



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. 009
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-152167	Date 2017-02-23
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 2017-03-15	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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.
09

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 009

THIS AMENDMENT IS RAISED TO:

- **INCLUDE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE SOLICITATION**
 - **EXTEND THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION TO MARCH 15, 2017 AT 2:00PM (EST)**
 - **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 CORPORATE CRITERIA (R1)**
 - **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 PROJECT EXECUTIVE LEVEL 3 (M2)**
 - **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 PROJECT MANAGER (M2)**
 - **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT LEVEL 3 (M2)**
 - **MODIFY ATTACHMENT 4.1 WORKSTREAM 3 ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT LEVEL 3 (M2)**
-

Question 134: Can you please confirm that ATTACHMENT 3.1 – Bid Submission Form on page 66, does not require an Address of proposed site or premise. I believe that was for Document Safeguarding and it is no longer required.

Answer 134

An answer has been provided. Please refer to Answer 116.

Question 135: Given that answers to our first question, submitted on January 25, 2017, have yet to be received and the potential responses are pertinent to our bid submission. We respectfully request a two-week extension to the submission date to March 15, 2017.

Answer 135

Canada will grant a further extension to the closing date.

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

INSERT: THE CLOSING DATE OF THE SOLICITATION IS **MARCH 15, 2017 2:00 PM**

Question 136: Amendment 5, Q&A 47 changed the R1 requirement for the Workstream 3 project executive role from "within the last ten (10) years" to "within the last fifteen (15) years" and from "desktop or operating system software upgrade" to "IM/IT implementations". Please confirm that the Crown will also be updating the "Points based on experience" criteria to reflect those changes?

Answer 136

An answer has been provided. Please refer to Answer 114.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 137:

Given that there have been 100+ Questions and Answers thus far, there are still areas of ambiguity in the RFP. For example: there are answers that point to a response to another question, which is not completely related.

Would the crown consider a re-release of the RFP with all of the changes incorporated? We feel that It would be of great benefit, for bidders, as well as the proposal evaluators. Please advise

Answer 137

Since a majority of changes incorporated were made to **Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria** Canada agrees to provide a revised copy of **Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria** only.

A revised **Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria** incorporating all the changes, will be provided to bidders as part of **Solicitation Amendment 010** at the earliest opportune time.

Question 138: Attachment 4.1 – Bid Evaluation Criteria (RFP page 68) states: "...The tables should not contain all the project information from the resume. Only the page number of the resume should be incorporated so that the assessor can verify this information."

With respect to our response format of the Mandatory and Rated matrices, please confirm that it is acceptable to also include the Project #, Client, start/end date, and duration, in addition to the page number of the resume where our substantiating information can be found. For example:

Project 1
Client Name
November 2013 – November 2016 (37 months)
Resume, Page: X

Answer 138

This requirement has been changed. Please refer to answer 89.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 139: Part 5 – Certification, Professional Services Resources, item (a), (RFP page 21) states: "By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that, if it is awarded a contract as a result of the bid solicitation, every individual proposed in its bid will be available to perform the Work as required by Canada's representatives and at the time specified in the bid solicitation or agreed to with Canada's representatives.

Question: As the services are required on an as-and-when-requested Task Authorization (TA) basis, and considering the validity period for evaluation purposes is 270 days, it is unreasonable to expect that all proposed resources will be available 9 months from bid closing. Would the Crown please confirm that Bidders will have the opportunity of replacing proposed resource(s), if required, at the TA Stage.

Answer 139

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that, if it is awarded a contract as a result of the bid Solicitation, every individual proposed in its bid will be available to perform the Work as required by Canada's representatives and at the time specified in the bid solicitation.

Once a Contract has been issued, if the Contractor is unable to provide the services of any specific individual identified in the Contract, it must provide a replacement with similar qualifications and experience. The replacement must meet the criteria used in the selection of the Contractor and be acceptable to Canada. Please refer to **SACC Clause 2035 08 (2008-05-12) Replacement of Specific Individuals** for more information.

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/3/2035/16>

Question 140: Amendment 4 (Q&A 26-1, 26-2 and 26-3) with respect to Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria, Corporate Qualifications, R1: We require clarification on the modifications to the definition of IT Professional Consulting Services.

Originally Bidders were allowed to demonstrate "similar" services by using equivalency of any of the common activities for the resource categories offered under the applicable Workstream in Annex A (50% of the responsibility bullets mapped) for all referenced contracts.

Amendment 4 now states "...Only consulting services that match the resource categories for the applicable Workstream of this solicitation will be accepted for evaluation purposes..." and "...If a Bidder is using TBIPS contracts to demonstrate experience, listing the resource categories will suffice...".

Question: If a Bidder has a TBIPS contract and the TBIPS categories are not an exact match, but meet 50% of the bullets listed in Appendix 1 to Attachment 4.1 included with Amendment 4, may we submit justification of how the bullets apply (i.e., the same format required for Non-TBIPS contracts)? If required, the associated SOW could also be submitted.

Answer 140

This requirement has been modified, please refer to answer 110.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 141: Amendment 4 was posted on the Buy & Sell website on 23 January 2017. There were significant modifications to the Corporate Requirements that now allow us to qualify under additional Streams. Based on the impact of these changes and in order for us to complete a compliant quality response, we respectfully request an extension of 2 weeks to the current closing date.

Answer 141

Canada is granting an extension the closing date of the Solicitation to March 15, 2017.

Question 142: 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?

Answer 142: This requirement has been changed. Please refer to answer 114.

Question 143: Please confirm, to be compliant to M1, a Bidder could provide three (3) Project References; each Project Reference includes services for only one (1) Work Stream category and for the same Work stream category; each Project Reference billed \$2M for the one Work Stream category.

For example: for M1 compliancy, at a minimum, a Bidder could submit 3 project references covering only 1 WS category (i.e. the same Work Stream category billed for in each reference) as long as each Project Reference billed for \$2M for that Work Stream category.)

Answer 143 In order to be compliant, the bidder must have been awarded (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.

- a) the contract value must be at least \$2M
- b) the contract must have a duration of at least two years within the last twelve (12) years
- 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.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 144: For R1, please confirm that to obtain maximum rated points, a Bidder could provide one Project Reference, which includes two (2) Work Stream resource categories, with a combined billing over \$5M.

Answer 144

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.

Question 145: The Crown has added wording to the new M1 regarding "Previous Similar Projects" – this information differs from the RFP at Part 3, 3.2 (a), (iv) on Page 13, where it states: "... (ii) a project must have been **commenced** by the bid closing date...". The Amendment has changed the M1 language from "commenced" to "completed". Additionally, for R1, the preamble states "completed", however the newly inserted table states "commenced". Please advise if this was the Crown's intention as it even further limits the projects that can be used to demonstrate against these requirements.

Answer 145

Please note that **ARTICLE 3.2 (IV) PREVIOUS SIMILAR PROJECTS** was deleted from the RFP as part of **Solicitation Amendment 004**.

The word "**commenced**" was reintroduced to Corporate Criteria (R1) in error. It should have said "**completed**". In order to demonstrate the requested experience, the work must have been completed by the bid closing date.

DELETE: ATTACHMENT 4.1 CORPORATE CRITERIA (R1)

INSERT: ATTACHMENT 4.1 CORPORATE CRITERIA (R1)

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">Contract numberStart and end date of the Contract(s)Amount invoiced for the contractIdentify the services billed for	<p>Max - 9 Points</p> <p>Points will be awarded based on business volume invoiced in the following manner (M = Million):</p> <p>>\$2M to \$3.5M = 3 points >\$3.5M to \$5M = 6 points >\$5M or higher = 9 points</p>	
-----	---	---	--

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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>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.</p> <p>Only the amount invoiced for the category that match will be accepted.</p> <p>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.</p>		
Total: 9 points		

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 146: In regards to Question 110, and the addition of *Previous Similar Projects, specifically (ii) a project must have been completed by the bid closing date*; we respectfully request that the Crown include on-going projects as well, as we have invested considerable time in locating our contracts while ensuring alignment to the M1 and R1 requirements. Additionally, on-going projects over several years demonstrates that we are able to keep delivering professional services on an on-going basis to the client and maintaining a trusted relationship, which would be beneficial to Transport Canada.

Answer 146 Canada has already modified the Corporate Criteria for this requirement in order to heighten the interest from Industry and entice competition. As a result of several bidders' improvement suggestions, Canada has;

- 1) decreased the original amount of resources simultaneously required in order to demonstrate the experience.
- 2) increased the original time period for which the Bidders may demonstrate the required experience.
- 3) decreased the original amount of resources categories required in order to demonstrate the experience per Workstream.

As a result of the changes, Canada requires that the experience provided, is for work that has been completed by the bid closing date.

This requirement will remain unchanged.

Question 147: Workstream 3, Project Manager Level 3, Rated Requirements:

The Project Manager candidates must have experience writing 3+ PADs using, a very specific TB of Canada Project Charter Template AND they must also have experience writing 3+ RFPs (each at a minimum value of \$2M) in order to get 6 of the 9 available points.

While experience in these requirements would be of value to Canada when hiring a PM to write an RFP, these same requirements would severely limit the ability to hire a PM resource to simply support the delivery of IT projects. Would the Crown consider adding a second PM category (perhaps a PM Level 2 category) to support the delivery of IM/IT projects on a day to day basis?

Answer 147: We have reviewed your comments. Canada intends to procure any additional services they may require through other procurement vehicles at TC's disposal.

This requirement will remain unchanged.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 148: Under M2 for Project Executive Level 3, the crown defines complex implementations as referring to company wide solution architecture. Can the crown clarify that bidders can interpret "solution architecture" as relating to company wide implementations of software products on desktops and laptops, as long as it is reasonably demonstrated that those software products solved a business problem or provided a solution within an existing framework or architecture?

Answer 148: Canada has reviewed your request. Project Executive, Level 3, M2 is modified to clarify the definition of complex IT projects and to add the project reference criteria of \$2M.

Given the similar nature of this requirement to that of the Project Manager, Canada is also modifying Workstream 3 P.9 Project Manager, Level 3, M2

DELETE: Workstream 3, P.5 Project Executive, Level 3 M2:

INSERT: Workstream 3, P.5 Project Executive, Level 3 M2:

Position Title				
P.5 Project Executive – Level 3				
M2	<p>The Bidder must have demonstrated experience as a Project Executive on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level Implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry implementing complex IT projects.</p> <p>Complex IT projects must refer to solutions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) had a minimum value of \$2M;b) supported a company-wide solution architecture;c) delivered SOA to the Enterprise; ord) involved departmental business transformation. <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) project value;d) date and duration worked on the project;e) size of the organization for which the project was delivered; andf) a description of the work, clearly explaining how the referenced project was complex – how it supported a company-wide solution architecture or delivered SOA to the Enterprise or involved departmental business transformation.			

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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 3, P.9 Project Manager, Level 3 M2:

INSERT: Workstream 3, P.9 Project Manager, Level 3 M2:

Position Title P.9 Project Manager – Level 3				
M2	<p>The Bidder must have demonstrated experience as a Project Manager on two (2) IM/IT Enterprise/Departmental-level Implementations within the Government of Canada or Private Industry implementing complex IT projects.</p> <p>Complex IT projects must refer to solutions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) had a minimum value of \$2M;b) supported a company-wide solution architecture;c) delivered SOA to the Enterprise; ord) involved departmental business transformation. <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) project value;d) date and duration worked on the project;e) size of the organization for which the project was delivered; andf) a description of the work, clearly explaining how the referenced project was complex – how it supported a company-wide solution architecture or delivered SOA to the Enterprise or involved departmental business transformation.			

Question 149: This question is in regards to Workstream 2 and 3, Enterprise Architect 3 – M2 Criteria

The original M2 criteria read:

M2: 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**.

For each project identified:

- a) the project must have a project team with a minimum of 7 members;

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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

- 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; **and**
- e) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?

Question/Answer #46 and #102 amended the wording to read (see yellow hi-lights):

M2: 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.** For each project identified:

- 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; and**
- e) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?

Our question: As the criteria reads now, the main text stating “OR” and d) stating “OR”, if a Bidder is demonstrating implementing SOA how is a Bidder to respond to “AND” e) describe what business transformation occurred..... We believe this is an error. Could the Crown amend the criteria back to its original state, however changing the ending of d) to “OR” rather than “AND”? Please see below:

M2: 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.**

For each project identified:

- 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; **and OR**
- e) describe what business transformation occurred – what was the result of the project?

Answer 149: Canada has reviewed your request. Enterprise Architect, Level 3, M2 is being modified to clarify the definition of SOA with respect to interoperability. This modification applies to both Workstream 2 and Workstream 3.

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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: Workstream 2, Enterprise Architect, Level 3 M2:

Position Title				
P.2 Enterprise Architect – Level 3				
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 for complex implementations-involving Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) or complex implementations 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;e) demonstrate how the project solution promoted interoperability at an enterprise-level, or what business transformation occurred at an enterprise-level.			

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

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

Position Title				
P.2 Enterprise Architect – Level 3				
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 for complex implementations-involving Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) or complex implementations involving business transformation.</p>			

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

Amd. No – N° de la modif.
09

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>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;e) demonstrate how the project solution promoted interoperability at an enterprise-level, or what business transformation occurred at an enterprise-level.			
--	---	--	--	--

Question 150: Criteria M2 for Enterprise Architect

For both Enterprise Architects (Levels 2 and 3), can the Crown please confirm that the "and" that follows bullet "D" should in fact be an "or"? As it currently stands, the "and" puts the bullets in direct conflict with the main requirement, which is an "or".

Answer 150: This requirement has been modified, Canada has removed the "and", please refer to Answer 149 for the changes.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.