



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. 013
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B8986-170040	Date 2017-01-06
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 2017-01-17	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
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

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation B8986-170040/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 013	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 620ZM
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client B8986-170040	File No. – N° du dossier 620ZM –B8986-170040	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 013

This amendment is raised to:

1. To provide answers to Bidder's questions in relation to this solicitation;
 2. Amend the Request for Proposal (RFP) as detailed in Appendix A-005 below
-

Question #23:

In Part 5 of the RFP, Item 5.1 (a), could the Client please confirm that the requirement for the completed Federal Contractors Program certification, before contract award, should read Attachment 5.1 and not 5.2?

Answer #23:

Yes the attachment is 5.1 and not 5.2.

Question #24:

This question is in regards to the Crown's response to Question #13, amendment #7. The SOW task lists (a. to k.) for the two roles that must be demonstrated for MTC1 and RT2 are absolutely unique to the requirements of CIC. It is not reasonable to expect that over 80% of them will exist in any other SOW from any other organization. Therefore, by including this requirement, CIC is not just favouring incumbents, but restricting competition. Further, the Crown has just introduced new mandatory requirements by insisting that tasks c., h., and i. be included in the 9 tasks demonstrated, further favouring the incumbent firms and further restricting non-incumbents from bidding. We respectfully request that the Crown allow more standard methods used by other Government of Canada RFP's to demonstrate tasks, such as client references, description of work completed which relates to the SOW tasks, and/or signed attestations.

Answer #24:

Canada has reviewed the criteria MTC1 and RT2. Please refer to the revised attachment 4.1 and 4.2.

Question #25:

This question is in regard to the Crown's response to Question #11. We appreciate that the Crown has decided to reduce the number of years requested to obtain points for Siebel CRM experience, however, this does not address the fundamental concern that it continues to favour incumbents, and restricting competition by requiring 20% of the score for each resource to come from Siebel CRM experience when CIC is the only major user of Siebel CRM in the NCR. We respectfully request that the Crown also recognize experience with other ERP/CRM solutions for

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation B8986-170040/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 013	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 620ZM
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client B8986-170040	File No. – N° du dossier 620ZM –B8986-170040	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

RT6, RT11, RT16 and RT21.

Answer #25:

Canada has reviewed the criteria RT6, RT11, RT16 and RT21. Please refer to the revised attachment 4.1, 4.2 and Appendix C to Annex A.

Question #26:

With respect to MTC1 AND RT2:

Several vendors have posed questions to the Crown to review these two requirements. It was noted in each question that the requirements unfairly favor the current incumbents and makes it impossible for other vendors in the community to respond with a viable bid.

While Amendment 7, Question and Answer #13 makes a concession by allowing vendors to use alternate roles under the conditions that 9 of the 11 tasks are still met, the second part of that answer “task c. h. and i. are included in the nine tasks” is even more restrictive than the initial requirement. By adding this statement to a solicitation that already significantly limited the competition the Crown has virtually guaranteed that only the incumbents will be able to respond with a compliant bid.

In the spirit of open and fair competition, we respectfully ask that the Crown reconsider and remove the requirement to have “tasks c. h. and i. included in the demonstrated nine tasks”.

Answer #26:

Canada has reviewed the criteria MTC1 and RT2. Please refer to the revised attachment 4.1 and 4.2.

Question #27:

Given the impact of this one statement, which has come very late in the procurement process, we also respectfully request that the Crown provide the vendor community with a two week extension to adjust our responses.

Answer #27:

The extension was granted until January 17, 2017 see the Amendment 12.

Solicitation No. – N° de l’invitation B8986-170040/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 013	Buyer ID – Id de l’acheteur 620ZM
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client B8986-170040	File No. – N° du dossier 620ZM –B8986-170040	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question #28:

Re: Corporate MT1

MT1 (2) states “The contract identified must: Have an initial minimum value of \$3,500,000 (Cdn) before taxes, not including amendments”.

Most contracts issued by the Government of Canada typically have an initial contract value less than \$3,000,000 (excluding taxes) as they usually cover only the first year of the contract, amendments to the contract later increase the amount. In order to ensure fair and open competition, would the Crown change the requirement to: Have an initial minimum value of **\$3,000,000** (Cdn) before taxes, not including amendments.

Answer #28:

Agree. Canada will modify the minimum value to \$3,000,000 (Cdn) before taxes, not including amendments. Please refer to the revised attachment 4.1.

Solicitation No. – N° de l’invitation B8986-170040/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 013	Buyer ID – Id de l’acheteur 620ZM
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client B8986-170040	File No. – N° du dossier 620ZM –B8986-170040	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Appendix A-005

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

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

INSERT *Attachment 4.1 – Mandatory Technical Criteria (Revised January 6, 2017)*

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

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

INSERT *Attachment 4.2 – Point Rated Technical Criteria (Revised January 6, 2017)*

At Appendix C to Annex C – Resources Assessment Criteria, has been amended as follow:

DELETE Appendix C to Annex C – Resources Assessment Criteria (Revised December 6, 2016)

INSERT *Appendix C to Annex C – Resources Assessment Criteria (Revised January 6, 2017)*

At Form 1- Bidder Corporate Capacity Form is amended as follows:

DELETE Form 1- Bidder Corporate Capacity Form *(Revised November 8, 2016)*

INSERT *Form 1- Bidder Corporate Capacity Form (Revised January 6, 2017)*

At Form 2- Resource Category Form is amended as follows:

DELETE Form 2- Resource Category Form

INSERT *Form 2- Resource Category Form (Revised January 6, 2017)*