder uses to demonstrate that they have the experience providing the billable days required for the Workstream. Whether the required billable days are gained across 2 contracts, 8 contracts, or 10 contracts, the same amount of work has been done by the bidding firm to recruit, secure, present, place, and retain resources on contract with clients. The duration and volume of the contracts does not matter and has no bearing on whether the bidding firm has experience providing the services. In fact, experience providing the services across more contracts demonstrates more work and skill of the bidder because they have had to recruit, secure, present, place, and retain while conforming to a greater variety of client requirements and skillsets.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Answer 40:

No. The requirement remains unchanged. The Bidder can provide up to 8 contract references for each resource category within a Workstream.

Question 41:

With a number of large government RFPs currently in process, we respectfully request a two (2) week extension to the current delivery date to provide us sufficient time to develop a quality, competitive response.

Answer 41:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Question 42:

Amendment 4, response 9 indicates that: "*Contract references are not limited to services delivered in Canada.*" Please confirm that the SACC Definition of Bidder clause applies to this RFP and that Bidders may not use references from their parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates regardless of the geographic location of delivery.

Answer 42:

Confirmed.

Question 43:

Given the significant number of workstreams, categories and tasks to map to within the Statement of Work we respectfully request an extension to June 15th.

Answer 43:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Question 44:

The "Client Reference Form for M1" on Page 133 of 155 has two rows for Resource Category Substantiation, namely row "A" for the "Resource Category Name" and row "B" for the "List of Tasks".

We are requested to cross-reference our response in these two rows "to the number of tasks identified in the SOW in Annex A for the workstream and resource category being evaluated".

In order to cross-reference the tasks in a manner that will aid evaluation, please confirm if Elections Canada would accept a small change to the table format whereby the cross-reference of tasks is presented in two columns, providing a side-by-side cross-reference of tasks (rather than rows as is currently the case). Please advise.

Answer 44:

Refer to answer 23 above.

Question 45:

Given the number of outstanding questions yet to be answered that affect the content of bidder proposals, we respectfully request a 2 week extension to the deadline in order to allow enough time to compile data and put together a compliant proposal.

Answer 45:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Question 46:

Please confirm Amendment 5, 3. should have been amended to “provide on- and off-hour support as required by the Technical Authority”.

Answer 46:

Please see amendment to RFP below.

Question 47:

Given the magnitude of responding to this solicitation, including 114,450 billable days and up to 128 references, we would like to request a 2-week extension.

Answer 47:

The solicitation closing date is extended to June 15, 2016.

RFP AMENDMENT

1. At Page 1 of the Request for Proposal:

Delete: Solicitation closes at 2:00PM on 2016-06-08

Insert: Solicitation closes at 2:00PM on 2016-06-15

2. At PART 3 – BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions, (d) Submission of Only One Bid, (i):

Add:

A single bid may contain bids to be awarded a contract in one or more Workstreams. However, a bid may not contain a bid from the Bidder, including related entities to be awarded more than one contract in any given Workstream.

3. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.7 Workstream 7 – ITOPS Delivery Services, 1.6 System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall):

Delete:

1.6 System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall)

- provide on- and off-hour support during general elections and by-elections as required by the Technical Authority

Insert:

1.9 System Administrator, Level 2 (Firewall)

- provide on- and off-hour as required by the Technical Authority

4. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.8 Workstream 8 – Database Services, 1.2 Database Administrator, Levels 2 and 3:

Delete:

- conduct web application development using:
 - Oracle version 10g
 - PL/SQL

Insert:

- conduct web application development using:
 - Oracle version 10g or higher

- PL/SQL

5. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.6 Workstream 6 – Architecture Services, P.2 Enterprise Architect, Levels 2 and 3:

Delete:

- develop technical architectures, frameworks and strategies to meet the business requirements and long term enterprise goals which include:
 - SOA framework/principles
 - application architecture standards based on J2EE
 - data architecture standards based on Oracle databases

Insert:

- develop technical architectures, frameworks and strategies to meet the business requirements and long term enterprise goals

6. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.1 Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.6 Business System Analyst, Levels 2 and 3:

Delete:

- evaluate EC's existing business procedures and methods

Insert:

- evaluate existing business procedures and methods

7. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.2 Workstream 2 – Web Application Services, A.7 Programmer/Analyst (.NET) Levels 2 and 3:

Delete:

- participate and assist the Elections Canada Technical Authority with security code reviews of .NET code

Insert:

- participate and assist the Technical Authority with security code reviews of .NET code

8. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.6 Workstream 6 – Architecture Services, A.1 Application/Software Architect, Levels 2 and 3:

Delete:

- evaluate EC's existing procedures and methods for application/software development, identify and document database content, structure and application subsystems and develop data dictionaries

Insert:

- evaluate existing procedures and methods for application/software development, identify and document database content, structure and application subsystems and develop data dictionaries

9. At Annex A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 3 SCOPE OF WORK, 3.2 Tasks, 3.2.6 Workstream 8 – Database Services, I.4 Database Modeller / IM Modeller, Levels 2 and 3:

Delete:

- apply EC's and/or industry best practices for standard naming conventions and coding

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
05005-150334/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
05005-150334

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
634el05005-150334

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
634el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

practices to ensure consistency of data models

Insert:

- apply best practices for standard naming conventions and coding practices to ensure consistency of data models

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.