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
THIS PROCUREMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY REQUIREMENT.

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-Quality Assurance Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation B8926-170506/A	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B8926-170506	**Date** 2017-10-19
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$$ZM-380-31867	
File No. - N° de dossier 380zm.B8926-170506	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2017-11-07**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☑ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Cook, Gail	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 380zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4882 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** (819) 956-1156
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: **Destination - des biens, services et construction:** CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA	

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 NO. 002

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and to answer Bidders' questions.

RFP REVISIONS

1. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.4 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 3 Evaluation Table Heading:

Delete:

Resource #4: ***B.1 Business Analyst – Information Management, Level 3***

Insert:

Resource #4: ***P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 3***

2. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.1 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst, Level 2, RTC4:

Delete:

RTC4	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository)

Insert:

RTC4	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository) or UML

3. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.2 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst, Level3, RTC11:

Delete:

RTC11	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository)

Insert:

RTC11	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository) or UML

4. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.3 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 2, RTC21:

Delete:

RTC21	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository)

Insert:

RTC21	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository) or UML

5. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.4 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 3, RTC34:

Delete:

RTC34	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository)

Insert:

RTC34	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing testing impact assessments based on requirement and design changes using: • Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository) or UML

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1:
We would like to confirm that it is acceptable to use Tester and System Administrator categories to meet this requirement, as long as we can demonstrate that our resources performed the same or similar tasks listed under the TBIPS Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst category, as per the instructions outlined under MTC1, item 1. e) of this requirement.

Answer 1:
Confirmed. When Bidders are demonstrating “same or similar categories” they are not required to match the TBIPS category title, only that they have been performing, through a SOW or TA, the equivalent tasks to that TBIPS category

Question 2:
Attachment 4.2, Section 2.4 (“Point-Rated Technical Criteria”) identifies Resource #4 as a B.1 Business Analyst—Information Management, Level 3. Please confirm that this should read “P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 3.”

Answer 2:
Confirmed. Resource #4 should read P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 3.

Question 3:
Annex A to Annex C states that “All resources assigned to this Contract without exception must be cleared at a minimum to the Secret Level.” However, the SRCL provided on page 56 and section 7.5.b on page 27 both indicate that Reliability Status, Confidential or Secret would be accepted. Please clarify the resource security level required at bid closing.

Answer 3:
All resources must be cleared at the level of Secret before award of a contract.

Question 4:
All four categories have a rated requirement that includes experience specifically with Sparx Enterprise Architecture. Since Sparx is a UML tool, we would like to request that the requirement be opened up to allow for experience with UML.

Answer 4:
Yes, Canada will accept experience with UML.

Question 5:
We would like to request a two week extension to the deadline given the volume of active RFPs at the moment, including another large RFP released for IRCC this morning and currently due on Nov 1st.

Answer 5:
An extension to November 7, 2017 was granted. Due to operational requirements, no further extensions will be granted.

Question 6:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.1, MANDATORY TECHNICAL CRITERIA, 1. THE BIDDER, MTC1 – Corporate Capacity, f (i)) [Page 62 of 83]

MTC1 f) (i) states:

f) Have a minimum total invoiced amount of:

(i) (a) 60% of the contract value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments, if the contract was completed in the last 5 years (as of bid closing date); or

(b) at least $2M of the contract value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments, if the contract was completed in the last 5 years (as of bid closing); or

If a Bidder has a Contract for $3.0M excluding applicable taxes that was completed in the last 5 years (as of bid closing date), must the Bidder have invoiced 60% of the $3.0M Contract [(a) above], or must the Bidder have invoiced at least $2M of the $3.0M Contract [(b) above]? (a) and (b) appear to be at cross-purposes?

Answer 6:
MTC1 f) (i) (b) is to address the scenario where the invoiced amount of a completed contract does not amount to 60% of the contract value but does have an invoiced amount of at least $2M. For example, where the contract value is $4M and has a total invoiced amount of $2.1M rather than $2.4M which is 60% of the contract value. $2.1M does not meet f) (i) (a) but does meet f) (i) (b).

Question 7:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.1, MANDATORY TECHNICAL CRITERIA, 1.0 THE BIDDER, MTC1 – Corporate Capacity, f) (ii) [Page 62 of 83]

MTC1 f) (ii) states:

f) Have a minimum total invoiced amount of:

(ii) (a) 50% of the contract value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments, if the contract is ongoing in the last 5 years (as of bid closing date); or

(b) at least $2M of the contract value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments, if the contract is ongoing in the last 5 years (as of bid closing date); or

If a Bidder has a Contract for $3.0M excluding applicable taxes that is ongoing in the last 5 years (as of bid closing date), must the Bidder have invoiced 60% of the $3M Contract [(a) above], or must the Bidder have invoiced at least $2M of the $3M Contract [(b) above]? (a) and (b) appear to be at cross-purposes?

Answer 7:
MTC1 f) (ii) (b) is to address the scenario where the invoiced amount of an ongoing contract does not amount to 50% of the contract value but does have an invoiced amount of at least $2M. For example, where the contract value is $5M and has a total invoiced amount of $2.1M rather than $2.5M which is 50% of the contract value. $2.1M does not meet f) (ii) (a) but does meet f) (ii) (b).

Question 8:
On October 13, 2017, PSPC released CIC/IRCC Solicitation #B8926-170500/A – Functional Services, closing November 1, 2017. We are intending to respond to both Solicitations [Functional Services closing November 1, 2017, and Quality Assurance Services closing October 31, 2017]. We request a two-week extension to November 15, 2017, of this RFP #B8926-170506/A – Quality Assurance Services, to allow the time to conduct a proper due diligence to submit a response.

Answer 8:
An extension to November 7, 2017 was granted. Due to operational requirements, no further extensions will be granted.

Question 9:
Due to the extensive effort required to develop a quality, competitive response to this RFP, we respectfully request a two week extension to the current closing date, making the new closing date Tuesday, November 14th?

Answer9:
An extension to November 7, 2017 was granted. Due to operational requirements, no further extensions will be granted.

Question 10:
The Pricing Schedule in Attachment 4.3 encourages Bidders to propose low rates in several categories by evaluating the Total Price after the Firm Per Diem Rates (column E) are multiplied by the Estimated Number of Resources (column C). The Estimated Number of Resources for the Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Level 2 and Level 3 is considerably higher than the Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst (Automated Testing)– Level 2 and Level 3 categories. By including a difference in the Estimated Number of Resources between all the categories, it encourages vendors to “tank” rates for the categories with higher Estimated Number of Resources in order to keep their Total Price down for financial evaluation. To ensure the winning bid includes fair market rates which are available to contract qualified professionals over the next five years, would Canada consider removing the weighting factor (Estimated Number of Resource) or adjust it to be the same number for each resource category?

Answer 10:
The estimated number of resources for each category is provided in order to show the potential scope of the requirement. Should any of the proposed rates be determined to be unreasonably low in accordance with Article 4.3 (d) of this bid solicitation, Canada may request price support. As such, the Pricing Schedule will not be adjusted.

Question 11:
We are encouraged to see IRCC using a Median Band in the Financial Evaluation methodology but are concerned that the Lower Band Limit is minus (-) 20% is not a big enough delta to ensure that bidders provide fair market rates. Would Canada consider changing the Lower Band limit to minus (-) 10%?

Answer 11:
The Lower Band Limit of minus 20% is considered to be reasonable to ensure competitive rates. As such, the Lower Band Limit will not be adjusted.

Question 12:
On page 66, MTC 13, The proposed resource must clearly demonstrate at least 4 years of experience in the last 7 years (as of bid closing date) developing and running test scripts using Java. Should the requirement be JavaScript instead of Java?

Answer 12:
The requirement is for Java not JavaScript.

Question 13:
This response requires a high level of effort and there are currently several large Tier 2 RFPs out for solicitation. Based on this, would Canada please grant a 2 week extension?

Answer 13:
An extension to November 7, 2017 was granted. Due to operational requirements, no further extensions will be granted.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.

NOTE: A BID ALREADY SUBMITTED MAY BE AMENDED PRIOR TO THE CLOSING DATE. AMENDING CORRESPONDENCE MUST ADDRESS THE SOLICITATION NUMBER AND THE CLOSING DATE AND MUST BE ADDRESSED TO:

BID RECEIVING
PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA
11 LAURIER STREET
PLACE DU PORTAGE, PHASE III
MAIN LOBBY, CORE 0B2
GATINEAU, QUEBEC K1A 0S5