



SHARED SERVICES CANADA
Invitation to Qualify
for the Procurement Process for
WORKPLACE TECHNOLOGY DEVICES (WTD)
PRINTING PRODUCTS
AMENDMENT # 011

ITQ Invitation No.	10047402/A	Date	August 11 th , 2016
--------------------	------------	------	--------------------------------

Issuing Office	Shared Services Canada 180 Kent Street, 13 th Floor Ottawa, Ontario K1P 0B5		
Contracting Authority (The Contracting Authority is SSC's representative for all questions and comments about this document.)	Name	Hamid Mohammad	
	Telephone No.	613-716-9792	
	Email Address	Hamid.mohammad@canada.ca	
Closing Date and Time	2016/08/24 14:00 PM		
Time Zone	Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)		
Destination of Goods/Services	Not applicable – Pre-Qualification Process Only		
Email Address for Submitting your Response by the Closing Date	SSC.consultation-consultation.SPC@canada.ca		
Comment	This document contains a security requirement		



Amendment 011

THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO:

1. Publish Canada's Responses to Respondents' Questions;
2. Revise ITQ Part 3, Section I: Qualification Response, 3.2.1, d);
3. Revise Attachment 4.1 PS-R2 Rated Criteria (English Only);
4. Revise Attachment 4.1 PS-M4; and
5. Correct error in Amendment 005, Modification 2.

NOTE: Respondents' clarification questions are numerically sequenced upon arrival at SSC. Respondents are hereby advised that questions and answers for this solicitation may be issued via BuyandSell out of sequence.

1.

Respondent's Question 47	In reference to Part 3, Section 3.2.1 (d), pg. 18-19 of 55 "The Review and Refine Requirements (RRR) Process Document will be provided to the Qualified Respondents in advance of the RRR phase to expedite arrangements with Respondents resources for the RRR phase. Upon receiving the selection notice to participate in the RRR phase, Qualified Respondents may only be given up to 3 working days to submit signed Agreement to Participate and Information form of the RRR Process Document." Question: In advance of the RRR phase and to ensure the 3 working days is sufficient for the review and return the Agreement to Participate, including ensuring proper levels of the business are in agreement of the terms of the agreement (without knowing the complexity or length of the agreement), we request a draft version of the RRR process document.
Canada's Response to Question 47	RRR will only be released to Qualified Respondents, however, instead of 3 days, 5 working days may be given. Please see revisions herein.
Respondent's Question 52	For any given department MPIS contract, can different categories of OEM products be combined from PS#1 and PS#2 to provide the optimal solution?
Canada's Response to Question 52	See Canada's Response to Q86 of the present amendment.
Respondent's Question 58	Please confirm, Core Team members does not mean actual individuals that are working from Respondents that are pulling this bid together.-correct?
Canada's Response to Question 58	Correct, as per article 2.4 Composition of Core Team, Core Team comprises of company/organization names.



Respondent's Question 61	<p>In reference to Attachment 4.1, PS-R2 - Section 1.2.2, pg. 18 of 36</p> <p>“Respondent should have additional Print Devices located within the Canadian Public Sector and currently under management in Canada at the time of this ITQ closing.”</p> <p>Question: Please clarify what is meant by “additional”. Is it additional to PS-M1 (45,000) and/or PS-R1 (90,000) or is it a breakout of the overall devices placed in Canada as per accounted for in PS-M1?</p>
Canada's Response to Question 61	<p>Yes it is breakout of all devices in Canada. The devices in this criteria PS-R2 can be included in the devices listed within PS-M1 and/or PS-R1. See revision herein.</p>
Respondent's Question 62	<p>Section 1.1.4: This procurement targets integrators, Managed Print Service providers, value added resellers and Print Manufacturers. As one of the largest independent Managed Print Services provider organizations in Canada we had anticipated that our input and recommendations would have received greater support in shaping the requirements for qualification for this new vehicle. However the qualification requirements for the number of devices managed and size of references required eliminate all but the largest print OEMs from being able to prime a response.</p> <p>Under the current qualification requirements a company such as ours would only be able to participate as a regional sub-contractor to an OEM print. The work involved would be that of fulfillment against service requests with little opportunity to demonstrate the value add that we bring to all of our other clients which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An OEM neutral approach supports competitive pricing and standardization while also providing a unique ability to integrate, manage and service cross vendor solutions • We are able to provide a variety of networked based platform independent hardware and software solutions. • With strong IT and consulting capabilities we are able to architect, integrate and extend solution scope while eliminating many unnecessary steps saving time and money. • We have access to a broad geographic network that allows organizations to consolidate managed print services across dispersed locations. • As a SME integrator we utilize a proven, refined and simplified methodology that results in a quicker return on investment time to savings, realization of economies / efficiencies and execution and implementation. • We are focused on managed print services and therefore we are indifferent to retaining or refreshing technologies during the process of optimizing printer fleets, increasing performance and reducing costs. <p>Although large by Canadian standards, our managed print services business includes some significant Canadian companies, however the volume of devices, contracts and geographic locations that these clients represent do not approach anywhere near the required thresholds for fleet size and revenue generation that the qualifications for WTD demand.</p> <p>We request that further reconsideration of the procurement strategy for Managed Print Services be undertaken so that a second Tier of MPS provider be enabled to qualify so that Canadian Innovation and businesses can participate in a meaningful way.</p>



Canada's Response to Question 62	<p>Thank you for the input, and your participation in the industry engagement phase from July 2015 - February 2016. The expectation is that smaller firms can partner with other firms in order to participate in this procurement as was reviewed in the web-based presentation at the conclusion of industry engagement.</p> <p>Please also see Canada's response to Q.76 of the present amendment.</p>
Respondent's Question 63	<p>Section 1.1.4: This procurement targets integrators, Managed Print Service providers, value added resellers and Print Manufacturers. The participation criteria outlined in Attachment 4.1 precludes the involvement of independent integrators, independent Managed Print Service providers and value added resellers based on known industry average fleet sizes within the Canadian reseller channel.</p> <p>Will you amend the criteria in Section 4.1 to align with the statement in Section 1.1.4?</p>
Canada's Response to Question 63	<p>See Canada's response to Q.62 of the present amendment.</p>
Respondent's Question 66	<p>Section 1.2 "Scope of Anticipated Procurement" (ii) SSC is currently contemplating the award of up to 3 contract(s) and/or Supply Arrangements and/or Standing Offers.</p> <p>Section 2.4 Composition of Core Team. The Core Team can be comprised of a maximum of 1 Lead Respondent and up to 2 additional Core Team Members.....</p> <p>Section 3.1.6 Core Team Composition Rules (e) There can be a maximum of 2 Named PM's in the core team and they must be distinct.</p> <p>Annex B – Section 5.2 SSC has not yet finalized the strategy for managing existing print devices. This will be a topic for discussion during the RRR phase. As outlined throughout Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3, the award of up to 3 contracts may yield a minimum of 3 distinct manufacturers or a maximum of 6 distinct manufacturers. Thus, the ITQ qualification process may yield a "technical service abandonment" of a significant portion of the currently installed base. This will further inhibit the transition to MPS for fleets that cannot be temporarily serviced by the Respondents. Discussing this at the RRR will be too late to resolve the service requirement. In the ITQ response phase, how will you insure all devices owned by Canada will be serviced by a certified field service provider in the event that a minimum of 3 distinct manufacturers become successful Respondents?</p> <p>Annex B – Section 5.2 (b) For Canada owned devices, new service provider would assume responsibility for ongoing management.</p> <p>How will manufacturer A (successful Respondent) provide adequate service for manufacturer B's product?</p>
Canada's Response to Question 66	<p>At this time, it has not been determined who will support legacy equipment (Canada owned and/or leased).</p> <p>The requirements will be discussed during RRR. If additional subcontractors are required during bid solicitation, they can be added by bidders at that time.</p>



<p>Respondent's Question 70</p>	<p>Definition of Terms: "Managed Print Services"... The service includes the development of design principles, assessment and optimization, the deployment, management and maintenance of the print environment... Manufacturers sell extended warranty service plans that are delivered by their network of certified service partners. This allows the Manufacturer to extend their service reach beyond their own company resources.</p> <p>Does selling an extended service plan count as a managed asset for the OEM even though it is the certified business partner that is doing the work?</p>
<p>Canada's Response to Question 70</p>	<p>Yes. If the extended service plan "includes the development of design principles, assessment and optimization, the deployment, management and maintenance of the print environment" and the OEM has the contractual relationship with the customer. The OEM may use one or any number of sub-contractors to deliver against the extended service plan.</p>
<p>Respondent's Question 76</p>	<p>Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.1 Devices under management PS-M1, R2, M4 Total networked devices are estimated at 53,824 (10.3, Table 12). As outlined in the Industry Engagement phase, three successful Respondents would share a minimum of approximately 20% of the installation base, or 10,764 networked devices. The initial mandatory requirement of 45,000 devices under management is over 4 times the expected installation base for a successful Respondent under this ITQ. The number seems arbitrarily high.</p> <p>Generally speaking, are these criteria designed to limit potential Respondents to equipment manufacturers only?</p>
<p>Canada's Response to Question 76</p>	<p>No, see Canada's response to Q62 of the present amendment.</p> <p>Multifunction printers to count for 3 print devices Also note that there are over 90000 local printers, scanners and faxes. The Government of Canada plans to consolidate them into multifunction devices (the exact number is TBD). Each of the 3 qualified respondents will be competing and one of the three will be competing on up to 60% + of the devices on the network which represents a minimum of 45000 devices, hence we want to ensure that each of the 3 winning vendors have the capacity to deliver up to 45000 devices to the Government of Canada.</p>
<p>Respondent's Question 77</p>	<p>Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.1 Devices under management PS-M1 Why is 45,000 devices deemed significant for this requirement? How did you arrive at this number?</p> <p>Would SSC considering removing this criteria given that the tools, infrastructure and skilled employees required to support and MPS environment are inherently different that a managed desktop environment.</p>
<p>Canada's Response to Question 77</p>	<p>See Canada's response to Q.76 of the present amendment.</p>
<p>Respondent's Question 78</p>	<p>Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.1 Devices under management PS-M1</p> <p>How did you determine 1 MFD represents the installed obligations of 3 single function printers?</p>



Canada's Response to Question 78	This topic was raised during industry engagement. It was suggested by industry that there is more value in supporting multi-function devices rather than single-function printers. It was determined that 3 is a reasonable metric based on the industry suggestion, team consensus and the number of MFDs in the current Canada environment.
Respondent's Question 79	Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.2 Devices under management PS-R2 Why are 5,000 devices in the public sector meaningful? Would SSC consider changing this requirement to reflect devices under management in the large enterprise commercial and an aggregate of 1,000 # of devices?
Canada's Response to Question 79	Canada believes that 5000 is a reasonable minimum to use for the rating scale. We believe public sector experience brings value in terms of understanding public sector security requirements, business processes and governance models. The requirement remains unchanged at this time; please note that this is a rated criteria not a mandatory criteria. Also note that Multi-Function devices count as three print devices. The biggest difference in MPS service delivery in the public sector vs. MPS service delivery in the commercial sector is privacy and security requirements, business processes (e.g., financial management and service management processes) policy adherence and government models.
Respondent's Question 80	Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.2 Devices under management PS-R2 From your perspective, what is the biggest difference in MPS service delivery in the public sector vs. MPS service delivery in the commercial sector? Will SSC consider removing the requirements for Public Sector and state large commercial enterprise?
Canada's Response to Question 80	See Canada's Response to Q 79 of the present amendment.
Respondent's Question 82	Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.5 Client References PS-M4. Why are 4 customer references each with a total contract value of \$5,000,000 deemed significant? How did you arrive at this number? Would SSC consider reducing this requirement?
Canada's Response to Question 82	It is desirable that the client references represent large clients with requirements in the same order of magnitude as many Canada departments. Given many contracts are typically multiyear contacts (e.g. 3-4 years), the annual contact value would be between close to \$1.5 million, which we believe is representative for the Government of Canada. Given some contacts may only be annual, this requirement is amended to also allow for an "annual" contract value of at least \$1.5M. See revision herein



Respondent's Question 83	Attachment 4.1, Section 1.2.1 Devices under management PS-M1, R2, M4 Will you amend the criteria to broaden the list of potential Respondents?
Canada's Response to Question 83	See Canada's response to Q 80, 81 and 82, of amendment numbers 010 and 011. No additional changes will be made at this time.
Respondent's Question 85	<p>Is it your intention to allow clients to select only Aboriginal suppliers for the step 2 bid solicitation similar to what TSPS, TBIPS and ProServices? These methods allow bidders to self-identify and provide certification that they are aboriginal firms (at step 1 RFSO/SA stage which establishes the pool of qualified suppliers) and clients can either invite all offeror's to bid (step 2) and only invite aboriginal firms to bid. This allows client departments to meet their aboriginal set-aside objectives. I believe there is sufficient aboriginal firms providing printer related goods & services to justify this decision. If you select to use this procurement strategy i.e. allowing two streams a) non-aboriginal firms b) aboriginal firms, you may want to speak with the owner of TSPS or TBIPS to see how this can be done. Basically, suppliers can bid on one or both stream, the evaluation criteria and the basis of selection remain the same as well as the basis of payment so suppliers are not allowed to bid different pricing on the two stream – the price is the same for both.</p> <p>a.Can you please confirm if the current method of supply uses this model? b.Can you please confirm if the upcoming method of supply intends to use this model?</p>
Canada's Response to Question 85	<p>a. Yes, the current NMSO model allows for the use of aboriginal set-asides due to the broad list of resellers across Canada.</p> <p>b. Contracting obligations that exist in the Comprehensive Land Claim Agreements across Canada will be a discussion point during the next phase of Review and Refine Requirements with the Qualified Respondents.</p> <p>With regards the voluntary set-asides, SSC is not restricting this ITQ to a certain group or size of company. This ITQ is open to all. During the Engagement period (From July 2015 to February 2016) SSC heard from industry that majority of the firms rely on a national network of small and medium enterprise (SMEs) partners, including Aboriginal firms, to deliver services. In order to achieve best value and meet operational and/or WTD end-state requirements, SSC is not imposing additional evaluation criteria or obligations at the ITQ phase. Whether evaluation criteria targeting Aboriginal firms or SMEs are included at the final solicitation phase will be discussed during RRR with the pre-qualified vendors. The structure and intention of the new Managed Print Service (MPS) vehicle is to have higher accountabilities rest with the resulting Contractor(s); there will be performance standards however SSC will not control with whom or how the Contractor delivers the service.</p> <p>If business capacity exists then SMEs and Aboriginal companies can respond to this ITQ as a prime or as a Partner or subcontractor.</p>
Respondent's Question 86	Would a response with two PS providers (OEMs) allow multiple product options to be offered in the same NMSO category, thus providing greater choice for a MPIS solution/provider in their bids?



Canada's Response to Question 86	A final decision on whether multiple products can be within the same NMSO category will be determined during RRR.
Respondent's Question 87	For any given department MPIS contract, can different categories of OEM products be combined from PS#1 and PS#2 to provide the optimal solution?
Canada's Response to Question 87	See Canada's Response to Q86 of the present amendment.

2.

PART 3 RESPONSE PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

At article 3.2.1 Section I: Qualification Response, d) Review and Refine Requirements (RRR) – Qualified Respondents participation and information forms (Required pre-RRR) revision as follows:

REPLACE: "3 working days" with "5 working days"



Attachment – 4.1

Workplace Technology Device (WTD) – Printing Products Invitation to Qualify Evaluation Framework and Process

3. Modification applies to English only.

At 1.2 – Print Services (PS) – Mandatory and Rated Criteria, 1.2.2 Print Services Mandatory and Rated Technical Criteria, PS-R2, revise as follows:

DELETE: word ‘additional’ from PS-R2 Rated Criteria

4.

Note to Respondent(s): the change/revisions have been highlighted.

At Section 1.2.5 Client References PS-M4, revise as follows:

ADD: ‘or an ‘annual’ contract value of at least \$1,500,000.’

#	1.2.5 Print Services Mandatory Criteria		
PS-M4	Mandatory Criteria	Rating	Cross Reference (Appendix B - PS Client References and Client List Table)
	<p>Respondent must provide 4 Canadian Client References for Print Devices under management¹ that are currently in progress at the time of this ITQ closing with each having a Total Contract Value of at least \$5,000,000 or an ‘annual’ contract value of at least \$1,500,000.</p> <p>One of the 4 Client References must have at least 50 locations, spread across at least 10 Cities in at least 3 Provinces in Canada.</p> <p>One of the 4 Client References must be in the Public Sector.</p> <p>The Respondent must demonstrate compliance from one or more contracts that have been in effect for at least 6 months prior to this ITQ closing.</p> <p>Note: When the MPIS and the PS are the same named entity, the 4 Canadian Client References of the MPIS can be used for the PS, as long as the client references are listed as client references on both the Managed Print Integration Services Client References and Client List Table and the Print Services Client References and Client List Table.</p>	Pass or Fail	



5.

Note to Respondent(s): the change/revisions have been highlighted.

At Amendment 005, Modification 2, Correct the superscripts and footnotes as follows:

DELETE:

At Appendix B.1, Print Services Contract List Table, the following superscripts and footnotes are ADDED

INSERT:

Contract	
Start Date ^(III)	End Date ^(IV)

^(III) & ^(IV): Canada will accept the start date of the first agreement and the end date of the agreement that finishes the latest.

INSERT:

At Appendix B.1, Print Services Contract List Table, the following superscripts and footnotes are ADDED

INSERT:

Contract	
Start Date ^(V)	End Date ^(VI)

^(V) & ^(VI): Canada will accept the start date of the first agreement and the end date of the agreement that finishes the latest.

ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS SOLICITATION
REMAIN UNCHANGED.

=====



Following is a summary of Attachments/Amendments issued to date to this solicitation:

Document Tracking	Distribution	Date	Description
Solicitation Documents	Buy and Sell	2016/07/06	Original Invitation to qualify
Amendment No. 001	Buy and Sell	2016/07/15	Canada's Response to Question # 1, 2, 7 Non PDF Electronic Attachment: ITQ Forms 1 and 2, and Attachment 4.1 – Appendix C & Appendix E
Amendment No. 002	Buy and Sell	2016/07/18	Canada's Response to Question # 8, 9 Non PDF Electronic Attachment 4.1 – Appendix A, A1, B & B1
Amendment No. 003	Buy and Sell	2016/07/20	Canada's Response to Question # 3, 4, 5, 6
Amendment No. 004	Buy and Sell	2016/07/25	Canada's Response to Question # 10, 12, 13, 15, 21, 23
Amendment No. 005	Buy and Sell	2016/08/01	Canada's Response to Question # 11, 14 Revision to Attachment 4.1 - Appendix A, A.1, B, B.1 Revision to Part 4
Amendment No. 006	Buy and Sell	2016/08/03	Canada's Response to Question # 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35
Amendment No. 007	Buy and Sell	2016/08/04	Canada's Response to Question # 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 59, 60, 64
Amendment No. 008	Buy and Sell	2016/08/05	Canada's Response to Question # 38, 57, 53, 65 Revision to Part 4
Amendment No. 009	Buy and Sell	2016/08/08	Canada's Response to Question # 22, 81
Amendment No. 010	Buy and Sell	2016/08/10	Canada's Response to Question # 42, 54, 55, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75



Document Tracking	Distribution	Date	Description
Amendment No. 011	Buy and Sell	2016/08/11	Canada's Response to Question # 47, 58, 61, 62, 63, 66, 70, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87 Revision to Part 3 and Attachment 4.1 – PS-R2, PS-M4 Correction to Amendment 005, Modification 2