

## **Solicitation No. 1000184651**

To All Offerors:

Please be advised that the Department has been asked for clarification relative to Solicitation 1000184651 and we would like to submit the following information to all prospective offerors to assist in the formulation of bid packages:

### **AMENDMENTS:**

1. Add the below to Part 4 – Evaluation Methodology:

#### **4.1.8 Joint Venture Experience**

- a) Where the Bidder is a joint venture with existing experience as that joint venture, it may submit the experience that it has obtained as that joint venture.

Example: A bidder is a joint venture consisting of members L and O. A bid solicitation requires that the bidder demonstrate experience providing maintenance and help desk services for a period of 24 months to a customer with at least 10,000 users. As a joint venture (consisting of members L and O), the bidder has previously done the work. This bidder can use this experience to meet the requirement. If member L obtained this experience while in a joint venture with a third party N, however, that experience cannot be used because the third party N is not part of the joint venture that is bidding.

- b) A joint venture bidder may rely on the experience of one of its members to meet any given technical criterion of this bid solicitation.

Example: A bidder is a joint venture consisting of members X, Y and Z. If a solicitation requires: (a) that the bidder have 3 years of experience providing maintenance service, and (b) that the bidder have 2 years of experience integrating hardware with complex networks, then each of these two requirements can be met by a different member of the joint venture. However, for a single criterion, such as the requirement for 3 years of experience providing maintenance services, the bidder cannot indicate that each of members X, Y and Z has one year of experience, totaling 3 years. Such a response would be declared non-responsive.

- c) Joint venture members cannot pool their abilities with other joint venture members to satisfy a single technical criterion of this bid solicitation. However, a joint venture member can pool its individual experience with the experience of the joint venture itself. Wherever substantiation of a criterion is required, the Bidder is requested to indicate which joint venture member satisfies the requirement. If the Bidder has not identified which joint venture member satisfies the requirement, the Contracting Authority will provide an opportunity to the Bidder to submit this information during the evaluation period. If the Bidder does not submit this information within the period set by the Contracting Authority, its bid will be declared non-responsive.

Example: A bidder is a joint venture consisting of members A and B. If a bid solicitation requires that the bidder demonstrate experience providing resources for a minimum of 12 billable months, the bidder may demonstrate that experience by submitting either:

- o Contracts all signed by A;
  - o Contracts all signed by B; or
  - o Contracts all signed by A and B in joint venture, or
  - o Contracts signed by A and contracts signed by A and B in joint venture, or
  - o Contracts signed by B and contracts signed by A and B in joint venture.
- that show in total 12 billable months.

2. Stream 1 – Table M1 – Proposed Resource:

Remove numbers R.1.1, R.1.2 and R.1.3 only from Table M1.

Otherwise, the Table contents remains the same. (Point Rated Criteria R1 does not refer to Table M1)

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

**Question #1:**

You indicate a Stream 1 SOA awarded to a “Bidder” which submitted resources for both Streams 1 and 2 would only include proposed resources who meet the minimum qualifications for Stream 1.

- a) Should a “bidder” with multiple resources submit a separate bid for each stream with resources that qualify for the specific stream?
- b) How can a “bidder” ensure their Stream 2 resources qualify for an award if also submitting resources for Stream 1?
- c) Can a “Bidder” receive multiple awards if they have submitted numerous bids with resources unique to each bid?

**Answer #1**

- a) That is possible. This would be up to the bidder. Please refer to Evaluation Methodology 4.1.7
- b) Bidders have the option of submitting bids for Stream 1 and Stream 2 but Bidders successful in both Streams will be eligible for award of a single SOA for the provision of Stream 1 only. Refer to Evaluation Methodology 4.1.7.
- c) No. A bidder will not be awarded more than one SOA award for this tender.

**Question #2**

Our employees currently provide both Stream 1 and Stream 2 services for most project we undertake. The answer to Question #17, Amendment #5, refers to section 4.1.7 which indicates if a “Bidder” submits for both Stream 1 and Stream 2, they will only receive an award for Stream 1.

- a) Does this mean all qualified Stream 2 only resources submitted with the bid will be eliminated:
- b) If so, can a “Bidder” submit for each Stream separately for their Stream 1 and Stream 2 resources.
- c) If not, how should a “Bidder” submit their Stream 2 resources for the RFSO if they are also bidding for Stream 1?

**Answer #2**

- a) If a Standing Offer is awarded for Stream 1, only those qualified resources proposed under Stream 1 will be included.
- b) Yes
- c) Bidders have the option of submitting bids for Stream 1 and Stream 2.

### **Question #3**

The answer to Question #16 – Amendment #5 financially limits the number of days in a single resource can provide services requested by LMRB. If a “Bidder submits more than one resource per bid, the amount of time each resource can provide service decreases substantially.

- a) Are the SOAs amendable once the award amount is reached?
- b) Can a “Bidder” submit a bid for each of its resources, particularly where the resources have a significant experience and qualifications.

### **Answer #3**

- a) The proportional call-up allocation will be followed, as outlined in 7.9 Call-up Allocation. All RFSOs would need to be exhausted before an amendment to increase would be considered.
- b) A bidder can submit one bid per Stream.

### **Question #4**

If a Bidder is a Joint Venture (JV), do the Bidder Project Summaries required in Stream 1, Table M2 need to involve all members of the JV? In other words, if a JV is formed to pool resources can the projects used for the project summaries be ones that were undertaken by one of the JV members alone? Can the Bidder who is a JV use project summaries that involved one JV member for each project? For example, JV member 1 did project 1 of 2 while JV member 2 did project 2 of 3? Would this be compliant with the requirements of Table M2?

### **Answer #4**

Please refer to Amendment #1 above which explains how Joint Venture Experience will be evaluated.

### **Question #5**

In Amendment #5, the answer to Question #5 states “Table M1 is evaluating the Proposed Resource(s).” However, the answer to Question #7 states, “No, Bidder’s resources are not being evaluated as Bidder’s Experience in R1”, and the answer to Question #9 states “The resources’ experience is not being evaluated in R1. This appears to be a contradiction.

Can you clarify: is R1 the rated criteria against which the information in Table M1 is to be evaluated, further to the Technical score for the bid? If so then is not R1 the rated criteria for technical evaluation the proposed resources, the evaluation of which you have stated is the purpose of Table M1?

If M1 evaluates the proposed resources, and if R1 evaluates M1 further to assigning a technical score, then is it not the case that R1 is evaluating the proposed resources? If not, then in order to receive a technical rating, do the proposed resources need to have this work experience exclusively with the Bidder?

### **Answer #5**

Please refer to Amendment #2 above which should clarify. The M1 table is used to evaluate Proposed Resources on the mandatory requirement M1 only. Table M1 does not relate to Point Rated Criterion R1. The resource(s)’ professional work experience in Table M1 does not need to be exclusively with the Bidder.

**Question #6**

The bid document says that Table M1 – Proposed Resource must be filled in and the M1 table sections are labelled R1.1, R1.2, R1.3. This seems to indicate that the proposed resource is being evaluated against the R1 rated criteria. Is the M1 table mislabeled?

**Answer #6**

Please refer to Amendment #2 above.

**Question #7**

Could you clarify how R1 experience is being calculated and whose experience is being evaluated? Specifically in a situation where 2 or more resources are being proposed, how is R1 being evaluated and calculated? Does this mean the Bidder's experience is being evaluated in R1? If that is the case, does the "Bidder's experience" include work performed by researchers under contract with the bidder or employed by the bidder.

**Answer #7**

R1 is evaluating the experience of the Bidder. The Bidder's experience would include work performed under contracts signed by the Bidder.

**Question #8**

Are we required to submit a M1 table for every resource that is proposed?

**Answer #8**

Yes

**Question #9**

If resources are not being evaluated under R1, then can we leave off sections R1.1 and R1.3 of the M1 Table for resources, as they are not mandatory criteria?

**Answer #9**

See amendment #2 above.

**Question #10**

Can a "bidder" utilize a modified M1 table as a template to fully demonstrate "bidder" experience for R1 requirements given the M1 table corresponds directly to the R1 rating structure?

**Answer #10**

It is up to the Bidder to demonstrate R1 experience. Use of a table similar to the M1 table would be one method a Bidder may choose to use.

**Question #11**

If a "bidder" has simultaneously undertaken numerous large projects across Canada utilizing numerous resources, will the cumulative days of "full-time" service provided by a "bidder" in a single month be considered as multiple months of service?

**Answer #11**

No, overlapping time frames will only be counted once.