



**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TBIPS - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> T8086-152167/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 008
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> T8086-152167	<b>Date</b> 2017-02-17
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-384-30689	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 384zm.T8086-152167	<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 2017-03-08</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 type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Beaudoin, Michael	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 384zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 469-4892 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-1207
<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>

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 008

---

THIS AMENDMENT IS RAISED TO:

- INCLUDE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE SOLICITATION
- EXTEND THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION TO MARCH 8, 2017 AT 2:00PM (EST)
- MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 1 SUMMARY TABLE
- MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 CORPORATE CRITERIA (M1)
- MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 CORPORATE CRITERIA (R1)
- MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 PROJECT EXECUTIVE (R1)
- MODIFY ATTACHMENT 3.1 BIDDER CERTIFICATION FORM
- MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 PROJECT MANAGER (R2)

---

**Question 104:** Further to Amendment #6, Answer 87: "Canada will accept experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies." Will the Crown confirm that it will accept experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies for requirement R2 as well?

**Answer 104:** Canada confirms that experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies will be accepted for R2.

**Question 105:** Concerning the B.13 Operations Support Specialist – Level 2 – Application Support – rated requirement R1 (on page 78) requires the resource to have "...experience using systems management tools such as Tivoli, HP Service Manager or Remedy." We understand that the tools stated (i.e. Tivoli, HP Service Manager, and Remedy) are examples only, and not necessarily the only tools that will be accepted in response to R1, and thus other examples of systems management tools such as Microsoft Systems Management Server (SMS) will be accepted. Please confirm this understanding.

**Answer 105:** Canada confirms that any industry-recognized systems management tool will be accepted.

**Question 106:** We noticed in the Amendment released the other day that it did not include our question below. Due to the delay in answering our question we would like to ask TC for an extension.

**Answer 106:** Canada will grant a further extension to the closing date.

**DELETE:** THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION IS MARCH 1, 2017 2:00 PM

**INSERT:** THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION IS MARCH 8, 2017 2:00 PM

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 107:** R3 for The Enterprise Architect Level 3(both Roles) requires “experience performing research and development (R&D) on new and emerging technologies (hardware and software).”

The term “Research and Development (R&D)” usually connotes designing and developing new technologies from the ground up. The Government of Canada does not typically do this (especially for hardware) except within very specific environments such as Defence Research and Development Canada.

Performing research and development is not a typical role of an Enterprise Architect. An Enterprise Architect is concerned with bringing all technology, application, information, and business architectures together into one cohesive solution. They may not work at the lower level of identifying specific software and hardware to drive out a solution. This is usually done by the Technology Architect or Application Architect and integrated into the Enterprise Architecture.

Enterprise Architects usually model hardware/software elements from a high-level standpoint to ensure that the solution can integrate the technical specifications required to meet business requirements.

Additionally, due to security, budget and architectural constraints, the Government of Canada usually takes longer to adopt “new and emerging technologies” (a term that is fairly vague and highly subjective). Due to the unclear nature of this question, would Canada please consider changing this to better match the requirements of the Government of Canada and the tasks of an Enterprise Architect as follows: “experience performing research and/or development on technologies (hardware and/or software).”

**Answer 107:** The current criteria reflects the requirement. In this context R&D refers to researching new and emerging technologies and developing solutions based on those findings. The requirement will not be modified as experience in this area is of value to Canada.

**Question 108:** Please refer to Amendment 4, QA 19, Corporate M1 items C and D which state “the contract must have been for a duration of at least 2 years within the last ten years” and “the Bidder must have provided at least 5 resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months within the last ten years”. Would the Crown please consider changing the contract duration in item C to “at least 1 year within the last ten years” to better align with item D where “the bidders must have provided at least 5 resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months within the last ten years.” We do not see the relevance of having a mandatory 2 year minimum contract duration if all other requirements within Corporate M1 can be met with a contract reference that has a minimum duration of 1 year.

The latest amendment made large alterations to the solicitation requirements and some of our previous questions remain unanswered. Due to these significant changes we respectfully request an additional extension to the submission date to February 22, 2017.

**Answer 108-1:** Canada considers 12 consecutive months to be a reasonable timeframe for evaluation purposes given the complex nature of this requirement and associated level of effort. The requirement will remain unchanged.

**Answer 108-2:** Canada has provided an extension to the closing date of the Solicitation to March 8, 2017.

**Question 109:** We have a question about the total points for Work Stream 1:

**Work Stream 1 Points Summary**

It seems that the Crown calculated points based on **5 categories** (including B.13 Operations Support Specialist, Level 2 – Problem/Change Management)

See below table:

<b>Points Summary Workstream 1 – IM/IT Operational Support</b>		
	<b>Bidders Total Points</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>
<b>Corporate Qualifications</b>		??/13
<b>Workstream 1 – IM/IT Operational Support</b>		??/45
<b>Total</b>		??/50

Since this category has been removed, can you please confirm that the max points available for Work Stream 1 should be changed to the following:

<b>Points Summary Workstream 1 – IM/IT Operational Support</b>		
	<b>Bidders Total Points</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>
<b>Corporate Qualifications</b>		/13
<b>Workstream 1 – IM/IT Operational Support</b>		/ 37
<b>Total</b>		/ 50

**Answer 109:** Canada confirms that this is a typographical error.

**DELETE:** Workstream 1 Summary Table

**INSERT:** Workstream 1 Summary Table

<b>Points Summary Workstream 1 – IM/IT Operational Support</b>		
	<b>Bidders Total Points</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>
<b>Corporate Qualifications</b>		/13
<b>Workstream 1 – IM/IT Operational Support</b>		/ 37
<b>Total</b>		/ 50

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 110:** Regarding Amendment #4, Question and Answer #26, the revised Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria, Corporate Qualifications

We have several questions relating to the revised wording of this criterion:

1. Where it states that "only consulting services that match the resource categories for the applicable work stream of this solicitation will be accepted for evaluation purposes", can the Crown please indicate if all categories in a stream need to be matched or would it be sufficient to demonstrate/match half? For example, for Workstream 2, if a Bidder demonstrated through contract invoicing that they had billed \$6M of IT professional consulting services in the categories of Business Analyst, Technical Writer and System Administrator, would the Bidder be awarded full points for this evaluation criterion?
2. Where it states "If a Bidder is using TBIPS contracts to demonstrate experience, listing the resource categories will suffice", does this mean that if a Bidder is using a TBIPS contract, regardless if the category titles match, they only need to list the resource categories and not demonstrate equivalency? For example in Workstream 1, if a Bidder is using a TBIPS contract with the categories Network Support Specialist and Helpdesk Specialist, would this be considered a match and be acceptable to just list the resource categories, or would the Bidder need to also demonstrate equivalency to the Operational Support Specialist category of this solicitation in order to score full points?
3. Where it states "for non-TBIPS contracts the work performed must be similar to the generic tasks described for the applicable resource category under TBIPS. The bidder must indicate the equivalent TBIPS resource category in its response", please define "similar". What level of task matching will be sufficient to score full points? For example if a bidder mapped the tasks of a contract category to the generic TBIPS tasks and 50% of the tasks matched, would that be sufficient?

**Answer 110:** In order to clarify this requirement, Canada is modifying **M1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries and R1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries** in order to specify the minimum amount of resources required in order to demonstrate the required experience.

**The following text is being added to M1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries.**

The same or similar services for a minimum of one (1) resource category will be required in order to demonstrate the required experience for **M1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries**.

**Previous Similar Projects:** Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) a project must have been completed by the bid closing date; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated. A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the TBIPS description of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A or Attachment 4.1 Appendix 1. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category.

Only the amount invoiced for the resource category that match will be accepted.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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

**The following text is being added to R1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries.**

The same or similar services for a minimum of two (2) resource categories will be required in order to demonstrate the requested experience.

**Previous Similar Projects:** Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) a project must have been completed by the bid closing date; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated. A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the TBIPS description of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A or Attachment 4.1 Appendix 1. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category.

Only the amount invoiced for the resource category that match will be accepted.

**DELETE: M1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries**

**INSERT: M1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries**

	<b>Mandatory Requirements</b>	<b>Reference in Bidder's Proposal</b>
<b>M1</b>	<p><b>Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries</b></p> <p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least three (3) IM/IT contracts, wherein they provided the same or similar services for a minimum of one (1) resource category in the Workstream they are bidding on, of which at least one was for a Government organization (Federal, Provincial, Municipal Crown Corporation) client.</p> <p>Bidders must clearly identify which Workstream they are bidding on.</p> <p>For each contract identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) the contract value must be at least \$2M</li><li>b) the contract must have a duration of at least two years within the last twelve (12) years</li><li>c) the Bidder must have provided at least five (5) resources simultaneously for a period of at least 12 consecutive months within the last twelve (12) years.</li><li>d) to demonstrate this experience the Bidder</li></ul>	

<p>must submit customer references for three individual IM/IT contracts (one reference for each contract) managed within the last twelve (12) years. The references must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. the name of the organization;</li><li>ii. the contract number;</li><li>iii. a description of the services provided;</li><li>iv. the name, and either the telephone number or e-mail address of the organization's contact responsible for the contract;</li><li>v. the contract award date;</li><li>vi. the contract expiry date;</li><li>vii. the dollar value of the contract; and</li><li>viii. the number of resources provided.</li></ul> <p>Only experience claimed since December 1, 2006 will be accepted.</p> <p>Only consulting services that match the resource categories for the applicable Workstream of this solicitation will be accepted for evaluation purposes.</p> <p>If a Bidder is using TBIPS contracts to demonstrate experience, listing the resource categories will suffice.</p> <p>For non-TBIPS contracts, the work performed must be similar to the generic tasks described for the applicable resource category under TBIPS. The bidder must indicate the equivalent TBIPS resource category in its response.</p> <p>A copy of the TBIPS resource categories and their generic task lists for the resource categories that will be accepted for evaluation purposes has been attached for reference as Attachment 4.1 Appendix 1.</p> <p><b>Previous Similar Projects:</b> Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) a project</p>	
--	--

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
**08**

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

	<p>must have been have been completed by the bid closing date; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated. A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the TBIPS description of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A or Attachment 4.1 Appendix 1. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category.</p> <p>Only the amount invoiced for the resource category that match will be accepted.</p> <p><b>Note: After bid close, If Canada requests clarification or verification of the information provided for M1, the Bidder must provide the contact information for the reference contract. If the Bidder is unable to provide the information requested, the experience claimed will not be considered for evaluation purposes.</b></p>	
--	--	--

**DELETE: R1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries**

**INSERT: R1 Corporate Qualifications – Project Summaries**

R1.	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that it has sufficient recent experience providing IT Professional consulting services. To demonstrate this experience, the Bidder must have invoiced for more than \$2,000,000 of IT Professional consulting services for a minimum of two (2) resource categories in the Workstream they are bidding on. Only work invoiced for since October 1, 2006 will be accepted.</p> <p>The following information must be provided to substantiate the business volume claimed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Contract number</li> <li>b. Start and end date of the Contract(s)</li> <li>c. Amount invoiced for the contract</li> <li>d. Identify the services billed for</li> </ol>	<p>Max - 9 Points</p> <p>Points will be awarded based on business volume invoiced in the following manner (M = Million):</p> <p>&gt;\$2M to \$3.5M = 3 points          &gt;\$3.5M to \$5M = 6 points          &gt;\$5M or higher = 9 points</p>	
-----	--	---	--

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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

<p>Only consulting services that match the resource categories for the applicable work stream of this solicitation will be accepted for evaluation purposes.</p> <p>If a Bidder is using TBIPS contracts to demonstrate experience, listing the resource categories will suffice.</p> <p>For non-TBIPS contracts, the work performed must be similar to the generic tasks described for the applicable resource category under TBIPS. The bidder must indicate the equivalent TBIPS resource category in its response.</p> <p>A copy of the TBIPS resource categories and their generic task lists for the resource categories that will be accepted for evaluation purposes has been attached for reference as Attachment 4.1 Appendix 1.</p> <p><b>Previous Similar Projects:</b> Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) a project must have been commenced by the bid closing date; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated. A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the TBIPS description of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A or Attachment 4.1 Appendix 1. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category.</p> <p>Only the amount invoiced for the category that match will be accepted.</p> <p><b>Note: After bid close, If Canada requests clarification or verification of the information provided for R1, the Bidder must provide the contact information for the reference contract. If the Bidder is unable to provide the information requested, the experience claimed will not be considered for evaluation purposes.</b></p>		
<p>Total: 9 points</p>		

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 111:** In preparing our response to Corporate Qualification R1 on page 70 of the RFP, our firm spent considerable time and effort analyzing and selecting reference contracts and invoices that demonstrated “similar” work based on projects where the work performed by the resources closely matched the responsibilities of the “Resource Categories identified in Annex A”, as required by the original wording of R1. Amendment #4 has substituted the descriptions in Annex A for “TBIPS resource categories and their generic task lists.” Please confirm that for evaluation purposes, firms may demonstrate that previous experience closely matches the specific resource category descriptions in Annex A OR the generic TBIPS resource category descriptions.

**Answer 111:** This requirement has been modified and a response has been provided, please refer to Answer 110.

**Question 112:** In regards to the P.5 Project Executive - Level 3 grid for Workstream 3 starting on page 99 of the original RFP, M1 states:

- *The Bidder must demonstrate ten (10) years experience within the last fifteen (15) years, .....*

Based on the above, we ask that you amend R1 for this category to state:

- *The Bidder should have demonstrated experience ..... on at least three (3) projects within the last **fifteen (15) years** ....*

**Answer 112:** The current criteria reflects the requirement. The requirement will remain unchanged as the experience in this area is of value to Canada.

**Question 113:** With regards to Question 24, would the Crown please confirm that Bidders may submit a single proposal containing all three Workstreams? Submitting a single proposal containing all Workstreams would adhere to Canada’s Policy on Green Procurement as well as reduce the administrative burden for the Bidder and Transport Canada associated with submitting each workstream as a separate proposal.

**Answer 113:** Bidders may submit a single proposal but Canada requests that Bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 114:** In amendment #005, Answer 47 The Crown made changes to P.5 Project Executive - Level 3, R1. Could the Crown please provide the updated R1 points.

**Answer 114:** In order to clarify this requirement, Canada is making the following modification.

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

**INSERT: Workstream 3, Project Executive, Level 3 R1:**

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"><li>a) organization;</li><li>b) project title;</li><li>c) date and duration worked on the project;</li><li>d) size of the organization for which the project was delivered; and</li><li>e) description of the work, clearly explaining how the referenced project was complex.</li></ul>	<p><b>Max - 3 Points</b></p> <p><b>1 point –</b> The Bidder should have demonstrated experience managing multi-disciplined teams throughout project implementation on at least one (1) project within the last fifteen (15) years involving large-scale IM/IT implementations.</p> <p><b>2 points –</b> The Bidder should have demonstrated experience managing multi-disciplined teams throughout project implementation on at least two (2) projects within the last fifteen (15) years involving large-scale IM/IT implementations.</p> <p><b>3 points –</b> 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>		
----	---	--	--	--

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 115:** For workstream #2, Enterprise Architect, L3, M1, please confirm that 10 years of cumulative experience in all 3 sub-elements (technical architecture, frameworks, strategies) needs to be substantiated to meet M1.

**Answer 115:** Combined experience in all three sub-elements totaling 10 years will be accepted.

**Question 116:** Within Attachment 3.1 – Bid Submission Form, can the Crown please confirm that the following section should be deleted:

<b>Bidder's Proposed Site(s) or Premises Requiring  Safeguard Measures. See Part 3 for instructions.</b>	Address of proposed site or premise: _____  City: _____ Province: _____  Postal
--	---

**Answer 116:** You are correct, this was included in error. **At Attachment 3.1**

**DELETE:**

<b>Bidder's Proposed Site(s) or Premises Requiring  Safeguard Measures. See Part 3 for instructions.</b>	Address of proposed site or premise: _____  City: _____ Province: _____  Postal
--	---

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 117:** The answer provided in Amendment 5 to question 61-1 has confused us. Currently Corporate qualification M1 states:

“The Bidder must have been awarded at least three (3) IM/IT contracts, wherein they provided the same or similar services for the Workstream they are bidding on, of which at least one was for a Government organization (Federal, Provincial, Municipal, Crown Corporation) client.

For each contract identified:

a) the contract value must be at least \$2M;”

Now in Amendment 5, Answer 61-1 it states “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.”

Question: The wording of M1 a) states “the same or similar services” and that “a) the contract value must be at least \$2M”. The response to question 61-1 implies that Transport Canada is significantly modifying this requirement from “contract value” to “invoiced value” and from “same or similar services” to having provided the exact services as the amount claimed can now only be for the “categories that match those in the applicable workstream”.

Given R1 is requiring vendors to demonstrate \$2M of invoiced services related to the Workstream resource categories, we were under the impression that with M1 the Crown was looking for Bidders to demonstrate that they have the ability to supply similar services against Tier 2 (ie. \$2M+) contracts. While there are a number of Tier 2 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. If the Crown is intending that Bidders must demonstrate contracts with the same categories as the Workstream for which they are bidding, by requiring demonstration of at least \$2M in those specific categories, the Crown is severely limiting the pool of qualified Bidders.

**Question 117-1** Please confirm that the contract value asked for in this requirement is in fact the value of the contract awarded to the Bidder, and not the amount invoiced to the client.

**Question 117-2** As the Crown removed Section 3.2 Section 1 Technical Evaluation, Paragraph (iv), specifically, “A project will be considered “similar” to the work to be performed under any resulting contract if the projects was for the performance of work that closely matches the work described in Annex A. Work will be considered to “closely match” if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the requirement described in this solicitation”, how is the Crown anticipating that vendors will demonstrate that the contract reference provided meets the requirement of “similar services”?

In light of fair and open procurement, we respectfully request that the Crown clearly define for the vendor community how they will evaluate reference projects against the requirement of “similar services”.

**Answer 117-1:** Only the amount invoiced for the resource category that match will be accepted.

**Answer 117-2:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to answer 110.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 118: Reference: Corporate M1 - For each contract identified- a) the contract value must be at least \$2M.**

**Question a:** After reviewing Amendment #5, Q&A 61, it seems as if there has been a change to the M1 requirement. The Q61 Answer appears to relate the M1 contract value of \$2M+, to only the WS resource categories billed under a contract reference. Please clarify, does the \$2M+ contract value for a contract reference, relate only to the WS resource categories billed or to the contract reference value as a whole? If there has been a change to the requirement, will we receive an associated amendment for the M1 requirement change?

**Reference: Corporate M1**

**Question b:** Does each contract reference have to have included all the WS resource categories, or, can each contract reference include a subset of the WS resource categories?

**Reference: Corporate M1**

**Question c:** Do the three or more contract references, collectively, have to cover ALL of the WS resource categories?

**Answer 118:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to answer 110.

**Question 119: Reference a:** RFP Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria, Workstream 3 – IM/IT Project Support, P.9 Project Manager, Level 3, M1 Requirement, page 106

Please confirm that the Crown will accept the City of Ottawa as a Government of Canada reference for M1?

**Answer 119:** Canada will accept experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies, see Answer 87.

**Question 120:** With regard to Answer 65 provided in Amendment 006, which changed the M1 requirement, specifically "(b)" which now states "the contract must have a duration of at least two years within the last twelve (12) years".

This change represents a material impact to bidders who have already invested considerable time in identifying contacts, verifying resources, and ensuring task alignment, in addition to gathering the supporting content to satisfy criteria i-viii. It is very late in vendor's production timelines to introduce such a change, and there doesn't seem to be a demonstrable advantage to Transport Canada in this amended requirement, given that Question 65 raised concerns about TBIPS resource category equivalency, rather than contract duration.

**Question 120-2:** Please confirm that the crown will still accept a contract with a 3 year duration that was awarded in Sept 2015 to meet the statement of M1(b)?

**Answer 120-1:** In order to align with other criteria, Canada has made the change to 12 years.

**Answer 120-2:** Canada does not confirm your understanding. Only the amount invoiced for the category that match will be accepted. This requirement has been changed, please refer to Answer 110.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 121: Reference: Corporate M1**

With respect to the Corporate Mandatory M1, which was revised in Amendment 06 at Q /A #65, please clarify, does the \$2M+ contract value for a contract reference, relate only to the WS resource categories billed or to the contract reference value as a whole? The amended M1 does not address this query.

**Answer 121:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to answer 110.

**Question 122: Reference: Corporate M1**

Does each contract reference provided have to have included all the WS resource categories, or, can each contract reference include a subset of the WS resource categories as long as all WS resource categories are covered off by the combined contract references. This query has been asked numerous times, yet never answered.

**Answer 122:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to answer 110.

**Question 123: Reference: Corporate M1**

Do the three or more contract references, collectively, have to cover ALL of the WS resource categories?

**Answer 123:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to answer 110.

**Question 124: Reference: Corporate M1 Q/A #65 and Q/A #86**

Given the answers to Questions #65 and 86, please clarify if the Crown is asking for "at least 3 IM/IT contracts" or "only three contracts" in response to M1?

**Answer 124:** This requirement has not changed. Canada is requesting at least 3 IM/IT Contracts.

**Question 125: Reference: Q/A #67: Re Corporate Mandatory Criteria, M1..."Question 67:**

The amended M1 requirement does not address this query. Please advise if the same contract/project reference can be used for M1 substantiation for more than one (1) Workstream?

**Answer 125:** Yes, the same contract project may be used as substantiation for more than one Workstream.

**Question 126: Reference Q/A 72-1: R1 Re: Answer 72-1:**

Please clarify if this is a new requirement - R1 project references cannot be the same as used to demonstrate to M1. If so, this is an onerous amount of work for the development of a response given the number of contracts that a Bidder must provide to substantiate over \$5M (in addition to the M1 projects) and the number of equivalencies that must, potentially, be provided. Would the Crown consider lessening the total value of contracts required to obtain full rated points for R1, or alternatively provide another extension to the due date for the amount of work that will be involved

**Answer 126-1:** The referenced contracts can be the same. Separate contract may also used to demonstrate the experience.

**Answer 126-2:** Canada will not modify the contract values.

**Answer 126-3:** An extension has been provided to March 8, 2017.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 127:** TC's response to Q#67 was to refer to Answer #65, however, Answer #65 does not clarify if bidders can use contracts in which services delivered involved resource categories identified in both streams 2 and 3. Please see question below:

In responding to M1, our qualifying relevant reference projects involve categories that span both work streams 2 and 3. For example, a contract meeting all other criteria, but involving services delivered, including: Business Analysts, Project Managers, Project Executives and Technical Writers. Given that in this example, services delivered involve those identified in both streams 2 and 3, would the Crown accept this project as compliant in responding to: **1)** Work stream 2 or **2)** Work stream 3, or, **3)** both?

Can TC clarify in the question above which option **1), 2)** or **3)** is acceptable?

**Answer 128:** In order to demonstrate the experience for M1, the example provided would be sufficient to meet the requirement of Workstream 2 and Workstream 3.

**Question 128:** Amendment 5, Question and Answer 47 changed the rated requirement (R1) for Project Executive Level 3 to say: "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." However, the scoring column has not been updated to reflect this change.

Can the crown please confirm that in order to score max points, the wording should be: "The Bidder should have demonstrated experience managing multi-disciplined teams throughout project implementations on more than three (3) projects within the last fifteen (15) years involving large-scale IM/IT implementations."

**Answer 128:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to Answer 114.

**Question 129:** Q&A 47 of Amendment 005 changed the Project Executive L3 R1 grid to

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.**

For each project referenced, the Bidder must provide the following details:

- a) organization;
- b) project title;
- c) date and duration worked on the project;
- d) size of the organization for which the project was delivered.
- e) **description of the work, clearly explaining how the referenced project was complex.**

The points based on experience for R1 was not changed to reflect the amendment, can the Crown please provide the corrected points based experience?

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 129:** This requirement has been modified, please refer to Answer 114.

**Question 130:** For R2, Point Breakdown at Page 108: "Max – 3 Points": Would the Crown consider awarding points for a mixture of the three (3) types of categories (less than \$2M, \$2M, and over 3 RFPs valued over \$2M), or less than three (3) RFPs in any combination which addresses the point breakdown? For example,

*One RFP valued at less than \$2M - 1 point,*

*One RFP valued at \$2M - 1 point,*

*2 RFPs over \$2M - 1 point.*

**Answer 130:** Canada has reviewed your question. The requirement is being modified,

**DELETE: Workstream 3, Project Manager, Level 3 R2:**

**INSERT: Workstream 3, Project Manager, Level 3 R2:**

R2	<p>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 with a value of at least \$2M.</p> <p>For each RFP referenced, the Bidder should provide the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) organization, RFP Title and description of the work;</li><li>b) date and duration worked on the RFP; and</li><li>c) size of the organization for which the RFP was delivered.</li></ul>	<p><b>Max - 3 Points</b></p> <p><b>1 point –</b> The Bidder should have demonstrated one (1) RFPs written for a Government of Canada federal department within the last ten (10) years with a value of at least \$2M.</p> <p><b>2 points –</b> The Bidder should have demonstrated two (2) RFPs written for a Government of Canada federal department within the last ten (10) years with a value of at least \$2M.</p> <p><b>3 points –</b> The Bidder should have demonstrated three (3) RFPs written for a Government of Canada federal department within the last ten (10) years with a value of at least \$2M.</p>		
----	--	---	--	--

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 131:** In light of several questions (Q24, Q51, Q74, Q96) being asked regarding the Enterprise Architect category and allowing for the same resource to be bid in both Workstream 2 and Workstream 3, we kindly would like to make note of a few points in hopes of the Crown reconsidering their decision to have all bidders submit separate resources for the Enterprise Architect category in both Workstreams. The Enterprise Architect categories in each Workstream are completely identical in all aspects and the intent of these solicitation are to prove that bidders have such resources should they be requested to provide them on a Capacity–On-Demand basis. Please consider the following;

1.1 Summary section (b) of the proposal states: "It is intended to result in the award of up to 3 contracts in each of the 3 Workstreams, with each contract purchasing Work from only 1 Workstream...." Further, the proposal also states under (a) Submission of Only One Bid for each Workstream: "A Bidder, including related entities, will be permitted to submit only one bid for each Workstream in response to this bid solicitation...." And lastly 3.2 Section I: Technical Bid, For Proposed Resources states: "The technical bid must include résumés for the resources as identified in Attachment 4.1. The same individual must not be proposed for more than one Resource Category...."

The bid clearly states the Crown's intent to award up to 3 contracts per Workstream, thus each proposal in each Workstream will be considered a separate proposal and will be evaluated as such. The Crown also makes it clear that a bidder can only submit one bid per workstream, again reflecting the fact that each Workstream is being considered separate and its own contract opportunity. The clause in 3.2 Section I: Technical Bid is very common, it is found in most of the current TBIPS solicitations and it merely states that a bidder cannot submit the same resource for more than one category of the same Workstream ie: John Smith as the Technical Architect and the Enterprise Architect of Workstream 2. If a bidder can prove they have a resource that can meet the Enterprise Architect category in Workstream 2, then clearly they have proven to have resources capable of meeting the exact same requirements and category in Workstream 3. It appears, by the number of similar questions regarding this category that most of the bidding community shares the same thoughts and we likely would all appreciate the Crown reconsidering their decision.

**Answer 131:** Canada appreciates your feedback and has thoroughly reviewed your comments.

This solicitation is for **CAPACITY-ON-DEMAND** and more than one P.2 Enterprise Architects may be required simultaneously and therefore Canada cannot agree to your request. The requirement will remain unchanged.

**Question 132:** Regarding Amendment #6, Answer: 87: "Canada will accept experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies.", and its impact to R1.

**Our Question):** Would the Crown confirm that it will accept experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies for requirement R1 as well?

If the answer is yes, would the Crown further confirm that experience writing project approvals for those same government entities, would satisfy this requirement?

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.  
08

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 132:** Canada confirms that experience from provincial and municipal governments, Crown Corporations and Agencies will be accepted for R1 as long as Treasury Board of Canada Project Charter template was used in the experience demonstrated.

**Question 133:** R3 for The Enterprise Architect Level 3(both Roles) requires “experience performing research and development (R&D) on new and emerging technologies (hardware and software).”

The term “Research and Development (R&D)” usually connotes designing and developing new technologies from the ground up. The Government of Canada does not typically do this (especially for hardware) except within very specific environments such as Defence Research and Development Canada.

Performing research and development is not a typical role of an Enterprise Architect. An Enterprise Architect is concerned with bringing all technology, application, information, and business architectures together into one cohesive solution. They may not work at the lower level of identifying specific software and hardware to drive out a solution. This is usually done by the Technology Architect or Application Architect and integrated into the Enterprise Architecture.

Enterprise Architects usually model hardware/software elements from a high-level standpoint to ensure that the solution can integrate the technical specifications required to meet business requirements.

Additionally, due to security, budget and architectural constraints, the Government of Canada usually takes longer to adopt “new and emerging technologies” (a term that is fairly vague and highly subjective).

Due to the unclear nature of this question, would Canada please consider changing this to better match the requirements of the Government of Canada and the tasks of an Enterprise Architect as follows:

“experience performing research and/or development on technologies (hardware and/or software).”

**Answer 133:** An answer has been provided, please refer to Answer 107.

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