



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
Science Procurement Directorate/Direction de
l'acquisition de travaux scientifiques
11C1, Phase III
Place du Portage
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet CFWC DEVELOPMENTAL & TECH SUPPORT	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8484-168506/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8484-168506	Date 2017-02-14
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$\$V-062-30691	
File No. - N° de dossier 062sv.W8484-168506	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-02-28	
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: Baxter, Emily	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 062sv
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4819 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-2229
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

Amendment 006

The purpose of this amendment is 1) to respond to potential bidders' questions, 2) revise PART 4 of the solicitation and 3) revise the Statement of Work.

1) Question 22:

Further to Questions & Answers 14 and 15 of Amendment 4:

We still strongly believe that rating schemes for RT1.1 and RT1.2 are unfair and contrary to PSPC's stated Code of Conduct for Procurement that calls for "Openness, Fairness and Transparency". Once again we ask that the Crown please review the current ratings for RT1.1 and RT1.2 and amend them to provide for a fair and open competition, one where each same item is awarded equal points.

Response 22:

As the current rating scales for RT1.1 and RT1.2 reflect the client's requirement, they remain unchanged.

Question 23:

Further to Questions & Answers 16 and 17 of Amendment 4:

The Crown has failed to provide meaningful answers to Questions #16 and #17. The Crown's response does not in any way address the concerns of these questions. The Crown's amendment only changes the fact that the resources would not have had to work 37.5 hours a week and does not address the concerns that many of the identified resource categories would not in most circumstances be required for 1575 hours per year, including the CFCW scenario where 9 of the required resource categories are projected to work far less than 1575 hours per year. Therefore, we ask again – will the Crown look at reducing the 1575 hours of work requirement at least for the categories in excess of the 10 mandatory ones?

Response 23:

As this is a task-authorization based contract, the levels of effort indicated are the client's projected requirements. Please refer to ATTACHMENT 1 – FINANCIAL BID PRESENTATION SHEET, which indicates that the level of effort indicated is an approximation of requirements given in good faith. As such, the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 24:

RT1.6 states:

"Bidder's experience performing projects additional to those in MT1 and that meet each of the following:

- a) The Bidder met each of sub- criteria MT1.a), b), c)
- b) The project was performed for a minimum duration of 36 consecutive months within the last 96 months of the solicitation closing date;
- c) The project had a total contract value of at least \$6 million (excluding Applicable Taxes) for the professional services component only. Contract value refers to the amount charged to the client paying for and receiving the work;

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8484-168506/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8484-168506

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
062sv
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

-
- d) The Bidder was responsible for at least 10 resources who each performed at least 1575 hours of work during the same 12 month period

1 project = 10 points
2 projects = 20 points
3 projects meeting the above criteria = 30 points"

RT1.6 is requesting the Bidder to demonstrate experience with 3 additional projects similar in scope to the projects provided in MT1, and for which the project's invoiced value (ie. amount charged to the client for professional services) is at least \$6M. Given that the two projects required in MT1 must only demonstrate an invoiced value of \$2M, why is the Crown now asking for projects of three times that amount in the point rated criteria?

Additionally, along with the other criteria (a, b, c, d) which the projects must meet, and given the points are awarded on an all or nothing basis (ie. a project must meet all 4 criteria in order to get any points), this requirement is very difficult to score well on, for anyone other than the current incumbent contractor.

In the interest of a fair and transparent procurement process we ask that for RT1.6:

- The contract value be reduced to \$2M or greater for full points; or
- Points be awarded such that a contract worth \$2M-\$2.99M = 5 points; \$3-\$4.99M = 7.5 points, and >\$5M = 10 points

Response 24:

The mandatory requirements of this RFP represent truly essential requirements, while rated criteria are used to assess various elements of the technical bid so that the relative merits of each bid can be used to distinguish one bid from another. This rated criteria is reflective of the client's requirement and, as such, remains unchanged.

Question 25:

RT1.1 states:

"For the Bidder's claimed projects for MT1, for every resource category additional to the minimum 10 of MT1, and that meet all MT1 criteria:

11-12 resource categories = 5 points per project
13-14 resource categories = 10 points per project
15-16 resource categories = 15 points per project
17-18 resource categories = 20 points per project"

While there are a number of large contracts throughout the government, very few, if any, organizations would have requirements with an exact match of services and resource categories as those being requested through this solicitation. By requiring Bidders to demonstrate that 17 of 27 categories match (ie. demonstrate that the roles and responsibilities align to the resource categories in this solicitation) for full points, the Crown is severely limiting the pool of qualified Bidders, and greatly favouring the current incumbent contractor.

In the interest of a fair and transparent procurement process, we respectfully request that RT1.1 be revised such that any resource categories over and above the mandatory 10 in MT1 d) be acceptable, regardless of whether they align to the categories of this solicitation.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8484-168506/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8484-168506

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
062sv
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Response 25:

The titles of the claimed resource categories need not match those of the SoW, but must still align with the occupational categories in the SoW. As such, this criteria remains unchanged.

Question 26:

Would the Crown kindly confirm that a personnel clearance will be deemed "active" if the update is in process with CISC PWGSC at time of bid submission and/or time of contract award?

Response 26:

Please refer to the RFP, **PART 6 - SECURITY, FINANCIAL AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS**, specifically article 6.1, 2, for the conditions which must be met before award of a contract.

Question 27:

Please refer to Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 4.1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria, MT2.2.1. It is our experience that degrees or diplomas obtained in the United States are typically accepted and are deemed to be equal to those obtained in Canada, and individuals are not typically required to obtain a Canadian academic equivalency document in order to practice their professions in Canada. Therefore, please confirm that an individual who possesses a BSc. in Electrical Engineering from State University of New York would be deemed to be compliant in support of this requirement, and that it is not necessary for this individual to apply for and obtain a Canadian Academic equivalency.

Response 27:

The requirement remains unchanged, as a Canadian Academic equivalency must be obtained where the post-secondary degree or diploma was completed and obtained outside of Canada.

Instructions regarding the provision of the applicable degree, diploma or the equivalency document are provided in **PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION**, in the Supporting Information column.

Question 28:

Please refer to Annex A – Statement of Work, 13 Minimum Resource Qualification Requirements, 13.1 Senior Account Manager, where it states: "All Senior Account Manager resources must have a minimum of 36 months of experience in the last 10 years, from the date of task authorization issuance, managing project team(s) of at least 10 people working on technical project(s) involving IT or Engineering services". Considering that this RFP includes Training requirements, would the Crown include experience with technical training projects for this position.

Response 28:

The Minimum Resource Qualification Requirements for 13.1 Senior Account Manager have been revised. Please see 2) c) below.

Question 29:

In Amendment 5, in Response 18, the Crown declined to include a limitation of liability along the lines of SACC N000C and in so doing stated the following: "As this is a research and development requirement,

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8484-168506/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8484-168506

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
062sv
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

this clause will not be included in the resulting contract." Given that DND will control all aspects of the environment including deliverables, location and all physical and cyber security, would Canada elaborate on its rationale for response 18 in amendment 5 by explaining exactly what it is about "research and development requirements" that would justify refusing to include a limitation to proponent's liability?"

Response 29:

Per the SACC 2040 (2016-04-04) General Conditions – Research and Development, which form part of the Contract, Section 26 states that the "Parties agree that no limitation of liability or indemnity provision applies to the Contract unless it is specifically incorporated in full text in the Articles of Agreement."

SACC Clause N000C is used specifically in Information Management/Information Technology (IM/IT) contracts, as special authority was granted by Treasury Board to allocate risk in accordance with this clause for those contracts. As this contract is primarily research and developmental in nature, as opposed to IM/IT based, this clause will not be included in the resulting contract.

Question 30:

As an active proponent for numerous federal government procurements, we have observed in recent years that there have been numerous instances, for many and varied services, whereby Canada has agreed to limit a bidder's liability; to provide just some examples: JUSTICE CANADA HELP DESK SERVICES Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 19335-160056/A, and DEFENCE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (DRMIS) AND SIGMA SYSTEM SUPPORT SERVICES DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR DRMIS / PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA FOR SIGMA SYSTEM DRMIS/SIGMA Professional Services - RFP W8474-126279.

Given that this contract is for the provision of professional, administrative and technical services and that DND controls the physical environment in all aspects including IM and physical security, ownership of the IT platforms, systems and networks, will DND re-consider its response in Response 18 and issue an amendment that will include a limitation of liability?

Response 30:

In addition to the information provided in *Response 29*, the decision to use the Liability clause at Section 26 of the SACC 2040 (2016-04-04) General Conditions – Research and Development, which remains silent in regard to Contractor liability in the resulting contract, is also based on the fact that the proposed contract is task authorization based and, as such, the Contractor's risk is reduced.

Question 32:

With respect to the Resource: Senior Distributed Modeling and Simulation Engineer: Mandatory Requirement MT2.3.4 and Rated Requirement RT2.3.1 declare a requirement for Virtual Battlespace version 2 (VBS2) as a simulation tool, indicating experience in excess of 36 months. The current version of the VBS tool is 3.0 and has been used to replace VBS2 in many environments, including but not limited to the CDN Army and CDN Navy. The VCCI tool, also a requirement for this competition, is now compliant with VBS3. For the most part, VBS3 is compatible with VBS2.

Given the level of compatibility between VBS2 and VBS3 and the current efforts within the Canadian Armed Forces to migrate from VBS2 to VBS3, would it be possible to aggregate experience in both applications meet the 36 month requirement?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8484-168506/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8484-168506

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
062sv
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Response 32:

Please see Part 2) a) and b) of this amendment.

Question 33:

With respect to Resource: Senior Systems Engineer Modelling and Simulation. RT2.1b.1 identifies the requirement for a Qualiware Lifecycle Management Tool. A number of tools are used to meet this specific requirement, with common objectives and only moderately different processes. Insofar as a variety of these tools are used by our organization for Crown programs, it is believed that experience in one is transferrable to experience with another.

Can experience with Enterprise Architect be used to meet the Qualiware LCM Tool requirement?

Response 33:

Given the client's requirements, Qualiware Lifecycle Management Tool must be used to meet this criteria. The criteria remains unchanged.

Question 34:

With respect to Resource: Senior Systems Engineer Modelling and Simulation. RT2.1b.2 identifies the requirement for the conduct of writing and maintaining Configuration Control Management documentation. This requirement is further defined as to having the work conducted on a NATO Secret or above network. The emphasis of the work is the writing and maintaining of CCM documentation. The sub requirement of it being conducted on a NATO Secret network does not influence the ability to do the work. It would seem that conducting the work on a segmented, controlled, Controlled Goods compliant, ITAR compliant network would be comparable.

Can experience conducting the work identified in RT2.1b.2 on a segmented, controlled Controlled Goods compliant, ITAR restricted network be considered equivalent to a NATO Secret network?

Response 34:

Amendment 005 revised the criteria from NATO Secret to a "network that is classified at the Secret level or above according to federal government standards of Canada or the US". However, work conducted on a segmented, Controlled Goods compliant, ITAR restricted network does not meet this criteria.

Question 35:

We would like to respectfully request a two (2) week extension to the bid closing date.

Response 35:

The solicitation closing date has been revised to February 28, 2017 at 2:00p.m. EST.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8484-168506/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8484-168506

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
062sv
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

2) a) At **PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, 4.1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria, MT2 Bidder's Resources, MT2.3 Senior Distributed Modeling and Simulation Engineer;**

DELETE:

MT2.3.4	The proposed resource must have a minimum of 36 months experience, acquired within the last 5 years of the solicitation closing date, developing or employing distributed simulation environments using VBS2.	Refer to Part 3 of the solicitation.	
---------	---	--------------------------------------	--

REPLACE WITH:

MT2.3.4	The proposed resource must have a minimum of 36 months experience, acquired within the last 5 years of the solicitation closing date, developing or employing distributed simulation environments using VBS2 or VBS3.	Refer to Part 3 of the solicitation.	
---------	---	--------------------------------------	--

b) At **PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria, RT.2 Point Rated Criteria of Bidder's Proposed Resources, RT2.3 Senior Distributed Modeling and Simulation Engineer, RT2.3.1;**

DELETE:

- VBS2

REPLACE WITH:

- VBS2 or VBS3

c) At **ANNEX A, STATEMENT OF WORK, 13 MINIMUM RESOURCE QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, 13.1 SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGER;**

DELETE:

All Senior Account Manager resources must have a minimum of 36 months of experience in the last 10 years, from the date of task authorization issuance, managing project team(s) of at least 10 people working on technical project(s) involving IT or Engineering services.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8484-168506/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8484-168506

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
062sv
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

REPLACE WITH:

All Senior Account Manager resources must have a minimum of 36 months of experience in the last 10 years, from the date of task authorization issuance, managing project team(s) of at least 10 people working on technical project(s) involving IT or Engineering services or training.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.