



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions  
- TPSGC**

**Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2  
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier  
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**  
Miscellaneous Special Projects Division (XN)/Division  
des projets spéciaux divers (XN)  
Canadian Building  
219 Laurier Ave. West, 13th Floor  
Room 13077  
Ottawa  
Ontario  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> e-Procurement Solution (EPS)	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-131350/H	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 041
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20131350	<b>Date</b> 2016-12-22
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XN-111-30112	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 111xn.EN578-131350	<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 2017-01-20</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire 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> Thauvette, Maxime	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 111xn
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 420-2201 ( )	<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/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Request for Proposal (RFP)****Solicitation Amendment: 041****Purpose:**

The purpose of this amendment is to amend the Request for Proposals (RFP) and provide answers to questions received with regards to this RFP.

**(A) CHANGES****CHANGE: 245**

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, section 4.3.2.5 Requirements for the EPS Interfaces, delete requirements *Int.08, Int.10, Int.11, Int.12 and Int.13* in their entirety.

**CHANGE: 246**

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, section 5.6.2.3 Delivery Channels,

DELETE: as per table 5.6.4.4 Service Desk Tiers and Responses Levels

INSERT: as per table 5.6.2.4 Service Desk Tiers and Operating Hours

**CHANGE: 247**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation and Selection Methodology, under MFC 3 of section 7.1. Mandatory Financial Criteria,

DELETE: The total Firm Lot Price bid for EPS Transition-in (table 1 of Annex 3) must be less than 70% of the total bid price for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3)

INSERT: The total Firm Lot Price bid for EPS Transition-in (table 1 of Annex 3) must be 70% or less of the total bid price for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3)

**CHANGE: 248**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation and Selection Methodology, under section 7.1.1 Financial Bids,

DELETE: All Bidders that have met all mandatory requirements (not including the PoP Test) of this solicitation, including being deemed technically responsive, will have their financial bid evaluated to determine its financial score.

INSERT: All Bidders that have met all mandatory requirements (not including the PoP Test) of this solicitation, including being deemed technically responsive, will have their financial bid, including any revisions as a result of the two-step process, if applicable, evaluated to determine its financial score.

**CHANGE: 249**

At Attachment 2 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, under evaluation criteria R6.4 of section 4. Point-Rated Criteria, delete *vii.* in its entirety and replace with:

<p>vii. to connect to the applicable Consumer Price Index (CPI) table from Statistics Canada to determine the price update calculation when required by a given Contract/Framework Agreement and to receive Consumer Price Index (CPI) data from a designated source (e.g. Statistics Canada) as per schedule.</p>	<p>The Bidder cannot provide this functionality = 0 points</p> <p>The Bidder will provide this functionality = 3 points</p>
--	---

**CHANGE: 250**

At Attachment 2 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, under evaluation criteria R6.4 of section 4. Point-Rated Criteria, delete xxxix. in its entirety and replace with:

xxxix. for Authorized Users to schedule the frequency (e.g. daily, monthly, on a specific date) to connect to the applicable commodity index feed (e.g. Oil Buyers Guide) in order to update the prices on a dynamic basis in the Catalogue File based on a calculation of markup or discount pricing attribute provided by the Supplier and the commodity index feed marker and to receive the commodity index feed from a designated source (e.g. Bank of Canada) as per schedule.	<p>The Bidder cannot provide this functionality = 0 points</p> <p>The Bidder will provide this functionality = 3 points</p>
--	---

**CHANGE: 251**

At Attachment 2 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, under evaluation criteria R6.5 of section 4. Point-Rated Criteria, delete xl. in its entirety and replace with:

xxxix. to retrieve and provide the up-to-date information, including security level expiration date, and active status, of resources security clearance from the CISC database as well as ensuring that the Supplier is holding a copy of the resources' security clearance and to receive security clearance data from a designated source on demand at both corporate and resource levels via the ESB.	<p>The Bidder cannot provide this functionality = 0 points</p> <p>The Bidder will provide this functionality = 3 points</p>
--	---

**CHANGE: 252**

At Attachment 2 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, under evaluation criteria R6.7 of section 4. Point-Rated Criteria, delete xxviii. in its entirety and replace with:

xxviii. to pull and share Supplier information and data in Near Real-Time from third party content providers and systems (e.g. CRA) such as but not limited to supplier legal name and CRA business number and to support the validation of Supplier's business number and legal name in Near Real-Time using XML with the CRA's Business Number Hub system.	<p>The Bidder cannot provide this functionality = 0 points</p> <p>The Bidder will provide this functionality = 3 points</p>
--	---

**CHANGE: 253**

At Attachment 3 to Part 4 – Proof of Proposal (PoP) Test, under section 2. Requirements, delete requirement G-01.09 in its entirety and replace with:

G-01.09	<p>for Users to export standard pre-packaged and User defined reports to various file formats and software such as, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. MS Excel/MS Word;</li> <li>ii. CSV file; and</li> <li>iii. XML file.</li> </ul>	67. Exporting a purchase order report to MS Excel.
---------	---	--

**(B) QUESTIONS****QUESTION: 691**

With regards to: "All EPS datacenters, EPS software, EPS middleware, the EPS Service Desk, SOC and NOC infrastructure and Data for the entire EPS reside within Canada and/or countries with which Canada has international bilateral industrial security instruments (IBISI)". May the EPS software be purchased from a country with whom Canada does not have international bilateral industrial security instruments?

**ANSWER: 691**

Yes, the Contractor may purchase software from a country with whom Canada does not have international bilateral industrial security instruments. However, all EPS hardware and software components are subject to Supply Chain Security Information Assessment as outlined in the RFP.

**QUESTION: 692**

With regards to: "All personnel for the entire EPS, including SOC, NOC and Service Desk be physically located and operate within Canada, countries with which Canada has IBISI, or within countries belonging to EU or NATO". May the initial installation of the EPS software be performed by personnel from a country with whom Canada does not have international bilateral industrial security instruments, nor is part of EU or NATO? All personnel responsible for the ongoing operation of the EPS would reside in Canada.

**ANSWER: 692**

All Work must be performed by personnel from Canada, a country within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union (EU) or from a country with which Canada has International Bilateral Industrial Security Instruments (IBISI). All initial implementation details must only be accessible by the personnel who meet the security screening requirements identified in sections 7.5. A. and 7.5. B of the RFP. At no point during the Term of the Contract may any unscreened personnel be engaged or be granted access to the EPS installation details.

**QUESTION: 693**

regards to: "All business entities must be physically located, be legally authorized to operate and to do business and be registered, where the local legislation requires such registration, within Canada, countries with which Canada has IBISI, European Union and/or NATO countries". Would a sub-contracted company be considered a business entity?

**ANSWER: 693**

Yes, Canada confirms that a sub-contracted company is a business entity. For additional information, please refer to the answer to question #317.

**QUESTION: 694**

With less than 2 weeks to the due date (December 21st, 2016), Canada unexpectedly has issued an updated version of portions of the RFP (December 9th, 2016) with a firm statement that no extension will be provided. The updated portions have discrepancies that need to be addressed and there are associated files that have yet to be provided.

**Discrepancies**

In our preliminary examination of the new RFP, we have found the following discrepancies:

**A) – Re: MFC 3**

The wording for MFC 3 was changed in Amendment 34 Change #226. Wording not the same in the new "clean" RFP: Difference of "must be 70% or less" to "must be less than 70%"

**Amendment 34 CHANGE: 226**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation and Selection Methodology, under MFC 3 of section 7.1. Mandatory Financial Criteria, DELETE: The total Firm Lot Price bid for EPS Transition-In (table 1 of Annex 3) must be 40% or less of the total bid price for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3).

INSERT: The total Firm Lot Price bid for EPS Transition-In (table 1 of Annex 3) **must be 70% or less** of the total bid price for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3).

**New RFP:**

MFC 3 The total Firm Lot Price bid for EPS Transition-in (table 1 of Annex 3) **must be less than 70%** of the total bid price for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3)

**B) – Re: MFC 10**

Again, wording not the same.

**Amendment 28 CHANGE: 182**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation and Selection Methodology, under section 7.1. Mandatory Financial Criteria, insert:

MFC 10 for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3), Bidder **must** quote Firm Unit Prices for all three Tiers(1, 2 and 3) for one and only one of the 4 metrics (GC Users, Procurement Users, Catalogue Spend or Transactions), as defined in section 7.10.1 Basis of Payment of the RFP.

**New RFP:**

MFC 10 for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3), **if** Bidders quote Firm Unit Prices, they must do so for all three Tiers (1, 2 and 3) for one and only one of the 4 metrics (GC Users, Procurement Users, Catalogue Spend or Transactions), as defined in section 7.10.1 Basis of Payment of the RFP.

**C) – Annex 1 Section 5.6.2.3**

In Annex 1 Section 5.6.2.3 – Delivery Channels, first paragraph makes reference to table in section 5.6.4.4. This section no longer exists. Please confirm that the reference should be to section 5.6.2.4.

**D) Associated files yet to be provided**

In addition, Canada's updated RFP did not come with its associated fillable forms and spreadsheets (such as Annex 3 – Price Schedule and Form 3 to Part 4 – SCSI – IT Product List and Subcontractor List Form). Clarity has not been provided by Canada as to which prior version the Bidders should use or if the updated RFP is missing the actual forms that Canada has requested bidders provide as part of their response. We request *that Canada reissue all the associated fillable forms and spreadsheets referenced by the RFP. In addition, we request a copy of Annex 1 Statement of Work with track changes, documenting all changes to date.*

**ANSWER: 694**

A) Canada confirms that the correct wording for MFC 3 should be *"The total Firm Lot Price bid for EPS Transition-In (table 1 of Annex 3) **must be 70% or less** of the total bid price for EPS Operational (table 2 of Annex 3)".* Please see amendment in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

B) Canada confirms that the wording in the RFP ("if") is correct. Bidders have the option to bid using either: 1) a Firm Lot Monthly Price, 2) Firm Unit Prices, or 3) both a Firm Lot Monthly Price and Firm Unit Prices.

C) Canada confirms that the reference should be: *5.6.2.4. Service Desk Tiers and Operating Hours.* Please see the amendment in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

D) Canada will not be distributing a track changes version of the RFP. If Bidders would like to obtain a MS Word version of the RFP documents, they should contact Canada through the enquiries process detailed in the RFP.

**QUESTION: 695**

In addition to the issues/discrepancies we raised on December 12th, we have found additional issues after further analysis of the new RFP issued on December 9th, as follows (numbering continuing from Dec 12th list):

**A) – Re: G-01.09**

"PDF" was removed in G-01.09 as per Change 218 in Amendment 34; however, "PDF" still appears for G-01.09 in the Proof of Proposal Test section (Attachment 3 to Part 4) item on page 424 of the new RFP released Dec 9th.

**B) – Re: Figure 2 Section 4.3.2 Solution Vision**

Section 4.3.2 Solution Vision- Figure 2 depicts the end state vision. The Interfaces 'Documents (To Be Determined)' and 'Spend Analysis Data (To be Determined)' have recently been confirmed as Future Optional services (refer to Amend 30 Q&A 607 items h and g); therefore, the diagram should be updated to reflect that these are "Optional Services".

**C) – Re: Int.08**

Item H-01.15 was deleted from Annex 1 and moved as a rated requirement (as R6.7 xxviii). This item however is linked to Int.08, however, no change was provided to Int.08. Since H-01.15 was moved as a rated requirement, it would have been expected that Int.08 would also be considered a rated requirement. Please clarify.

**D) – Re: Int.10**

Item D-06.10 was deleted from Annex 1 and moved as a rated requirement (as R6.4 vii). This item is linked to Int.10, however no change was provided to Int.10. Since D-06.10 was moved as a rated requirement, it would have been expected that Int.10 would also be considered a rated requirement. Please clarify.

**E) – Re: Int.11**

Item D-06.04 was deleted from Annex 1 and moved as a rated requirement (as R6.4 xxxix). This item is linked to Int.11, however no change was provided to Int.11. Since D-06.04 was moved as a rated requirement, it would have been expected that Int.11 would also be considered a rated requirement. Please clarify.

**F) – Re: Int.12**

Item E-12.05 was deleted from Annex 1 and moved as a rated requirement (as R6.5 xl). This item is linked to Int.12, however no change was provided to Int.12. Since D-06.04 was moved as a rated requirement, it would have been expected that Int.12 would also be considered a rated requirement. Please clarify.

**ANSWER: 695**

- A) Please see the amendment in the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment.
- B) As detailed in the RFP, *Figure 2* depicts an end state vision of the services, which may include optional services. As such, Canada will not update the diagram.
- C) Please see the amendment in the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment.
- D) Please see the amendment in the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment.
- E) Please see the amendment in the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment.
- F) Please see the amendment in the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment.

**QUESTION: 696**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, what level of detail does the Crown require? Is it sufficient to breakdown into 4 constituent elements: transition-in services, transition-in non-services, Operational services and Operational non-services? Can the Crown provide a proposed cost breakdown model?

**ANSWER: 696**

The Bidder should breakdown its pricing following sound and consistently applied accounting principles to the level of detail reasonably needed to substantiate the costing structure. It is the Bidder's responsibility to determine the level of detail needed to substantiate their costing structure.

**QUESTION: 697**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, for software pricing, does the Crown want pricing breakdown by software vendor, software components, software module, and associated volume assumptions? The pricing model proposed by PWGSC is so different from standard pricing that we're not able build a model that shows how standard pricing is used to generate the proposed price. We propose that providing one overall price breakdown for all software and hardware be sufficient.

**ANSWER: 697**

Please refer to the answer to question #696.

**QUESTION: 698**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, what level of breakdown is required for overhead costs that are not associated with software and services? Is one overall sum sufficient for Overhead, or does the Crown want breakdown by infrastructure, facilities, telecommunications, office supplies...

**ANSWER: 698**

Please refer to the answer to question #696.

**QUESTION: 699**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, does the Crown want a breakdown of travel expenses? Does the travel breakdown need to be detailed by month or milestone or other metric?

**ANSWER: 699**

Please refer to the answer to question #696.

**QUESTION: 700**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, for transition-in services, does the Crown want the breakdown by Milestone? Does the Crown also want a breakdown by Team Member?

**ANSWER: 700**

Please refer to the answer to question #696.

**QUESTION: 701**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, for software breakdown, if we include our volume assumptions, could those volume numbers be used by the Crown in the future for change orders in order to reduce the price if actual volumes are much lower than assumed?

**ANSWER: 701**

The Contractor will be paid in accordance with section 7.10 *Terms of Payment* and Annex 3 – *Price Schedule*. As stated throughout the RFP, any volumes provided are historical volumes only and do not represent a commitment by Canada. As such, whether the volumes are higher or lower than assumed by the Bidders, Canada does not intend to amend the Price Schedule in Annex 3.

**QUESTION: 702**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, MFC9, could any of breakdown information be used by the Crown for issuing change orders in order to reduce the price?

**ANSWER: 702**

The Contractor will be paid in accordance with section 7.10 *Terms of Payment* and Annex 3 – *Price Schedule*. Other than negotiations for optional services as detailed in the RFP, Canada does not intend to negotiate the Contractor's pricing in Annex 3 – *Price Schedule*.

**QUESTION: 703**

Regarding RFP Attachment 1 to Part 4, Section 7.1, if a Bidder needs to provide additional pricing information in order to meet the Mandatory Financial Criteria (MFC 1 – MFC 10), how would that price be factored into the financial score?

- a) Example 1. For MFC 3, if the Bidder's EPS Transition-in price is greater than 70% of the EPS Operational price and the Bidder uses the Two-Step process to become compliant by increasing the Operational price. Which numbers would be used for the Financial Score?
- b) Example 2. For MFC 3, if the Bidder's EPS Transition-in price is greater than 70% of the EPS Operational price and the Bidder uses the Two-Step process to become compliant by decreasing the EPS Transition-in price. Which numbers would be used for the Financial Score?

**ANSWER: 703**

As described in the RFP, Bidders who fail any of the Mandatory Financial Criteria will be invited, under the two-step process, to re-submit a revision to their Financial Bid to meet compliancy. If applicable, the information provided in the Bidder's revised Financial Bid will be used to determine the Bidder's Financial Score. Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.



**QUESTION: 704**

Annex 3 – Price Schedule. Firm Unit Prices for EPS Operational include the option to use four metrics (GC Users, Procurement Users, Catalogue Spend, and Transactions). The solution that we are proposing prices its solution based on Total Spend transacted using the software. A pricing model that uses “Catalogue Spend” instead of “Total Spend” puts solutions that use the Spend metric for pricing at a disadvantage because the Crown is asking that a percentage of the solution usage be provided at no cost. Furthermore, the Crown could deliberately design the solution to maximize non-catalogue spend. For instance, the Crown did not define the GC User metric as the number of GC Users working on procurements that are using Framework Agreements. The current Firm Unit Price metrics provide an unfair pricing advantage to solutions that do not rely on a “Spend”-based metric. Can the Crown change the Catalogue Spend metric to include Total Spend? Note that the use of Firm Lot Monthly Price is not a feasible alternative because that would mean that we don’t get to benefit from Firm Unit Price which are used to address unknown volumes.

**ANSWER: 704**

Canada has selected metrics it feels it can confidently and fairly evaluate. All Bidders have the same opportunity to select the metric of their choice, if any. As such, Canada does not see any disadvantage to any of the metrics included in this RFP – the metrics for the Firm Unit Prices for EPS Operational will remain unchanged.

**QUESTION: 705**

Annex 3 – Price Schedule. For the Catalogue Spend metric, what assurances does the Bidder have that PWGSC will not define an approach that results in zero revenue? If the answer to this question is to use the Firm Lot Monthly Price, then Bidders that use Spend as their unit price metric are not provided the same benefit of leveraging Firm Unit Price. This places Spend pricing based Bidders at a competitive disadvantage over Bidders that use User- and Transaction-based models. Can the Crown change the Catalogue Spend metric to include Total Spend?

**ANSWER: 705**

Please refer to question #704. Canada is not in a position to provide any assurances nor has it made any guarantee on any volumes, whether on Catalogue Spend, Transactions, GC Users or Procurement Users. As stated throughout the RFP, any volumes provided are historical volumes or for evaluation purposes only and do not represent a commitment by Canada. However, Canada does not anticipate that its approach will result in zero revenue for any metric selected, including Catalogue Spend.

**QUESTION: 706**

Annex 3 – Price Schedule. Services Procurement is often priced differently from other procurement. Given that the Crown is not able to provide a breakdown of volumes between Services Procurement and other procurement, can the Crown separate out Services Procurement Pricing? This separation could be accomplished by duplicating the Firm Unit Prices for EPS Operational in Table 2. If in the future PWGSC were to decide to make Services Procurement optional or delay its deployment, this pricing model could provide additional flexibility and potential savings. Separating pricing for Services Procurement would also reduce the Bidder’s pricing risk and result in a better price for Crown.

**ANSWER: 706**

Canada has considered the proposed change but the required Bidder pricing for EPS Operational, including Table 2, will remain unchanged.

**QUESTION: 707**

Annex 3 – Price Schedule. Will Service Procurement be procured using framework agreements?

**ANSWER: 707**

Please refer to *Annex 1, section 3.5.2 Background Information on Framework Agreements*, which describes the range of goods and services procured under Framework Agreements. Many of the listed types of Framework Agreements are for the procurement of services.



**QUESTION: 708**

Can the Crown please provide a Word version of the Final RFP document posted on Dec 9?

**ANSWER: 708**

If Bidders would like to obtain a MS Word version of the RFP documents, they should contact Canada through the enquiries process detailed in the RFP.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**