



**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**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**  
**Raison sociale et adresse du**  
**fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Informatics Professional Services Division / Division  
des services professionnels en informatique  
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier  
4C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Integration Development	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> B8986-170040/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 008
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> B8986-170040	<b>Date</b> 2016-12-01
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-620-30574	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 620zm.B8986-170040	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-12-13</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> St-Jean Valois, Joanne	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 620zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 469-4945 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-1156
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

<b>Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation</b> B8986-170040/A	<b>Amd. No – N° de la modif.</b> 008	<b>Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur</b> 620ZM
<b>Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client</b> B8986-170040	<b>File No. – N° du dossier</b> 620ZM –B8986-170040	<b>CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME</b>

## SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 008

This amendment is raised to provide answers to Bidder's questions in relation to this solicitation

---

### Question #16:

With respect to Corporate Mandatory Criteria MTC1 and Point-Rated Technical Criteria RT2:

When demonstrating experience against the resource categories ERP Programmer/Analyst (.NET) Level 3 and ERP Programmer/Analyst (BIZTALK) Level 3 in fulfillment of both MTC1 and RT2, the Crown is asking vendors to provide contract documentation that demonstrates 9 out of the 11 SOW tasks. The associated SOW tasks are extremely limiting due to the specific technology and CIC environment references throughout. Meeting 81% of these tasks seems an undue burden given many TA contracts contain a concise list of tasks/duties (i.e. 5 items). Additionally, given the specific technology and CIC environment references it would be almost impossible for a vendor to meet the requirement unless they were currently working within this environment.

When responding to TBIPS RFPs vendors are required to demonstrate 51% of the TBIPS category requirements which are much more generic. Would the Crown please consider modifying MTC1 and RT2 to reflect similar TBIPS practices by allowing vendors to demonstrate 51% (5 – 6 tasks) of the SOW tasks?

### Answer #16:

Please refer to answer 13 of amendment 7.

### Question #17:

Given the complexity of this bid would the Crown please consider providing the vendor community an additional 1 week extension (December 12, 2016) to ensure they receive quality responses?

### Answer #17:

Please refer to Amendment 6 the closing date has been extended to December 13, 2016.

### Question #18:

(Reference: requirements RT16 and RT21)

We have found that the requirement for "experience providing Microsoft BizTalk programming solutions in

<b>Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation</b> B8986-170040/A	<b>Amd. No – N° de la modif.</b> 008	<b>Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur</b> 620ZM
<b>Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client</b> B8986-170040	<b>File No. – N° du dossier</b> 620ZM –B8986-170040	<b>CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME</b>

support of interfaces within a Siebel CRM application" is primarily applicable to resources that have worked on IRCC projects and their extensions at Global Affairs Canada. This heavily favours the incumbent suppliers at the expense of other qualified bidders.

We recognize that this is a rated requirement, however it represents 20% of the score for each resource, which heavily affects the viability of proposals from non-incumbent bidders. In the interest of encouraging more competitive bids, will the Crown please consider modifying requirements RT16 and RT21 to accept BizTalk experience within other ERP/CRM solutions, beyond the Siebel CRM product exclusively?

#### **Answer #18:**

Please refer to answer 11 of amendment 7.

#### **Question #19:**

(Reference: requirements RT6 and RT11)

We have found that the requirement for "experience providing programming solutions using C# and .NET within a Siebel CRM application" is primarily applicable to resources that have worked on IRCC projects and their extensions at Global Affairs Canada. This heavily favours the incumbent suppliers at the expense of other qualified bidders.

We recognize that this is a rated requirement, however it represents 20% of the score for each resource, which heavily affects the viability of proposals from non-incumbent bidders. In the interest of encouraging more competitive bids, will the Crown please consider modifying requirements RT6 and RT11 to accept C# and .NET experience within other ERP/CRM solutions, beyond the Siebel CRM product exclusively?

#### **Answer #19:**

Please refer to answer 11 of amendment 7.

#### **Question #20:**

The following question is regarding MTC1 and RT2:

Requesting client issued TAs/SOWs which demonstrate 9 of 11 tasks which match this RFP's SOW is unreasonably restrictive as these tasks are extremely specific and deviate significantly from the TBIPS Catalogue tasks as defined by PSPC's iMOS.

<b>Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation</b> B8986-170040/A	<b>Amd. No – N° de la modif.</b> 008	<b>Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur</b> 620ZM
<b>Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client</b> B8986-170040	<b>File No. – N° du dossier</b> 620ZM –B8986-170040	<b>CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME</b>

Given that most qualified References to support of MTC1 and RT2 will be contracts previously issued under the TBIPS Supply Arrangement, the SOWs for each Resource Category usually follow the approved TBIPS Catalogue tasks. Therefore, Bidders cannot reasonably be expected to demonstrate compliance to this requirement with only a copy of the contract/TA, except for Bidders currently working under the scope of this specific SOW.

To ensure fair competition, would the Crown please amend both MTC1 and RT2 to allow for Bidders to demonstrate compliance by providing a signed letter confirming that they have provided resources who have performed the minimum number of the associated tasks listed in Section 5 of the Statement of Work of this bid solicitation. For example: "A copy of the Contract Statement of Work and/or Task Authorization Statement of work, **and a signed letter from a client representative (if required)**, must be submitted with the bid to substantiate the tasks provided by the proposed category."

**Answer #20:**

Please refer to answer 13 of amendment 7.

**Question #21:**

Given the fact that to date, we have not received answers to our clarification questions which will greatly affect the preparation of our response, we hereby respectfully request an extension of the bid submission deadline to December 13, 2016.

**Answer #21:**

Please refer to Amendment 6 the closing date has been extended to December 13, 2016.

**Question #22:**

Given the high volume of RFP's that have been issued and that we are currently responding to, will the crown please provide an extension to Monday, December 12, 2016?

**Answer #22:**

Please refer to Amendment 6 the closing date has been extended to December 13, 2016.