Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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

Title - Sujet Integration Development	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation B8986-170040/A	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B8986-170040	**Date** 2016-12-01
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$$ZM-620-30574	
File No. - N° de dossier 620zm.B8986-170040	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2016-12-13**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☑ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: St-Jean Valois, Joanne	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 620zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4945 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** (819) 956-1156
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**	

Canada

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation	Amd. No – N° de la modif.	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
B8986-170040/A	007	620ZM
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client	**File No. – N° du dossier**	**CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME**
B8986-170040	620ZM –B8986-170040	

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 007

This amendment is raised to:

1. Provide answers to Bidder's questions in relation to this solicitation; and
2. Amend the Request for Proposal (RFP) as detailed in Appendix A-003 below.

Question #11:

The following question relates to Point-Rated Technical Criteria RT6/RT11/RT16/RT21. Due to the fact that Siebel is an older technology and not widely used in recent years (unlike other rated technologies), we find the requirement for 9+ years to score full points on the noted requirements to be restrictive/unreasonable. Please amend the rating scheme as follows:

"1 to 2 years – 2 points

2 to 3 years – 4 points

3 to 4 years – 6 points

4 to 5 years – 8 points

5+ years – 10 points"

Answer #11:

Canada accept the changes and will reduce the number of years for RT6/RT11/RT16/RT21. But Canada do not agree with the statement of the potential bidder that Siebel is an older technology and not widely used.

Question #12:

The following question references Resource Mandatory Technical Criteria MTC5 and MTC7. We feel that candidates with either C# or ASP.NET and extensive ERP system experience would be equally valuable as those with both. When CIC will be filling a total of 37 roles, requiring C# **and** ASP.NET will be restrictive to the potential candidate pool as a mandatory requirement. We hereby request that the wording of MTC5 and MTC7 be changed to the following:

"The proposed resource must demonstrate at least 5 years of experience within the last 7 years, developing C# **and/or** ASP.NET solutions using the .NET Framework."

Answer #12:

Canada has removed ASP .NET from MCT5 and MCT7, see revised Attachment 4.1.

Question #13:

It is our understanding that requirement MTC1 for Corporate Capacity on Page 1 of 6 of Attachment 4.1 requires, in item 5, that the contract provided includes provision of the services in at least one of the two noted categories. Further, the nature of the services under contract must meet 9 of 11 of the SOW tasks related to this RFP and be substantiated by copy of a client issued Statement of Work or Task Authorization. It is also our understanding that RT2 on Page 1 of 11 of Attachment 4.2 requires same requirements and supportive elements for each of the contracts provided.

It must be considered that Client issued Statements of Work or Task Authorizations will vary drastically in terms of the TBIPS categories/roles utilized or called up and the number and degree of detail provided in relation to the tasks. Indeed this mandatory requirement (and complementary rated requirement) present a highly restrictive and uneven playing field for Bidders in that the requirement will favour incumbents and/or present a difficulty for Bidders based not upon their capability to provide these services but upon the client's level of detail and role choices for their potentially highly relevant contracts which is out of control of the Bidder.

In consideration of the above would the Crown agree to:

a. Remove the need to align the contract with the A.3 TBIPS category exclusively – as indeed highly relevant similar services may be procured as a variety of TBIPS roles which is ultimately at the discretion of the client groups and indeed, by demonstrating that the work completed related to a minimum of 9 of 11 tasks, this renders the category role title redundant.
b. Provide an alternate means to support the tasks provided under the supplied contracts. Most similar large TBIPS procurements have set a precedence that a signed (referenced) letter by the client stating the nature of the work completed has been satisfactory. This has been found to be the ultimate attestation and support if given by the client contact referenced.
c. Make same two changes above to RT2 requirement.

Answer #13:

a. Canada will accept Programmer/Software Developer as a category as long as the resource still meets nine tasks out of tasks a to k and that task c. h. and i. are included in the nine tasks.

b. No, a copy of the Contract Statement of Work and/or Task Authorization Statement of work must be submitted with the bid to substantiate the task provided by the proposed category as stated in the Request for Proposal at Attachment 4.1 MTC1. Furthermore, no additional list of tasks will be accepted even if signed by Client representative.
c. No change will be done for the RT2. The requirement for RT2 remain unchanged.

Question #14:

The following question relates to the nature of the resource categories required in the RFP. Based on Treasury Board's definition of an "ERP", we are concerned that the type of resources with the skills identified in this RFP are not well aligned to the A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst category. In general, our clients select a variety of different categories for their resourcing needs, in particular for .NET or Biztalk, they are more likely to use the A.7 Programmer/Analyst category. For example, the skill set including C# and .NET programming are not commonly aligned to the A.3 category. We are concerned about the restrictiveness of this alignment as well as ability to find 37 of these resources if they are categorized in this manner. We respectfully ask that the resource category be changed to A.7 Programmer/Analyst. This will also allow the Crown access to a greater pool of qualified resources for future requirements (as the Crown plans to engage 37 resources over the course of the contract.

Answer #14:

Canada chose the category A.3 ERP programmer analyst because this category reflects and responds to our need.

Question #15:

Please advise us as to the companies which CIC is currently contracting (or has contracted with in the past) with to complete prior similar services. Additionally we would like to know which TBIPS categories have been used and the total number of resources and spend for previous similar work.

Answer #15:

The services are currently being provided by two Suppliers. Each Suppliers are performing a portion of the work.

Name of Supplier: CGI Information Systems and Management Consultants Inc.

Contract Value: $10,281,875.09 (including Applicable taxes)

Duration of Contract: October 19th, 2012 to October 18th, 2017

Name of Supplier: Randstad Interim Incorporated

Contract Value: $10,110,104.92 (including Applicable taxes)

Duration of Contract: October 19th, 2012 to October 18th, 2017

The categories that had been used are:

ERP Programmer Analyst .NET – Level 3

ERP Programmer Analyst Biztalk – Level 3

APPENDIX A-003

At Attachment 4.1 – Mandatory Technical Criteria, has been amended as follow:

DELETE Attachment 4.1 – Mandatory Technical Criteria (Revised November 18, 2016)

INSERT ***Attachment 4.1 – Mandatory Technical Criteria (Revised November 28, 2016)***

At Attachment 4.2 – Point Rated Technical Criteria, has been amended as follow:

DELETE Attachment 4.2 – Point Rated Technical Criteria (Revised November 18, 2016)

INSERT ***Attachment 4.2 – Point Rated Technical Criteria (Revised November 28, 2016)***

At Appendix C to Annex C – Resources Assessment Criteria, RT1/RT2/RT3/RT4/RT5 **English version only** *has been amended as follow:*

DELETE ***Appendix C to Annex C – Resources Assessment Criteria***

INSERT ***Appendix C to Annex C – Resources Assessment Criteria (Revised November 28, 2016)***