



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. 009
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8484-168506	Date 2017-02-23
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 2017-03-06	
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 009

The purpose of this amendment is to respond to potential bidders' questions.

1) *Question 38:*

Please refer to Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria, RT2.1b, Senior Systems Engineer (M&S), RT2.1b.3 where it states: "...writing and maintaining systems architecture documentation using DNDAF or DoDAF, NAF and MODAF"; and refer to Section 7; Roles, Responsibilities and Tasks by Resource Category 7.3, Senior System Engineer where the Roles, Responsibilities and Tasks for this role which only refers to the DoDAF and DNDAF views (Canada/US).

Given the information from the task description, and the fact that DNDAF, NAF and MODAF are all derivatives of DoDAF, but not the only derivative frameworks that might be encountered, we believe that a candidate would have sufficient experience if they possessed hands-on experience with the root framework (DoDAF) or the Canadian Framework (DNDAF), and additional hands-on experience with one other derivative (e.g., NAF or MODAF), thereby demonstrating knowledge of a key framework and the ability to understand the nuances of a derivative framework. On that basis, would the Crown please consider offering full points for a candidate who possesses:

Experience with the Canadian DND Architecture Framework (**DNDAF**) or US Department of Defense Architecture Framework (**DoDAF**), and one (1) of the following two framework options:

1. NATO Architecture Framework (**NAF**)
2. British Ministry of Defence Architecture Framework (**MODAF**)

Response 38:

The current scoring scheme represents the added value in having a resource with experience in writing and maintaining systems architecture documentation using each of the listed frameworks. The criteria remains unchanged.

Question 39:

Please reference the section 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria. Under RT.1 Bidder's Corporate Experience, criterion RT1.1 applies an exponential allocation of points for increasing numbers of resource categories above the minimum 10 categories in MT1 (11-15 resource categories – 5 points /project; 16-20 resource categories – 10 points /project; more than 20 resource categories – 20 points/project). The same exponential point allocation system is used for RT1.2 for increasing consecutive months of deployment of resource categories.

Given that the incumbent vendor's contract was the only contract of this magnitude to supply these categories of resources in 2012 and that none of these categories were referenced in the original RFP in 2012, it is apparent that the incumbent will be the only bidder to meet the majority of the categories exceeding the mandatory 10 first categories. By implementing an exponential rated point scoring allocation as in RT1.1 and RT1.2 in these circumstances, the Crown appears to be deliberately augmenting the incumbent's total points potential in an unfair and preferential manner, distancing them from other bidders exponentially. Never in our many years of business responding to government RFPs have we seen the use of such an unprecedented exponential point allocation system.

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.
009
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

In lieu of the current exponential point system, we would request that the Crown consider utilizing a more traditional linear point rating system which might, for example, allocate 1 point per category demonstrated in a project to a maximum of 20 points per project. This would permit bidders to be measured on the same equivalency of categories and not create a disproportionate allocation to the incumbent. This more traditional linear point rating system which sets a level playing field for scoring would ensure the Crown of transparency and fairness in this procurement.

Response 39:

Please refer to Amendment 003, Responses 12 and 13, as well as Amendment 004, Responses 14 and 15.

Further, Amendment 002, Response 2 confirmed that there is no requirement for the Bidders' proposed categories and roles to exactly match the titles of the categories and roles in the Statement of Work. As such, it is the Bidder's opportunity to determine which categories and roles would match the nomenclature of the Statement of Work, as the resource categories provided by Canada represent Canada's best efforts to associate the titles and roles with industry standards.

Question 40:

The original request for proposal for CFWC Support Services (Solicitation No. W8484-127587/A dated 2012-07-25) focused mainly on the capabilities and experience of the resources. There was only one Mandatory Corporate Experience requirement (see below), i.e. one that was based on two reference projects as in this solicitation but that did not define the exact individual categories that the reference projects must have included. There were no Rated Corporate Experience requirements in the original solicitation only rated requirements for the Bidder's Contract Management and Resource Management plans. The first amendment to the solicitation added Rated Corporate project experience and these rated requirements notably rated the value of each of the projects awarding points based on a value scale, something the current solicitation does not do.

Original Solicitation - MT1.0 CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

The Bidder must demonstrate at least three (3) years of experience providing Informatics, Engineering or Project Management professional services.

To demonstrate this experience, the Bidder must provide a minimum of two (2) corporate project references for projects it has completed. The Bidder must have started work on each project within the last 10 years from the date of solicitation closing.

Each project reference must have a minimum contract value of \$5 million Canadian (CDN) including GST/HST.

The Bidder should provide the following information for each project reference:

- a. Description of the work completed the Bidder demonstrating the nature and relevance of its experience;
- b. Description of the resource team, including their roles and responsibilities throughout the project;
- c. Deliverables completed and submitted by the Bidder;
- d. Start and end dates of the project;
- e. Client organization*;

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.
009
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

f. Contract value, including GST/HST;

g. Client Contact who can validate the information presented (name, phone number and email address).

* Project(s) referenced must have been for client(s) external to the Bidder's organization. Project references having the following project clients will not be considered: Any organization that is related to the Bidder (e.g.: parent company or subsidiary of the Bidder and the Bidder's internal clients).

Now that there is an incumbent at CFCW the Crown has changed their evaluation criteria and this evaluation criteria clearly provides the incumbent with an unfair, probably insurmountable advantage for this solicitation.

It is requested that the Crown:

1. Modify MT.1 d) to remove the requirement that the reference projects have to include the functions of at least ten of the resource categories listed in Annex A – SOW and have it so that the reference projects have to include at least 10 IM/IT or engineering resource categories as the current slate of acceptable categories is highly restrictive and overly favourable to the incumbent contractor.

2. Modify RT1.6 c) to remove the requirement for a total contract value of at least \$6 million and replace it with a contract value rating scheme such as the one in the original solicitation (RM3.2) which was \$5M.

Response 40:

The evaluation criteria are based on the current projected needs of the client.

Please refer to Amendment 002, Response 2, which confirmed that there is no requirement for the Bidders' proposed categories and roles to exactly match the titles of the categories and roles in the SOW.

As detailed in Response 38, it is the Bidder's opportunity to determine which categories and roles would match the nomenclature of the Statement of Work, as the resource categories provided by Canada represent Canada's best efforts to associate the titles and roles with industry standards.

Question 41:

Please refer to Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 4.1.1.1, Mandatory Technical Criteria, MT.1 d) and 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria RT1.1.

It is our understanding based on extensive research that many of the resource categories listed in Annex A – SOW are highly specialized and that many have not been utilized in but two contracts one of them being the current CFWC contract. This not only makes it difficult to meet the mandatory requirement MT.1 d) it makes it virtually impossible to score points in rated requirement RT1.1. We respectfully request that rated requirement RT1.1 be removed from the rated evaluation.

Response 41:

Please refer to Response 38 and Response 39.

As the qualifications required are based on the current projected needs of the client, the evaluation criteria remain unchanged.

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.
009
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

Question 42:

From the list of questions received to date, one can deduce that there have been 3 - 4 distinct potential bidders interested in responding to this RFP. As Question 36 has been the only question related to resource category 7.23, it indicates that only one of those 3-4 potential bidders may have encountered challenges in sourcing for this role.

Given that the role remains a valid category in the procurement, and one that a vendor may be called upon to fill if awarded the contract, can the Crown provide it's rationale in removing evaluation of the role completely rather than making criteria MT 2.7.2, MT2.7.3, MT2.7.4 and MT2.7.5 rated criteria as suggested as an option in Question 36?

A change of this nature so late in the procurement process is highly unusual, and removing the role entirely from the mandatory evaluation may have impacted multiple potential bidders to the benefit of the sole bidder that posed the question.

Response 42:

After reflecting on the criteria, Canada determined that, while the Hybrid Cloud and High Performance Computing Engineer category is a role that is required by the CFWC, the need for this role is not believed to be immediate following award of contract.

Question 43:

Based on the response for question 36, because resource category 7.23 was not totally removed from the list of potential roles that the Crown may require to be fulfilled after contract award, and in retaining the pricing evaluation criteria for resource category 7.23 (Attachment 1 –Financial Bid presentation sheet), the Crown seems to indicate that they still consider this role viable as a baseline requirement for CFWC.

By maintaining all mandatory and rated criteria unchanged outside of the bid evaluation process, the Crown is still asking the supplier community to plan for the possible Task Authorization for that role. In this context, we respectfully ask the Crown to consider that the criteria outlined in MT2.7.2, MT2.7.3, MT2.7.4 and MT2.7.5 be made rated criteria and therefore enabling all potential bidders to respond against this specific role and to be able to fulfill Task Authorization requests in the future after contract award.

Response 43:

Please refer to Response 42. In addition, the functions of the role are required under the resulting Contract, and as such, tasks involving this category may be issued.

Question 44:

Question 36 states that the bidder had performed a Canada-wide search for a qualified candidate for role 7.23. As a potential bidder, recognizing that the skills and expertise requested were not necessarily widely available in the market place, we also performed a search for that specific role, resulting in at least 3 qualified (the majority of which were local to the NCR) resources that met all of DND's mandatory requirements. On that basis and out of fairness to all bidders, as only one bidder is reporting this challenge, we ask that the criteria outlined in MT2.7.2, MT2.7.3, MT2.7.4 and MT2.7.5 be included in the bid evaluation as rated criteria. This approach will enable all potential bidders to benefit from their sourcing efforts and assure DND that they will be able to source this role in a more predictable way after contract award.

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.
009
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

Response 44:

Please refer to Response 42 and Response 43.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.