



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

*as instructed in the RFSO/RFSAsolicitation document, Component I, Part 2, article 2

Revision to a Request for Supply Arrangement - Révision à une demande pour un arrangement en matière d'approvisionnement

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

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Electronic Information Technology Professional Srv
Div/Div des srv professionnels en technologie de l'information électronique
11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier
Portage III 0A1 - 1
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS / SPICT	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-170432/A	Date 2016-08-12
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20170432	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
File No. - N° de dossier 004ei.EN578-170432	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EI-004-30363	
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale	2016-07-21
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-08-31	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: IMOS MDAI	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 004ei
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (866) 930-4667 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-7827
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
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)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 004

This amendment is raised to:

- A. (left blank)
 - B. (left blank)
 - C. Answer questions received from bidders
-

A. (n/a)

B. (n/a)

C. Questions and Answers

Question 20

We have just completed our on line submission for the above mentioned TBIPS update. We do not have any SO rates as we are currently set up for a supply arrangement only.

- a) Please confirm that the response is complete and that nothing else is required from our end. If something is missing or in any way incomplete, please let me know.
- b) Reading the documentation on the SPSS (sic) site, I assume that there is no need to sign and scan any pages for email submission. If it is required, please let me know.

Answer to Question 20:

- a) After the bidder submits their DCC bid, the Main Supplier Contact registered in CPSS will receive a system generated email confirming receipt of the bid. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that the bid is complete and is submitted.
- b) Please refer to:
 - Component I, Part 2 Bidder Instructions, article 2,
 - FAQ #9 from Solicitation Amendment 001, and
 - Question and Answer #8 from Solicitation Amendment 002.

Question 21

- a) We are currently qualified in 6 categories in the Business Services stream. At the time of qualification, we did not request any unsubstantiated categories. According to the RFSA/RFSO, any request for an unsubstantiated category in this refresh is only allowed on categories qualified in this refresh. In other words, we cannot now ask for 3 unsubstantiated categories based on our previous qualification in 6 categories. However, in this re-refresh, can we submit references in the last 3 years to re-qualify in the same 6 categories we previously qualified in, and therefore request through this refresh 3 unsubstantiated categories?
- b) Along the same lines, in the Project Management Services stream, we currently have 2 unsubstantiated categories. In this re-refresh, can we submit references in the last 3 years to now qualify the 2 categories that are currently unsubstantiated, and through that qualification, request through this refresh 1 additional unsubstantiated category?

Answer to Question 21:

- a) As per Attachment A, M.5 Identification of Categories, article 3; “An existing SO and/or SA Holder cannot re-substantiate a grandfathered category from a previous solicitation if that Category was awarded as ‘substantiated’.”

A category that was previously awarded as ‘substantiated’ must be identified as ‘currently substantiated’ in this bid. [Note: If applying for additional tier(s), prior to identifying a category as ‘currently substantiated’, you must first identify the Stream as ‘currently offered’]

- b) Yes. You would identify such a category as “Currently unsubstantiated – now substantiated” in the DCC. Please note that any reference submitted for such a Category will be evaluated, and the result of the evaluation will prevail over the information provided in a previous solicitation.

Question 22:

- a) Regarding the Security Requirement in Part 4, section 3, which states: “Bidder must hold a valid organization security clearance” and that: “If the Bidder is a joint venture, all joint venture members must hold at least a valid DOS issued by the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate (CISD)”. It also states that: “Bidders who have not yet received their DOS clearance from CISD by the date that the Offer/Arrangement Authority has issued any Standing Offer as a result of this solicitation will be considered non-responsive.” It also states that: “Bidders that are seeking sponsorship for the initial DOS clearance are to submit their request through their DCC submission by the closing date.”

This would seem to create a problem of a Joint Venture whereby they may have to sponsor several members of a JV for the DOS clearance and could have their overall submission declared non-responsive if one of them does not receive the DOS clearance in time. Is this a correct assumption?

- b) Due to potential delays in DOS clearance and due to summer vacation and being short staffed we respectfully request an extension to September 30, 2016.

Answer to Question 22:

- a) Yes, that is correct for the SO but not for the SA.

Regarding the Standing Offer → Component I, Part 4, article 3.3 states:

“Bidders who have not yet received their DOS clearance from CISD by the date that the Offer/Arrangement Authority has issued any Standing Offer as a result of this solicitation will be considered non-responsive to this bid solicitation's requirements for the issuance of a Standing Offer.”

Regarding the Supply Arrangement → Component I, Part 4, article 3.2 states:

“in respect of a Supply Arrangement, should a Bidder receive its required clearance while all other requirements of the bid solicitation have been met and its bid is still valid, Canada will consider awarding a Supply Arrangement to that Bidder.”

Note: The issuance of a successful bidder's SA will be put on hold pending security clearance.

- b) The closing date remains the same.

Question 23:

In reviewing the DCC information is it unclear as to what I submit under the Category and Status of each stream, in particular the items that were previously marked as unsubstantiated.

As a company that holds the SO and SA for example under Stream 1 (A) Applications Services we had previously qualified (substantiated) for 12 of the categories, which allowed us to unsubstantiated the other 5 and as such we were awarded a contract (sic) for all 17 categories under that stream. When we review the DCC information, we still see the wording currently unsubstantiated.

As we were awarded a contract (sic) for all the categories do we now select the other wording from “currently unsubstantiated” to the other selection “currently unsubstantiated – now substantiated” as we awarded a contract (sic) which included the (sic) all the categories or do we leave it as “currently unsubstantiated”

Answer to Question 23:

If are already qualified for all categories in that stream, then there would be no benefit in substantiating your unsubstantiated categories.

In a different scenario, a bidder may decide to substantiate categories that were previously awarded as ‘unsubstantiated’ to gain experience in that stream. For example:

- Bidder X is an existing SO/SA supplier in Stream 2 - Geomatics Services.
- As a result of the previous evaluation, Bidder X is currently qualified for 5 substantiated categories (G.1, G.2, G.3, G.4, G.5), and for 2 unsubstantiated categories (G.6, G.7).
- Bidder X is now bidding for more categories in this stream.
- Bidder X decides to bid for G.6 and G.7 as substantiated.
- Bidder X would identify G.6 & G.7 as ‘Currently unsubstantiated – now substantiated’ in the DCC and would provide the required reference details.
- Bidder X could also apply for one “Newly Unsubstantiated” (category G.8).
- If the evaluation results are positive for G.6 & G.7 (i.e. each category receives a positive reference), then Bidder X would be qualified for G.6 & G.7 as substantiated and G.8 as unsubstantiated.
- If the evaluation results are negative for either G.6 or G.7, then the Bidder would lose their current qualifications for the category (or categories) that received a negative response, and Bidder X would not qualify for G.8 as unsubstantiated.

Question 24:

RE: Attachment A to Component I Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria for the Standing Offer and the Supply Arrangement, M5 – Identification of Categories, #5

In qualifying for additional categories it is our understanding that all information will be provided electronically through the DCC, however, in the response requirement for #5 references are to provide a date range of when services were offered and there does not appear to be a “date” field in the DCC for vendors to complete. Can PWSGC please confirm that date information will be provided by the reference and not the vendor?

Answer to Question 24

Canada will identify the date range in the reference's email (within three years immediately prior to the bid closing date). The reference will be asked to confirm that the services were provided within that date range.

Question 25:

For the Mandatory Criteria, for each 'Group', for Financial Certifications, it is requested that the vendor enter the date for the fiscal year end. Could you please explain what the fiscal year end date should be? Should it be 31st August 2016 in all cases so that the vendor can show that they carried out a certain amount of business in the previous, say 3 years? Or should it conform to the vendor's own internal fiscal year end?

Answer to Question 25:

The Bidder is to provide their own internal fiscal year end date.

Question 26:

Our company is currently a Tier 1 supplier in Stream 1 - Application Services. We previously qualified for 12 categories as 'substantiated' and 5 categories as 'unsubstantiated' in Stream 1.

My understanding of your answer to question 16 from Solicitation Amendment 003, is that we do not have to provide additional references with respect to that Stream if we want to qualify for Tier 2, although we would have to respond to the M.3 Insurance Requirements and M.4 Total Cumulative Value Billed with respect to Tier 2. Is my understanding correct?

Answer to Question 26:

Yes, that is correct. In the DCC, you would identify this Stream as 'currently offered' in the Tier 2 portion of your bid, and then identify your current category qualifications as 'currently substantiated' and 'currently unsubstantiated' as applicable.

Question 27:

a) Part 2, Section 2, Submission of Bids

The RFSA/RFISO indicates that a portion of the bid will be submitted to Canada by email upon request.

We appreciate that PWGSC is taking steps to simplify the submission process and reduce the amount of paper in the process.

We have a concern with the "upon request" portion of the requirement. Should a vendor contact be on vacation when the request is made, there is a chance that they may be found non-responsive should they not be able to respond when the request is made. Furthermore, should a request to a vendor be routed a SPAM box, they would also potentially, be dropped as a potential bidder for not responding in sufficient time.

We request the PWGSC provide assurances that bidders will be given additionally time should they not respond to an initial request in a timely manner, and perhaps offer other alternatives for submitting the information. For example, all bidders know the information that is required for the email submission and as such, may bidders email the required elements to PWGSC in advance of receiving such a request?

b) CPSS, Mandatory Requirement M1, Financial Certification

Do existing vendors who are relying on the grandfather certificate to meet this and other requirements, leave this section as is (with the date of the fiscal year end as originally entered) or should they update the date to their most recent fiscal year end?

Answer to Question 27:

- a) Canada will conduct its correspondence in accordance with the following: Canada will make a minimum of 2 attempts by email to reach the bidder's "Main Supplier Contact" registered in CPSS. Should no response be received in the specified time, Canada will follow up with a phone call to the Main Supplier Contact's number in CPSS prior to deeming the bid non-responsive.

Canada will follow the instructions received in an 'out of office' notification, where applicable.

Please ensure that the name and contact information for your company's Main Supplier Contact is current and accurate in CPSS.

- b) This section can be left 'as is'.

Question 28:

I am currently in the process of completing the DCC Submission for the TBIPS Re-compete (EN 578170432/A) and had a question in regards to providing newly substantiated categories.

Is there a minimum time period for which the services must have been provided to the client reference in order for it to be considered a valid substantiation? If so, could you please indicate this minimum time period?

Answer to Question 28:

Yes. Please refer to Attachment A to Component I, M.5 Identification of Categories, second paragraph that starts with "For each Category..."

Question 29:

- a) If we are not changing anything from our current TBIPS SA & SO including our Substantiated and Non Substantiated, do we need to provide references?
b) How do we change to Substantiated from Non Substantiated?

Answer to Question 29

- a) No
b) You would identify those categories as "Currently unsubstantiated – now substantiated" in the DCC and provide the reference details. Please refer to Question & Answer 23 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 30:

We have an existing Tier 1 JV with two companies taking part. We wish to qualify our JV for Tier 2 but our two companies do not have sufficient TCVB.

- a) What is the process for including a third company in our JV so that we can qualify?
b) Can we just amend our PBN to include the 3rd company name, add the new company info and Tier 2 info on CPSS as the new qualification part of our submission (and provide the TCVB info) while grandfathering everything else?

- c) Do we have to start over and re-submit a complete new bid?
- d) If we have to start over and re-submit a complete new bid can we re-use the current PBN by amending the companies named or do we get a new PBN?
- e) If we have to start over and re-submit a complete new bid can we still do a grandfather submission under our current JV just in case there is a problem with our new JV bid?

Answer to Question 30

- a) You would have to get a new PBN for the new JV, create a new CPSS account, and submit a bid as a new bidder.
- b) No, your existing JV is registered in CPSS under its unique PBN. For your new JV, you would have to obtain a unique PBN for it and enroll in CPSS under that new PBN. The Grandfather Certification does apply in this situation.
- c) Yes
- d) No, please refer to Answer a) above
- e) One legal entity may participate in the maximum of two bid submissions. Please refer to Component I, Part 2, article 1.3 Bid Participation.

Question 31:

Could you please clarify the expectations with the Grandfather Certification? It would seem that what you are saying is that rather than send information that you already have on file, we can submit the filled Grandfather Certification. Is this correct?

Answer to Question 31:

Current SO/SA Holders must submit their online DCC bid BY the closing date and time and must submit the supporting documentation, which includes the Grandfather Certification, by email upon request by Canada AFTER the closing date.

Please refer to:

- Component I, Part 5 – Certifications, article 1 “The Grandfather Certification (existing SO/SA Holders only), first paragraph that starts with “Existing SA and/or SO Holders who wish to rely on information...”
- Component I, Part 2 – Bidder Instructions, article 2. Submission of Bids
- Component I, Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions
- Component I, Attachment A, M.1 Financial Certification, article 1. b) and c)
- Component I, Attachment A, M.2 Minimum Years in Business, article 1. b) and c)
- Component I, Attachment A, M.3 Insurance Requirements, article 1. b) and c)
- Component I, Attachment A, M.4 Total Cumulative Value Billed (TCVB), article 1. b) and c)
- Component I, Attachment A, M.5 Identification of Categories article 1. b) and c)

Question 32:

My firm looks after a number of TBIPS renewals and new submissions on behalf of our clients. Given that TBIPS has now moved to a totally digital submission, and has requested certain documentation via email upon request from PWGSC. Are we able to submit this documentation on behalf of our clients to PWGSC in advance to lessen their burden, whereby avoiding the contact in the future by PWGSC in the future? By documentation I am referring to the integrity provisions, bidders statement, and grandfather certification.

It would be more efficient for us, as they will inevitably be contacting us when they are contacted by PWGSC for the documentation, and it creates another logistical link that could cause communications problems and delays.

Answer to Question 32:

Canada is unable to accommodate this request. Canada will contact the bidder by email after the closing date to request this information. Please refer to:

- Question and Answer 27 a) from this Solicitation Amendment, and
- Question and Answer 8 from Solicitation Amendment 002.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.