



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. 010
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8484-168506	Date 2017-03-01
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

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

Amendment 010

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

1) *Question 45:*

RT1.1

Despite the assertion in the Crown's Response #39 that:

"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."

it is our belief that 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria RT1.1 is biased, unfair and contrary to PSPC's stated Code of Conduct for Procurement that calls for "Openness, Fairness and Transparency".

The terminology in the SOW is so specific to CFWC that it is impossible to "match" the roles/responsibilities of more than 14 categories, regardless of the resource category titles. The requirement of MT1.d, that the "functions" of the SOW resource categories be aligned, ensures that unless a Bidder has two DND CFCW \$2M plus reference projects, that Bidder could not meet more than 14 of the identified 27 categories. This provides an unfair advantage to the incumbent.

In order to achieve an open, fair and transparent procurement process and ensure that the Crown receives more than one competitive bid it is requested that the Crown either fully remove item RT1.1, or at the very least reduce the number of additional resource categories that receive rated points to 14 categories, something that qualified bidders other than those who have specific CFCW qualifying projects can obtain.

Response 45:

MT.1 and RT1.1 have been revised. Please see 2) a) and c) below.

Additionally, with regards to the Statement of Work, although the resource category descriptions are specific to CFWC's requirement, there's no requirement to exactly match the Canadian Forces Warfare Centre specific terminology in the SOW. Any reference to CFWC or CFWC specific items (specifically, Joint Battle Lab, Network Operations Centre, Integrated Test Bed, CFX Net, CFBL Net, US JTEN, JSAF NTB, JCATS, JADOCS, Command Post of the Future, Falconview, TBMCS, GCCS, Integrated Command and Control, Joint Experimentation Team, C4ISR or C2 systems and tools, or supporting military exercises, events or experiments) in the category descriptions in the SOW can be substituted for generic equivalents or with other IT systems or software at the Bidder's discretion, as long as the Bidder describes how its proposed resource category aligns with the generic role or generic responsibilities described in the SOW.

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

Question 46:

RT1.1

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

The point rating scheme for 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria RT1.1 is biased, unfair and contrary to PSPC's stated Code of Conduct for Procurement that calls for "Openness, Fairness and Transparency". It does not recognize or treat each resource category as equal and 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). This is not only unfair, foreign to Government of Canada bids but also contradicts the Model Evaluation Criteria and Selection Methodology provided in the TBIPS Supply Arrangement Model Bid Solicitation and Resulting Contract Clauses, a model that actually reduces not increased the value for additional items.

TBIPS being the recommended PSPC Supply Arrangement for Task- Based Informatics Professional Services.

https://buyandsell.gc.ca/cds/public/2013/09/09/aebba677a51e97676b558c7df58ff6cc/casemantbips_rfp_s hort_form_final.pdf

It is requested that RT1.1 be amended so that points are awarded on a declining scale for additional resource categories as per PSPC's own model or at the very least that points be awarded equitably for each additional category, i.e. 1 point per additional category instead of having one additional category being worth .417 points per category and having 7 additional categories being worth 1.176 points per category.

Response 46:

This is a standalone procurement and therefore does not follow the Model Evaluation Criteria and Selection Methodology under the TBIPS Supply Arrangement however, RT1.1 has been revised as per *Response 45*. Please see 2) c) below.

Question 47:

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.

The Crown's response to Question 41:

"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."

indicated that " the qualifications required are based on the current projected needs of the client". It is our contention the project needs of the client in this task-based requirement are for the provision of the identified resources as opposed to restricting the bid process to only those bidders who have done major projects for the CFCW. We request that the Crown reduce the Corporate Project requirements which are

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

extremely restrictive and competitively damaging and instead focus on the bidders' ability to provide the required resources and services.

Response 47:

For the purposes of this solicitation, the means of identifying a suitable supplier is based on the prior experience of a Bidder in relation to the current projected needs of the client.

Question 48:

RT1.2 reads:

13-20 consecutive months 5 points per project
21-28 consecutive months 10 points per project
29-39 consecutive months 15 points per project
40 or more consecutive months 20 points per project

The point rating scheme for 4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria RT1.2 is biased, unfair and contrary to PSPC's stated Code of Conduct for Procurement that calls for "Openness, Fairness and Transparency". It does not recognize or treat each consecutive month as equal and applies an exponential allocation of points for increasing numbers of consecutive months above the minimum 12 months in MT1). This is not only unfair, foreign to Government of Canada bids, contradictory to the Model Evaluation Criteria and Selection Methodology provided in PSPC's own TBIPS Supply Arrangement Model Bid Solicitation and Resulting Contract Clauses (a model that actually reduces not increased the value for additional items) but it is extremely presumptuous of the Crown to state that one month could be worth more than another month. A month is a month is a month.

Under this scheme having 20 consecutive months gives you .25 points per project where having 21 consecutive months would give you .476 points per project (all that increase for one month), 29 consecutive months would give you same overall points as 21 consecutive months (making those 8 months non-existent) and having 40 consecutive months versus 39 consecutive months would make that one extra month worth 5 points all on its own.

It is requested that RT1.2 be amended so that points are awarded on a declining scale for additional consecutive months as per PSPC's own model or at the very least that points be awarded equitably for each additional consecutive month, i.e. 1 point per additional consecutive month.

Response 48:

This is a standalone procurement and therefore does not follow the Model Evaluation Criteria and Selection Methodology under the TBIPS Supply Arrangement. As such, the evaluation criteria remains unchanged.

Question 49:

MT.1e)

The requirement states that for each project, for each of the categories claimed by the Bidder for d) above: - at least one full-time** resource (individual) performed at least 1575 hours of work. The requirement for 1575 hours of work for each and every category is contradictory to the Client's own Annual Estimated Level of Effort (hours).

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

Would the Crown please change the 1575 hour requirement in MT.1e) to reflect by category the Client's own stated requirements as are found in Attachment 1, e.g. MT.1d) would require that a Bidder show, for the Instructor category, at least one full-time resource performed at least 1575 hours of work whereas the Client clearly indicates that the Instructor category part-time with an Annual Estimated Level of Effort of only 300 hours?

Response 49:

As indicated in Attachment 1 - Financial Bid Presentation Sheet, the Annual Estimated Level of Effort provided is only an approximation of requirements given in good faith and is provided for financial bid evaluation purposes only. As such, the criteria remains unchanged.

Question 50:

MT2.7 and 4.1.1.2

Amendment #7 deleted the mandatory and rated requirements for the Hybrid Cloud and High Performance Computing Engineer, however the Hybrid Cloud and High Performance Computing Engineer retains a significant factor in the financial evaluation with an Estimated Annual Level of Effort of 1,650 hours. If as the Crown says in Response #42 the need of this role is not immediate should not the Crown adjust the Estimated Annual Level of effort, at least for the Contract Period?

Response 50:

ATTACHMENT 1 has been revised. Please see 2) d) below.

Question 51:

Please refer to Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 4.1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria, MT2.3 Senior Distributed Modeling and Simulation Engineer, MT2.3.3.

It is our understanding that JSAF NTB is an upgrade to JSAF 2007. It is also our understanding that JSAF NTB has not been used outside of CFWC for much longer than the last two years, hence making it difficult to find a qualified candidate who is not an incumbent and would have adequate experience using JSAF NTB.

We respectfully request that the Crown accept experience developing, launching or integrating distributed simulation environments using JSAF NTB or JSAF 2007 as valid experience towards this requirement.

Response 51:

MT2.3.3 has been revised. Please see 2) b) below.

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

2) a) At **PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, 4.1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria, MT.1 Bidder's Corporate Experience;**

DELETE:

d)	For each project, the work included the roles and responsibilities of at least ten of the resource categories listed in Attachment 1 and described in the Annex A – SOW.	List and describe each resource category the bidder assigned to the project explaining how each resource category's roles and responsibilities meet the criteria. (The titles of the claimed resource categories need not match those of the SOW, but must align with the occupational categories in the SOW.) Each resource category listed by the Bidder must only be used once to demonstrate its relevance to a category in the SOW.	
----	--	---	--

REPLACE WITH:

d)	<p>For each project, the work included the roles and responsibilities of at least ten of the resource categories listed in Attachment 1 and described in the Annex A – SOW.</p> <p>The titles and roles and responsibilities of the claimed resource categories need not match those of the SOW, but must align with the occupational categories detailed in the SOW.</p> <p>Any reference to CFWC or CFWC specific items (specifically, Joint Battle Lab, Network Operations Centre, Integrated Test Bed, CFX Net, CFBL Net, US JTEN, JSAF NTB, JCATS, JADOCS, Command Post of the Future, Falconview, TBMCS, GCCS, Integrated Command and Control, Joint Experimentation Team, C4ISR or C2 systems and tools, or supporting military exercises, events or experiments) in the category descriptions in the SOW may be substituted for generic equivalents or with other IT systems or software at the Bidder's discretion.</p>	<p>List and describe each resource category the bidder assigned to the project explaining how each resource category's roles and responsibilities, including any generic equivalent substitutes, meet the criteria.</p> <p>Each resource category listed by the Bidder must only be used once to demonstrate its relevance to a category in the SOW.</p>	
----	---	--	--

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

b) At **PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, 4.1.1.1** **Mandatory Technical Criteria**, MT2.3 Senior Distributed Modeling and Simulation Engineer;

DELETE:

	MT2.3.3	The proposed resource must have a minimum of 12 months experience, acquired within the last 3 years of the solicitation closing date, developing, launching or integrating distributed simulation environments using the JSAF Navy Training Baseline (NTB) suite of tools.	Refer to Part 3 of the solicitation.	
--	---------	--	--------------------------------------	--

REPLACE WITH:

	MT2.3.3	The proposed resource must have a minimum of 12 months experience, acquired within the last 3 years of the solicitation closing date, developing, launching or integrating distributed simulation environments using the JSAF Navy Training Baseline (NTB) or JSAF 2007 suite of tools.	Refer to Part 3 of the solicitation.	
--	---------	---	--------------------------------------	--

c) At **PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, 4.1.1.2** **Point Rated Technical (RT) Criteria**;

DELETE:

	RT.1	<u>Bidder's Corporate Experience</u>		190 possible points (Minimum 95 points)	
--	------	--------------------------------------	--	---	--

REPLACE WITH:

	RT.1	<u>Bidder's Corporate Experience</u>		186 possible points	
--	------	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------	--

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

				(Minimum 93 points)	
--	--	--	--	------------------------	--

DELETE:

	RT1.1	For the Bidder's claimed projects for MT1, for every resource category additional to the minimum 10 of MT1, and that meet all MT1 criteria:	Information to have already been provided in response to criteria MT1. If not provided for the categories additional to the minimum 10, provide the information as in response to this criterion R.1.1.	40 points maximum	
		11-12 resource categories		5 points per project	
		13-14 resource categories		10 points per project	
		15-16 resource categories		15 points per project	
		17-18 resource categories		20 points per project	

REPLACE WITH:

	RT1.1	For the Bidder's claimed projects for MT1, for every resource category additional to the minimum 10 of MT1, and that meet all MT1 criteria:	Information to have already been provided in response to criteria MT1. If not provided for the categories additional to the minimum 10, provide the information as in response to this criterion R.1.1.	36 points maximum (18 points maximum per project)	
		Each additional resource category, per project		1 point	

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.
010
File No. - N° du dossier
062sv.W8484-168506

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

d) At **ATTACHMENT 1 - FINANCIAL BID PRESENTATION SHEET;**

DELETE:

Hybrid Cloud and High Performance Computing Engineer	1650	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
---	------	----	----	----	----	----

REPLACE WITH:

Hybrid Cloud and High Performance Computing Engineer	1125	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
---	------	----	----	----	----	----

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.