



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 TBIPS - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation T8086-152167/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-152167	Date 2017-01-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-384-30689	
File No. - N° de dossier 384zm.T8086-152167	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-02-22	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Beaudoin, Michael	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 384zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4892 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207
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
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 005

THIS AMENDMENT IS RAISED TO:

- **INCLUDE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE SOLICITATION**
- **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 2 ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT LEVEL 3 (M2)**
- **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT LEVEL 3 (M2)**
- **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 PROJECT EXECUTIVE LEVEL 3 (R1)**
- **MODIFY ARTICLE 5.3 (II) CERTIFICATION OF LANGUAGE**
- **EXTEND THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION TO FEBRUARY 22, 2017 AT 2:00PM (EST)**

Question 41: We would like to submit the following question in regards to the above-referenced solicitation:

This is in reference to page 90 of the provided RFP, under the Mandatory Criteria section for Technology Architect – Level 3, section M1. Please refer to the following excerpt, “and *Custom* off the Shelf (COTS) application implementations” and clarify if this should instead read “and *Commercial* off the Shelf (COTS) application implementations” instead.

Answer 41: This requirement has been modified and an answer has already been provided, please refer to Answer 39-2.

Question 42: In Workstream 2, M2 in the Enterprise Architect (Level 3) evaluation grid states the bidder must have demonstrated experience as “an Enterprise Architect on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level Implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry that involve implementing Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) **or** Complex IT projects involving business transformation.” (emphasis added)

Under the detailed information required for each project identified, the bidder must also “d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise.”

The main text of the requirement says **OR**, so if the project(s) in the response are not implementing SOA and are instead Complex IT projects involving business transformation, it is not possible to respond compliantly to sub-item d).

We request that sub-item d) either be deleted or be changed to something along the lines of “d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise, or, how it served to address business transformation, whichever is appropriate.”

Answer 42: Canada has reviewed your request. Workstream 2, Enterprise Architect, Level 3, M2 d) is modified to include “or, how it served to address business transformation, whichever is appropriate.”

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

DELETE: Workstream 2, Enterprise Architect, Level 3 M2:

INSERT:

M2	<p>The Bidder must have demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level Implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry that involve implementing Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) or Complex IT projects involving business transformation.</p> <p>For each project identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) the project must have a project team with a minimum of 7 members;b) the project must have a minimum value of \$2M;c) demonstrate how the referenced project is for an Enterprise-Level Implementation (how it provides a company-wide solution architecture);d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise or how it served to address business transformation, whichever is appropriate; ande) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?			
----	---	--	--	--

Question 43: In Workstream 2, M1 in the Technology Architect (Level 3) evaluation grid states the Bidder must have “demonstrated ten (10) years’ experience within the last fifteen (15) years, developing technical architectures, frameworks and strategies for both custom-built and Custom off the Shelf (COTS) application implementations.”

Question 43-1: Please confirm that “Custom off the Shelf” should have been “Commercial off the Shelf”. Since it is possible for projects to be solely custom development and/or solely COTS application implementations, please confirm our understanding that the ten (10) years is cumulative experience using a combination of custom-built and COTS.

Question 43-2: Further, in order to ensure adequate demonstration of both types of application implementations, if the experience is confirmed as cumulative then we recommend that each candidate must demonstrate no less than four (4) years of custom-built experience and four (4) years of COTS experience, where the total cumulative of both types of experience must still equal/exceed ten (10) years.

Answer 43-1: This requirement has been modified and an answer has already been provided, please refer to Answer 39-2. Combined experience using a combination of custom-built and COTS totaling 10 years will be accepted

Answer 43-2: Canada has reviewed your recommendation but has chosen to maintain the current wording. This requirement will remain unchanged.

Question 44: In Workstream 2, R2 in the Technology Architect (Level 3) evaluation grid states the Bidder should have demonstrated experience, within the last 10 years, documenting Current (As-is) architecture, developing Target (To-Be) architecture and developing gap analyses for architecture migration strategies.

Please confirm that this is cumulative experience and not 10 years of each of the specific sub-elements that need to be substantiated as it is possible to do as-is/to-be without having to follow through with a migration strategy

Answer 44: Combined experience for each of the specific sub-elements totaling 10 years will be accepted.

Question 45: In Workstream 2, M1 in the Technical Writer (Level 2) evaluation grid states the Bidder must have demonstrated five (5) years' experience within the last ten (10) years, developing IT documentation and communications.

Question 45-1: Can you please clarify what is meant by "communications". Is that communication plans, press releases, or something else?

Question 45-2: Please confirm that this is cumulative experience.

Question 45-3: If so, we recommend that each candidate be required to demonstrate at least two (2) years of developing IT documentation and two (2) of "communications", so long as cumulatively they still substantiate experience that equals/exceeds five (5) years.

Answer 45-1: "Communications" refers to communication plans and messaging geared to internal departmental staff that provide information and updates on projects and initiatives that will affect them.

Answer 45-2: Combined experience developing IT documentation and Communications Plans totaling 5 years will be accepted.

Answer 45-3: Canada has reviewed your recommendation but has chosen to maintain the current wording. This requirement will remain unchanged.

Question 46: In Workstream 3, M2 in the Enterprise Architect (Level 3) evaluation grid states the bidder must have demonstrated experience as "an Enterprise Architect on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level Implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry that involve implementing Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) or Complex IT projects involving business transformation." (emphasis added)

Under the detailed information required for each project identified, the bidder must also "d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise."

The main text of the requirement says **OR**, so if the project(s) in the response are not implementing SOA and are instead Complex IT projects involving business transformation, it is not possible to respond compliantly to sub-item d).

We request that sub-item d) either be deleted or be changed to something along the lines of "d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise, or, how it served to address business transformation, whichever is appropriate."

Answer 46: Canada has reviewed your request. Workstream 3, Enterprise Architect, Level 3, M2 d) is modified to include "or, how it served to address business transformation, whichever is appropriate."

DELETE: Workstream 3, Enterprise Architect, Level 3 M2:

INSERT:

M2	<p>The Bidder must have demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level Implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry that involve implementing Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) or Complex IT projects involving business transformation.</p> <p>For each project identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) the project must have a project team with a minimum of 7 members;b) the project must have a minimum value of \$2M;c) demonstrate how the referenced project is for an Enterprise-Level Implementation (how it provides a company-wide solution architecture);d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise or how it served to address business transformation, whichever is appropriate; ande) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?			
----	---	--	--	--

Question 47: In Workstream 3, R1 in the Project Executive (Level 3) evaluation grid states the Bidder should have demonstrated experience managing multi-disciplined teams throughout project implementation on at least three (3) projects within the last ten years involving a large- scale desktop or operating system software upgrade.

A Project Executive as defined by TBIPS has what would normally be a much higher level of responsibility than to have been involved in desktop migrations. We are confused as to the relevance of this requirement. With applications being of prime importance to all government departments, we would have expected there to be greater emphasis on application initiatives rather than a focus on desktop refreshes. We suggest that this requirement be amended to reflect experience that is more in line with the TBIPS SOW for this resource category. Possibly the requirement could focus on experience managing projects with certain team sizes, managing multiple projects and project managers simultaneously (possibly two years of experience managing multiple projects simultaneously) or some other task/tasks that reflect a combination of experience.

Answer 47: Canada has reviewed your request. P.5 Project Executive – Level 3, R1 is revised as follows:

DELETE: Workstream 3, Project Executive – Level 3, R1

INSERT:

R1	<p>The Bidder should have demonstrated experience managing multi-disciplined teams throughout project implementation on at least three (3) projects within the last fifteen (15) years involving large-scale IM/IT implementations.</p> <p>For each project referenced, the Bidder must provide the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) organization;b) project title;c) date and duration worked on the project;d) size of the organization for which the project was delivered; ande) description of the work, clearly explaining how the referenced project was complex.			
----	---	--	--	--

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question 48: In Workstream 3, R2 in the Project Executive (Level 3) evaluation grid states the Bidder should have demonstrated experience assessing technology alternatives, developing impact statements and cost/benefit analyses and recommending options to stakeholders and IM/IT practitioners.

These are considered duties of a Technical Architect and not of a Project Executive. We request that this requirement be removed

Answer 48: The current criteria reflects the requirement. Technical Architects develop technology architectures and alternatives and identify and analyze technical solutions. Project Executives use those findings to assess alternatives in order to make recommendations to managers on the "best" option based on factors including costs and benefits to the organization. The requirement will not be modified as experience in this area is of value to Canada.

Question 49: In Workstream 3, R2 in the Project Manager (Level 3) evaluation grid states the Bidder should have demonstrated experience writing a minimum of three (3) Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for a Government of Canada federal department within the last ten (10) years.

A Project Manager's duties are not typically considered to include writing RFP's. This is the role of a Procurement Specialist. Further, we would assume that if a Project Manager were involved in this activity while working for Transport Canada as part of this supply arrangement that the vendor providing this resource would be precluded from servicing any possible business requirements that would be associated with the outcome of any such RFP. This could/would create a significant conflict of interest that would impact the overall serviceability of this contract and any future business needs resulting from any RFP written by a Project Manager.

Since it would create conflicts of interest, it should not be a relevant requirement for this role and we request that this requirement be removed given its impact.

Answer 49: The requirement will not be modified as experience in this area is of value to Canada.

Please note: There were no Contractors involved in the creation of this RFP.

Question 50: Given the Certification of Language and the Table on page 22 of the bid, please confirm whether the resources proposed as part of a Bidders' proposal need to be Bilingual, or only the resources proposed at time of Task Authorization?

Answer 50: The resources proposed at bid close should reflect the language requirements as defined on in Article 5.3 (II). This article is being modified to clarify the language requirements.

DELETE: Article 5.3 (II) Certification of Language

INSERT:

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Article 5.3 (II) Certification of Language

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that, should it be awarded a contract as result of the bid solicitation, every individual proposed in its bid will be fluent in the specified language below. The individual(s) proposed must be able to communicate orally and in writing in the specified language without any assistance and with minimal errors.

The following are the language requirements for the proposed Workstreams.
Various categories of professional services that will be required.

WORKSTREAM 1 – OPERATIONAL SUPPORT		
RESOURCE CATEGORY	LEVEL	LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT
HELP DESK SPECIALIST	1	BILINGUAL
HELP DESK SPECIALIST	2	BILINGUAL
OPERATIONS SUPPORT SPECIALIST	1	BILINGUAL
OPERATIONS SUPPORT SPECIALIST	2	BILINGUAL

WORKSTREAM 2 – BUSINESS SUPPORT		
RESOURCE CATEGORY	LEVEL	LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT
BUSINESS ANALYST	2	ENGLISH
TECHNICAL WRITER	2	ENGLISH
SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR	2	ENGLISH
TECHNICAL ARCHITECT	2	ENGLISH
TECHNOLOGY ARCHITECT	3	ENGLISH
ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT	3	ENGLISH

WORKSTREAM 3 – PROJECT SUPPORT		
RESOURCE CATEGORY	LEVEL	LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT
ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT	3	ENGLISH
PROJECT EXECUTIVE	3	ENGLISH
PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR	1	ENGLISH
PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR	2	BILINGUAL
PROJECT MANAGER	3	ENGLISH

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question 51: As per Section 3.2.(v) on page 13 of the RFP, please confirm if the same resource may be bid in the same category but in two different streams? For example, could the same resource be bid for Stream 2 – P.2 Enterprise Architect Level 3 and Stream 3 – P.2 Enterprise Architect Level 3?

Answer 51: No, the Bidder must not propose the same resource more than once in response to this solicitation. Please refer to **Article 3.2 Section 1: Technical Bid (V) For Proposed Resources** for further information. This solicitation is for **CAPACITY-ON-DEMAND** and more than one P.2 Enterprise Architects may be required simultaneously.

Question 52: Re: Stream 2, P.2 Enterprise Architect – Level 3 evaluation grid, the requirement M2 states: "The Bidder must have demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry that involve implementing Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) or Complex IT projects involving business transformation."

This leads us to believe that experience implementing Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) OR Complex IT projects involving business transformation is acceptable to meet this requirement. Yet the requirement then states the following, which seems to contradict the first part of the requirement:

"For each project identified:

- d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise; and
- e) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?"

Given the above statement, can the Crown please revise M2 such that it reads like this:

- d) demonstrate how the referenced project delivered SOA to the Enterprise; OR
- e) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?"

And please confirm the change above would also apply to Stream 3 – Enterprise Architect Level 3 grid on page 96 of the RFP.

Answer 52: This requirement has been modified and an answer has already been provided, please refer to Answer 42.

Question 53: Re: Stream 3 – P.5 Project Executive – Level 3 evaluation grid, the requirement R1 states:

“The Bidder should have demonstrated experience managing multi-disciplined teams throughout project implementation on at least three (3) projects within the last ten (10) years involving a large-scale desktop or operating system software upgrade.”

This requirement is very restrictive. Given that large-scale desktop or operating system software upgrade projects are often multi-year endeavours, this means Canada is restricting the pool of qualified candidates to those who have essentially spent the last ten years of their career only working on projects of this nature, and at the project executive level. There will be few such resources available in the Ottawa market who meet this criteria, thus severely restricting the competitive nature of this RFP. Would the Crown please consider revising this criterion such that points would be awarded for experience with one, two or three such implementation projects or allow experience with other types of upgrade or transformation projects?

Answer 53: This requirement has been modified, please refer to Answer 47.

Question 54 Re: Stream 3 – P.6 Project Administrator – Level 1 and Level 2 evaluation grids, the requirement R1 states:

“The Bidder should have demonstrated experience using the record and document management tool RDIMS/Hummingbird DM or GCDocs”, and maximum points are gained for having more than 3 years of experience. As written, this requirement is quite limiting, given that using these tools is not common for Project Administrators. Would Canada please expand this requirement to also accept experience with other Enterprise Content Management/Records Management systems? Or alternatively, revise the scoring such that less experience with the specific RDIMS/Hummingbird DM or GCDocs tools would be acceptable (ie. 1 point – 1 year of experience; 2 points – 18 months of experience; 3 points – 2+ years of experience)?

Answer 54: The criteria reflects the requirement. RDIMS/Hummingbird DM or GCDocs are Government of Canada standards that are commonly used by Project Administrators managing project documentation. Experience in this area is of value to Canada. This requirement will remain unchanged.

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question 55: Re: Corporate Qualifications, requirement R1, please confirm the following:

- a) Can the \$2M+ invoiced amount be a combination of contracts, or must that value be derived from one contract only?
- b) If a Bidder had a contract with multiple resource categories, 2 of which matched the categories of Stream 2 (and the resource activities matched at least 50%), and had invoiced more than \$5M against this contract, would that be sufficient to score full points for R1 in that stream?

Answer 55-1: The \$2M+ invoiced amount may be from a combination of contracts. This requirement has been modified - please refer to Answer 26.

Question 56: Re: Amendment 1, Question 2, please confirm that in fact Bidders must propose 5 resources for Stream 1?

These being:

- Helpdesk Specialist – Level 1
- Helpdesk Specialist – Level 2
- Operations Support Specialist – Level 1
- Operations Support Specialist – Level 2 – Application Support
- Operations Support Specialist – Level 2 – Problem/Change Management

Answer 56: Bidders are to submit a total of 4 resources for Workstream 1. This requirement has been modified and an answer has already been provided, please refer to Answer 29

Question 57: Please reference Attachment 4.1 , Corporate Qualifications, requirement R2 on page 71 of the RFP Rated Requirements

The RFP states:

"The Bidder should have provided a detailed description of its proposed approach and established methodology with respect to the following:

- a) approach and methodology aimed at ensuring the quality and timeliness of deliverables submitted to the Transport Canada Technical Authority;
- b) approach and methodology aimed at the recognition and mitigation of relevant risks that the bidder anticipates within the resulting work, based on previous experience;
- c) approach to communication aimed at ensuring that the Transport Canada Administrative and Technical Authorities are apprised of any progress, challenges, issues and risks that may arise during the course of the work issued under a Task Authorization (TA);
- d) human resources approach including the Bidder's approach to recruitment, training and development and retention of qualified resources, aimed at ensuring the availability of back-up resources to replace existing/proposed resources should the need arise under a TA; "

The evaluation Framework for R2 then allocates only a single point for each of a), b), c), d) which in effect provides for little gradation in response value and lends itself to a very subjective evaluation on an all or nothing basis. Given that the group of Bidders will all have very detailed descriptions of their unique processes that will not be necessarily common, can the Crown provide for a more detailed evaluation scoring for a), b),c), d) to enable more relativity in assignment of values in line with the amount of detail being provided? An example could be similar to the following:

- Response Fully Covers all the major components - assign 3 points
- Response covers most of major components – assign 2 points
- Response covers only a few of the major components – assign 1 point
- Response missed most of the major components –assign 0 points

Since the Corporate Qualification are repeated in each Stream, there should be a larger weighting than only 13 points per Stream. The proposed adjustment to the R2 would in effect result in an improved weighting for Corporate Qualifications from 13 points to 21 points which would make Corporate Qualification of Stream 1 worth approximately 31% of the overall technical points as opposed to the current 22%. The same would apply to the other two Streams which would now be weighted at 28% for Stream 2 and 32% for Stream 3. These proposed new weightings would provide a greater re-assurance on the overall Bidder capabilities in relation to its resourcing capabilities.

Answer 57: Canada has reviewed your recommendation but has chosen to maintain the current wording. This requirement will remain unchanged.

Each Workstream is mutually exclusive of one another and as such, the weighting of the Corporate Qualifications are not the same for each Workstream.

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question 58: Please confirm that the crown will accept as a municipal corporate reference for M1, Metrolinx, an agency of the Government of Ontario under the Metrolinx Act, 2006, responsible for the coordination and integration of all modes of transportation in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

Answer 58: Canada will accept experience from any Provincial Ministry or Agency.

Question 59-1: The crown has selected a median evaluation methodology with a -20% limitation to vendors for substantiation requests. In our experience, this incentivizes bidders to price as closely as possible to the -20% range of pricing. For an RFP this size, it is highly likely that Transport will receive more than 15 responses per stream, which means that the median -20% will result in professional services rates that are very low.

Question 59-2: This problem is compounded by the evaluation methodology which designates 40% of the evaluation to price, which further incentivizes the submission of low rates as bidders price conservatively to avoid loss of scoring on the 40% portion. To avoid the outcome of unreasonably low rates, will the crown consider amending the median band to -10% substantiation range, and/or will the crown consider weighting the evaluation as 80% technical score and 20% pricing score, to ensure that Transport Canada does not end up with poor rates in the resulting contract?

Answer 59-1: In Canada's experience, Bidders will from time to time propose rates at the time of bidding for one or more categories of resources that they later refuse to honour, on the basis that these rates do not allow them to recover their own costs and/or make a profit.

The median rate allows Canada to determine whether it can rely, with confidence, on the Bidder's ability to provide the required services at the rates bid.

Answer 59-2: We have determined that the combination of weighting factors for technical merit and price that are included in the Solicitation will provide the best value to Canada.

This requirement will remain unchanged.

Question 60: Attachment 4.2, Pricing Schedule contains instructions to bidders regarding calculations under "Resource Categories with Estimated Level of Effort". However, these instructions and calculations do not match those in the tables provided for Bidders to complete. Would the client please clarify how Bidders are to perform their calculations in order to arrive at their Total Bid Price?

Answer 60: This requirement has been modified, please refer to Answer 16-2.

Question 61: Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria – Corporate Qualifications - Mandatory Requirement M1: Part (b) of this requirement states the contract referenced must have been awarded at least 12 months prior to the closing date of this solicitation and no later than 10 years prior to the closing date of this solicitation, and part (c) of this requirement states that the contract must have a duration of at least 2 years within the last 10 years. Would the Crown accept a contract that has been awarded outside the 10 years prior to the solicitation close date as long as the contract has been ongoing for at least 2 years within the last 10 years of the solicitation close date?

Question 61-1 Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria – Corporate Qualifications - Mandatory Requirement M1: The Crown is asking for the Bidder to demonstrate they have been awarded at least 3 IM/IT contracts, wherein they provided the same or similar services for the Workstream they are bidding on. The wording “same or similar services” without providing specific criteria leaves the requirement open to interpretation by the Bidder. For example, a Bidder could essentially provide a contract where they only provided resources in 1 of the categories in the Workstream and would not be demonstrating they would have the capabilities to meet the true needs of Transport Canada and this requirement. A common practice from several other departments who have issued solicitations of similar size and scope specify the number of categories on each stream which the Bidder has to demonstrate they have provided services for.

We would like to recommend the Crown add the following criteria to provide more clarification of the requirement:

Workstream 1: The Bidder must demonstrate each contract included the provision of at least 2 of the following categories:

- Help Desk Specialist – Level 1
- Help Desk Specialist – Level 2
- Operations Support Specialist – Level 1
- Operations Support Specialist – Level 2

Workstream 2: The Bidder must demonstrate each contract included the provision of at least 3 of the following categories:

- Business Analyst – Level 2
- Technical Writer – Level 2
- System Administrator – Level 2
- Technical Architect – Level 2
- Enterprise Architect – Level 3

Workstream 3: The Bidder must demonstrate each contract included the provision of at least 3 of the following categories:

- Enterprise Architect – Level 3
- Project Executive – Level 3
- Project Administrator – Level 1
- Project Administrator – Level 2
- Project Manager – Level 3

Question 61-2 Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria – Corporate Qualifications - Mandatory Requirement M1: Part (d) of this requirement is asking for the Bidder to demonstrate they have provided at least 10 resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months within the last ten years. Would the Crown please clarify that this is referring to the entire contract being referenced?

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation
T8086-152167

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
05

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
384zm

Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client
T8086-152167/A

File No. – N° du dossier
384zm T8086-152167/A

CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Answer 61: This requirement has been modified and an answer has already been provided, please refer to Answer 19.

Answer 61-1: In order for amounts to be accepted for evaluation purposes, the amount claimed can only be for the category(ies) that match those in the applicable Workstream. Only the amount invoiced for the category(ies) that match will be accepted. The bidder cannot claim any value of work that does not match the categories of the applicable Workstream.

Answer 61-2: This requirement has been modified and an answer has already been provided, please refer to Answer 19.

Question 62: As we are waiting on important questions to be answered for this solicitation, we respectfully request an extension to the current close date. Would the Crown please extend the end date of this solicitation to February 15th 2017?

Answer 62: Canada will grant an extension to the closing date of the Solicitation

DELETE: THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION IS **FEBRUARY 8· 2017 2:00 PM**

INSERT: THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION IS **FEBRUARY 22· 2017 2:00 PM**

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.