



RETURN BIDS TO :

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving Shared Services Canada | Services partagés Canada
180 Kent Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1G 4A8
13th Floor

AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

DEMANDE DE PROPOSITION

Proposal To: Shared Services Canada

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the goods, services, and construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out thereof.

Proposition aux: Services partagés Canada

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté la Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées **Instructions : See Herein** ou incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes ci-jointes, les biens, services et construction énumérés ici sur toute feuille ci-annexées, au(x) prix indiqué(s)

Comments - Commentaires

This document contains a Security Requirement

Vendor/Firm Name and address
Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution

Shared Services Canada – SA Authority
Procurement Operations
180 Kent Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1G 4A8

Title – Sujet Professional Services - MidRange Engineering	
Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 2B0KB-17-7820	Date August 14, 2017
Amendment number: 1	
Buy & Sell Reference No. – N° de reference de SEAG 2B0KB-17-7820	
File No. – N° de dossier 2B0KB-17-7820	TBIPS Supply Arrangement EN578-05-5605
Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin at – à 2 :00 PM on – le 28-August-2017	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Daylight Saving Time DST	
F.O.B. - F.A.B.	
Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Inquiries to : - Adresser toutes questions à: Anne-Marie Ouellette	Buyer Id – Id de l'acheteur C11
Telephone No. – N° de téléphone : 613-286-0281	FAX No. – N° de FAX 613-948-0990
Destination – of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination – des biens, services et construction : See Herein	

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery required - Livraison exigée See Herein	Delivered Offered – Livraison proposée
Vendor/firm Name and address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Facsimile No. – N° de télécopieur Telephone No. – N° de téléphone	
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



ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS 8 TO 17

QUESTION #	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	<i>The RFP cover page lists the closing date as August 21, 2017 2:00PM but in the summary on Buy and Sell it shows a closing date of September 11, 2017 at 2:00PM. Can the Crown please clarify what the correct closing date is.</i>	The closing date is August 21, 2018 with an extension granted to August 28th, 2017 @ 2pm
2	<i>The mandatory criteria for System Administrators UNIX/LINUX, Windows and Virtualization shows the bidder must present one (1) resources for this role and must be fluently bilingual (English, French) and identified clearly in the bid as being the bilingual-designated candidate. In the Statement of Work it shows that all of the roles require mainly English. Can the Crown please confirm the language requirement for these roles.</i>	The bilingual resources are to be submitted at bid closing. The "mainly English" resources are at the TA stage.
3	<i>M3 states "For any resource category that is not a direct match to that of the table, the Bidder must demonstrate that each resource used to substantiate billable days for any given resource category has demonstrated over 50% of the tasks for such category as detailed in...." It seems that the end of the sentence is missing. Can you please confirm if we are required to demonstrate 50% of the tasks based on the TBIPS category or 50% of the tasks based on the SOW in the RFP.</i>	For any resource category that is not a direct match to that of the table, the Bidder must demonstrate that each resource used to substantiate billable days for any given resource category has demonstrated over 50% of the tasks for such category as detailed in the SOW in the RFP. The Bidder will complete, along with any required resource category mappings, as the basis for summarizing the billable days. The Bidder must provide an electronic copy (CD or USB stick) of all invoices used to serve as substantiation.



<p>4</p> <p><i>While we recognize that SSC is trying to make certain that bidders have a history of providing adequate numbers of Mid-Range/System Admin resources in the NCR at the secret level, the stipulation that 80% of the total reference contract value be for mid-range services delivered in the NCR does not accomplish that. It may actually do just the opposite under certain scenarios.</i></p> <p><i>For Example:</i></p> <p><i>Company A - has a reference contract with a total value of 5 million dollars over the past 5 years. Upon award, they place 2 unique mid-range/system administration resources that remain for the duration of the contract and they bill a total of 2.5 million over the 5 years.</i></p> <p><i>Under M1 ii) and iii) as it is written currently, this is a compliant reference contract.</i></p> <p><i>Conversely,</i></p> <p><i>Company B - has a reference contract with a total value of \$40 million to provide a variety of IM/IT services to a single organization over the same 5 year period. They place 25 unique resources in the NCR specifically for mid-range/system administration roles amounting to \$19 million dollars over the same 5 years.</i></p> <p><i>Under M1 ii) and iii) as it is written currently, this contract is non-compliant, i.e. \$19M or 48% of the total value of the \$40M contract is for mid-range resources, and \$19M or 48% of the total contract is for mid-range resources in the NCR.</i></p> <p><i>Clearly, under this scenario, the 80% requirement does not correlate to a better demonstrated ability to provide multiple mid-range/system administration resources in the NCR by Company A.</i></p> <p><i>As such, we respectfully request the removal of the 80% in both instances.</i></p> <p><i>Perhaps simply using the dollar amounts provided in M1 i) 10 million in total value with 5 million billed and in ii) 5 million in value and a minimum of 2.5 million billed on the reference contracts would suffice to demonstrate that ability if those billed amounts were demonstrated to be specifically for mid-range services.</i></p>	<p>Corporate Reference Contracts</p> <p>The bidder must have been awarded three (3) contracts in the last ten (10) years from the initial RFP due date where they were the prime supplier (must have billed the client directly) where the services were provided in support of an IT/IM shared service* delivery organization with an employee base of at least 5,000 employees, and where over 80% of the professional services were for the delivery of Midrange** technical infrastructure architecture and/or Midrange system administration professional services in the National Capital Region. The contracts must also meet the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) One (1) contract must have a contract value of at least \$7 million of IT professional services (taxes included, but excluding any software/hardware costs) and must have invoiced at least \$4 million of the contract value to-date in resource services. ii) Two (2) contracts must each have a contract value of at least \$5 million of IT professional services (taxes included, but excluding any software/hardware costs) and must have invoiced at least \$2.5m of the contract value to-date in resource services. iii) All three (3) contracts must have been provided to clients operating in Canada, and two (2) of the contracts must have been provided for clients where over 80% of the services were delivered from locations in the National Capital Region. iv) The two (2) contracts provided for clients must have been for resources at the level of SECRET, or higher. <p>For each contract the bidder must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o name of client organization o client contact name (must be an employee of client organization and accountable for contract services) o title o contact phone number and/or email address o contract start and contract end o description of services o dollar value of contract o dollar value invoiced <p>SSC reserves the right to request proof of invoice amounts.</p> <p>*Definition: Shared Services is a service model designed to gain efficiencies in routine processing by leveraging common practices and enabling technology for multiple distinct Technical organizations/partners. (e.g. Global Affairs Canada is a distinct Technical organization/partner from Shared Services Canada).</p> <p>**Definition: Midrange is defined to include any of the following: Unix (and variants), Linux, Solaris, Windows Server, VMWare, Hyper-V</p>
---	--



	<p>As such, we propose M1 be amended to the following:</p> <p><i>The bidder must have been awarded three (3) contracts in the last ten (10) years from the initial RFP due date where they were the prime supplier (must have billed the client directly) where the services were provided in support of an IT/IM shared service* delivery organization with an employee base of at least 5,000 employees, and where the professional services were for the delivery of Mid-range** technical infrastructure architecture and/or Mid-range system administration professional services.</i></p> <p><i>The contracts must also meet the following criteria:</i></p> <p><i>i) One (1) contract must have a contract value of at least \$10 million of IT professional services (taxes included, but excluding any software/hardware costs) and must have invoiced at least \$5 million of the contract value to date in for mid-range resource services.</i></p> <p><i>ii) Two (2) contracts must each have a contract value of at least \$5 million of IT professional services (taxes included, but excluding any software/hardware costs) and must have invoiced at least \$2.5m of the contract value to-date in Mid-range resource services.</i></p> <p><i>iii) All three (3) contracts must have been provided to clients operating in Canada, and two (2) of the contracts must have been provided for clients where Mid-range services were delivered from locations in the National Capital Region.</i></p> <p><i>iv) Two of the reference contracts provided must have been for resources at the Secret level or higher</i></p>	<p>The bidder must have been awarded three (3) contracts in the last ten (10) years from the initial RFP due date where they were the prime supplier (must have billed the client directly) where the services were provided in support of an IT/IM shared service* delivery organization with an employee base of at least 5,000 employees, and where over 80% of the professional services were for the delivery of Midrange** technical infrastructure architecture and/or Midrange system administration professional services in the National Capital Region. The contracts must also meet the following criteria: *This contract is for Midrange System Administrators in the NCR so this is the reason for this clause.</p> <p>i) One (1) contract must have a contract value of at least \$7 million of IT professional services (taxes included, but excluding any software/hardware costs) and must have invoiced at least \$4 million of the contract value to-date in resource services.</p> <p>ii) No change here.</p> <p>iii) This contract is for the NCR, thus the reason for this clause.</p> <p>iv) Secret clearance is required for our datacenters</p>
5	DELETED TEXT page 24 and 25. See document	 Microsoft Word Document
6	As per M3, the Crown is asking for actual invoices from bidders to substantiate billable days. This is an extremely time consuming and cumbersome endeavor, especially during vacation season. As such, we respectfully request a two week extension.	An extension has been granted to Monday August 28th @ 2pm



Canada Canada Canada

7	<p>Could SSC please clarify how the requirements have changed to justify adding bilingualism as a mandatory requirement? None of our current resources who are <u>actually performing the role now for SSC</u> are bilingual?</p> <p>Would it make more sense to have bilingualism required at the TA stage if it is far more likely to need English essential resources with the occasional bilingual resource if ever?</p> <p>This seems to be highly restrictive given the current and historical requirements for System Admin resources at SSC.</p> <p>We kindly request the removal of bilingualism as a mandatory requirement.</p>	<p>In keeping with the GOC policy on Official Languages, and given the demographic profile of the NCR, we must retain the right to bilingual resources in this contract and the vendor's ability to provide these types of resources</p>
8	<p>Resource Requirements; you need to provide 4 resources, and 3 of them have to be bilingual or 1 of the 4 have to be bilingual. Do they need to be bilingual at bid submission or only at the TA stage when requested?</p>	<p>Of the 4 resources, 3 must be bilingual and the 4th resource, for the Level 3 System Administrator - Storage, can be bilingual or English only. They need to be bilingual at bid submission.</p>
9	<p>Resource Requirements; you need to provide 4 resources, and 3 of them have to be bilingual or 1 of the 4 have to be bilingual?</p>	<p>Of the 4 resources, 3 must be bilingual and the 4th resource, for the Level 3 System Administrator - Storage, can be bilingual or English only.</p>
10	<p>Do they need to be bilingual at bid submission or only at the TA stage when requested?</p>	<p>They need to be bilingual at bid submission.</p>
11	<p>R4 of the Rated Evaluation Criteria for the System Administrator – Unix/Linux, Level 3 contains discrepancy in point allocation. The requirement states within brackets (Maximum 10 points) but the scoring for this requirement is stated to be a maximum of 5 points. Can the Crown please confirm that this requirement will receive up to a maximum of 5 points</p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate how the candidate has experience, in the last five (5) years at bid closing, with SSC IT Service Management policies and procedures and SSC Operations Change Management processes: (Maximum 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 – <3 years: 2 points ▪ 3 or more years: 5 points
12	<p>R5 of the Rated Evaluation Criteria for the System Administrator – Windows, Level 3 contains discrepancy in point allocation. The requirement states within brackets (Maximum 10 points) but the scoring for this requirement is stated to be a maximum of 5 points. Can the Crown please confirm that this requirement will receive up to a maximum of 5 points?</p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate how the candidate has experience, in the last five (5) years at bid closing, with SSC IT Service Management policies and procedures and SSC Operations Change Management processes: (Maximum 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 - <3 years: 2 points 3 or more years: 5 points



Canada Canada Canada

13	Rated Evaluation Criteria R1 and R2 of the System Administrator – Storage, Level 3 require 12+ years of experience within the last ten (10) years to score full points. This time restriction of ten (10) years makes it impossible for Bidders to demonstrate the required 12+ years' experience for full points. Would the Crown please remove the time restriction to allow Bidders to demonstrate the 12+ years' experience	<p>R1-The Bidder should demonstrate at bid closing how the candidate has experience in Storage Virtualization Design and Implementation in a Disaster Recovery Scenario</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 years = 10 points • 10-12 years = 15 points <p>12+ = 20 points</p>
14	Rated Evaluation Criteria R1 and R2 of the System Administrator – Storage, Level 3 require 12+ years of experience within the last ten (10) years to score full points. This time restriction of ten (10) years makes it impossible for Bidders to demonstrate the required 12+ years' experience for full points. Would the Crown please remove the time restriction to allow Bidders to demonstrate the 12+ years' experience?	<p>R2- The Bidder should demonstrate at bid closing how the candidate has experience working in at least three (3) of these environments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aix 2. Solaris 3. Linux 4. Unix 5. Windows 6. VMWARE 7. Mainframe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 years = 10 points • 10-12 years = 15 points • 12+ = 20 points
15	The System Administrator – Virtualization Rated Evaluation Criteria is numbered R1, R3, R4, R5, R7, and R8. Could the Crown please confirm the numbering of Rated Evaluation Criteria for the System Administrator – Virtualization and confirm that there is no R2 and R6?	<p>The Grid has been renumbered to;</p> <p>R1 R2 R3 R4 R5 R6</p>
16	Mandatory requirement M3 on page 23 of the RFP states that bidders must provide a CD or USB stick of all invoices used for substantiation. Section 3.1.1 – Bid Preparation Instructions states Bidders can submit their responses via email. In order to ensure that the size of the transmission does not exceed standard limitations, will SSC accept an emailed response containing Technical, Financial and Certification volumes, and a separately delivered CD/USB stick containing all invoices by 2pm on the final due date?	<p>For any resource category that is not a direct match to that of the table, the Bidder must demonstrate that each resource used to substantiate billable days for any given resource category has demonstrated over 50% of the tasks for such category as detailed in the SOW in the RFP.</p> <p>The Bidder will complete, along with any required resource category mappings, as the basis for summarizing the billable days. The Bidder must provide an electronic copy (CD or USB stick) of all invoices used to serve as substantiation.</p> <p>USB STICKS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED</p>
17	In Amendment #1, QA 4, there is amended text to mandatory requirement M1 provided within the Question column and then different requirement text with client comment provided within the Answer column. Would it be possible for SSC to provide a revised RFP containing amended requirement wording, to ensure there is no error in bidders' understanding of the revised mandatory and rated requirements	<p>The only changes to M1 are identified in yellow highlight (Please see Q4)</p>