



**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 - EL  
Division/Services professionnels en informatique -  
division EL

4C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> EFM Systems Integration	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> F1686-150029/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> F1686-150029	<b>Date</b> 2016-12-06
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-615-30604	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 615el.F1686-150029	<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 2016-12-19</b>	
<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> Ghaddab, Nabil	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 615el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-5419 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<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/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

This Solicitation amendment is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and to modify the Solicitation.

**A. QUESTIONS AND CORRESPONDENT ANSWERS:**

**QUESTION 1**

Corporate Mandatory C.M2 indicates that “The bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories\*, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, within the last 5 years prior to the bid solicitation date.”

Resource Category	Minimum Number of Billable Days
Application/Software Architect – Level 3	330
Programmer/Software Developer – Level 3	440
Programmer/Software Developer – Level 1	2860
Tester – Level 3	330
Database Administrator – Level 3	440
Database Modeller – Level 3	440
Quality Assurance Specialist / Analyst – Level 3	220
Technical Writer – Level 3	220

However, in the financial evaluation (page 31 of 95) the weighting provided to the various categories does not seem to align with the number of billable days requested.

For Example:

- Programmer/Software Developer –Level 3 is weighted at 300 points,
- Programmer/Software Developer – Level 1 is weighted at 150 points.

This would indicate that the Level 3 will potentially be used twice as much as the Level 1 resource yet proponents are requested to demonstrate almost ten times the number of billable days for the Level 1 resource.

Would the Crown consider reducing the number of billable days required for the Programmer/Software Developer – Level 1 to being aligned with the other categories and the weighting assigned within the financial evaluations – 220 days.

**ANSWER 1**

Canada has revised the question and the RFP will remain unchanged.

## QUESTION 2

As per the response to question 4.2 defining an “end to end” solution;

*“End to End development: Projects where the company was 100% accountable to complete and deliver a solution from beginning to end without the support of other parties and vendors.”*

This type of reference describes a Solutions-Based supply of service, suitable for an SBIPS RFP, and is not in scope for a Task-Based (TBIPS) solicitation.

As per the PWGSC website (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/spc-cps/spics-sbips-eng.html>) and <http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/sptb-tbps/index-eng.html>):

*“**Solutions-Based Informatics Professional Services (SBIPS)** is a method of supply comprising of services and, in certain situations, essential goods, whereby a supplier defines and provides a **solution to a requirement**, manages the overall requirement, phase or project and accepts responsibility for the outcome.”*

*“A **TBIPS requirement** is related to a particular activity required to address a specific IT need and is usually associated with a specified set of responsibilities. The tasks involved are finite work assignments that require one or more consultants to complete. A task involves a specific start date, a specific end date, and set deliverables. **Tasks are usually not large projects, although they may be subsets of a larger project.** Tasks may require highly specialized work to be performed requiring a rare or unique skill or knowledge **for a short period of time.**”*

Given this information, we respectfully request the removal of the “end to end” element from M1. However, DFO’s responsibility to engage a vendor who has demonstrated the volumes and depth of skills required for the work could be covered with some alternative approaches, such as:

1. A requirement to demonstrate \$1M worth of staffing with J2EE-specialist resources in the period specified
2. A requirement to demonstrate exclusive staffing capability on a project worth \$1M or more
3. A requirement to show J2EE work as part of one, two, or all three of the reference projects in M1.

## ANSWER 2

Canada has revised the question and the RFP has been amended accordingly. See RFP modification below.

### QUESTION 3

C.M1 bullet 3 asks for completed "end to end" development of an enterprise application on the Java 2 Enterprise Edition platform. Amendment 002, Question and Answer # 4 added a formal definition of End to End development as "Projects where the company was 100% accountable to complete and deliver a solution from beginning to end without the support of others parties and vendors". This definition would apply to SBIPS like contracts (solution based) versus TBIPS like contracts (Task based). Therefore, would the crown accept projects wherein the Bidder supplied resources (totaling a minimum value of \$1,000,000) within the requested resource categories of this solicitation during the Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC) of a completed End to End Development of an enterprise application on the Java 2 Enterprise Edition (version 1.3 or more recent) platform?

### ANSWER 3

Canada has revised the question and the RFP has been amended accordingly. See RFP modification below.

### QUESTION 4

- 1.1 The answer to question 1.3 was unclear. C.M2/C.R1 explicitly identifies that "similar resource categories could be accepted if the subject resource has performed at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in Annex A for the same resource category." Categories such as Programmer/Software Developer and Programmer/Analyst are often used interchangeably by clients as the skillset is very similar. Please confirm that bidders may use different categories of resources to comply with C.M2 and C.R1.
- 1.2 The answer to question 1.3 amended C.M2/C.R1 to state that "The Bidder must demonstrate that the tasks performed by each resource category and Level included at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in Annex A for the same Resource Category and Level under which the bidder is claiming billable days." It is our understanding that C.M2/C.R1 is measuring whether or not the resources that bidders have placed on contract have performed 50% of the listed tasks in the Statement of Work for the required category and level. As the resource categories in the SOW have separate tasks for each level, the level of resources we have billed should not matter as C.M2/C.R1 is evaluating the relevance of the listed tasks they have performed. Level 2 and 3 resources are more experienced and perform the tasks of a Level 1 resource as well as more senior tasks, which is reflected in the SOW of this RFP. Additionally, Level 2 and 3 resources are tougher resources to locate and place on a contract as they have more experience. It is only a testament to bidders' advanced expertise in placing various types of resources if they can show that they have placed more senior roles rather than junior ones. For these reasons, requiring bidders to match the exact level of the resource categories outlined in the RFP is excessive. Please confirm that bidders do not need to match the resource level as long as bidders can demonstrate that the resources have performed 50% of the tasks in the SOW for the equivalent category and level.
- 1.3 C.M1 was amended with a definition of "End to End development," which is outlined as: "projects where the company was 100% accountable to complete and deliver a solution from beginning to end without the support of others parties and vendors." The vehicle selected for this solicitation is

TBIPS. Vendors who qualify on TBIPS do not do this as they are not 100% accountable to complete and deliver a solution from beginning to end without the support of other parties or vendors. If Canada would prefer that vendors deliver a solution as a result of this solicitation, then SBIPS should be selected as the vehicle. As the vehicle selected for this solicitation is TBIPS, please remove this definition as it is not consistent with the services performed by vendors qualified under TBIPS.

- 1.4 Clients are often unavailable during the holiday season and it becomes increasingly difficult to confirm their willingness to act as references, and even more difficult to secure reference letters from these clients. Additionally, the level of effort required to gather and catalogue the information requested is incredibly extensive. Canada is currently only granting the minimum solicitation period for Tier 2 RFPs, whereas the workload required exceeds the time allotted. Would Canada please extend the closing date of this solicitation to January 9<sup>th</sup>?

#### **ANSWER 4**

- 1.1 As stated in C.M2, similar resources categories could be accepted if the subject resource has performed at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in Annex A for the same resource category.
- 1.2 Bidders do not need to match the resource level as long as Bidders can demonstrate that the resources have performed 50% of the tasks in the SOW for the equivalent category and level.
- 1.3 Canada has revised the question and the RFP has been amended accordingly. See RFP modification below.
- 1.4 Canada has revised the question and the RFP will remain unchanged.

#### **QUESTION 5**

Regarding the definition of “end to end development” provided in the amended grid in Amendment 002: “End to End development: Projects where the company was 100% accountable to complete and deliver a solution from beginning to end without the support of others parties and vendors.”

The vast majority of contracts on TBIPS contain task authorizations for individual resources, not system development solutions. Solutions such as this would be on the SBIPS supply arrangement/standing offer and very few such projects have existed throughout the lifetime of the SBIPS. Within TBIPS, a bidder may have resources involved throughout the full lifecycle of a project but would VERY rarely be 100% accountable for the solution.

The objective of this Statement of Work states: “IM&TS requires the establishment of a pool of IM/IT resources to assist it on an “as-and-when-requested basis” to support the development and transition to a Java-based solution platform in addition to maintenance of the current legacy environment.” Additionally, with the intention to award 3 contracts, with rotational allocation of Task Authorizations, it is unlikely that any one contract winner will be responsible for the complete “end to end” solution as defined here.

We suggest that DFO would be better served by aligning this corporate requirement more closely with the objective, as follows:

C.M1.

3. A minimum of one (out of the three proposed) must have been completed for the development of enterprise application(s) on the Java 2 Enterprise Edition (version 1.3 or more recent) platform.

#### **ANSWER 5**

Canada has revised the question and the RFP has been amended accordingly. See RFP modification below.

#### **RFP AMENDMENT:**

1. At Corporate Mandatory Requirement C.M1 of Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria of Part 3 of the RFP:

DELETE: C.M1 in its entirety; and

INSERT: C.M1, as follows:

(See next page)

Criteria	Mandatory Criteria	Bidder's response	
		Met Y/N	Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert data)
<b>C.M1</b>	<p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least 3 Informatics Professional Services* contracts.</p> <p>To be accepted, each contract must have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. been awarded within the past 5 years of the Initial Solicitation Closing Date**</li> <li>2. a minimum value of \$1,000,000.00; and</li> <li>3. A minimum of one (out of the three proposed Contracts) must have been completed for the development of enterprise application(s) on the Java 2 Enterprise Edition (version 1.3 or more recent) platform.</li> </ol> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) A letter from its client (referencing a contract award date and a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder is providing or has provided such services under a contract with a minimum value of \$1,000,000.00; and</li> </ol> <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management contract.</p> <p>**Initial Solicitation Closing Date is December 19, 2016.</p>		

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**