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.** 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B8926-170506	**Date** 2017-10-27
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. 004

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 2.1 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst, Level 2, RTC8:

Delete:

RTC8	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience identifying and documenting software defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server.

Insert:

RTC8	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience identifying and documenting software defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server, and/or IBM Rational ClearQuest, and/or HP Quality Center.

2. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.2 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst, Level 3, RTC15:

Delete:

RTC15	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience developing and maintaining test plans, scenarios, scripts and data from system use cases and functional designs.

Insert:

RTC15	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience identifying and documenting software defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server, and/or IBM Rational ClearQuest, and/or HP Quality Center.

3. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.3 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 2, RTC25:

Delete:

RTC25	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience developing and maintaining test plans, scenarios, scripts and data from system use cases and functional designs.

Insert:

RTC25	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience identifying and documenting software defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server, and/or IBM Rational ClearQuest, and/or HP Quality Center.

4. At Attachment 4.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Item 2.4 P.11 Quality Assurance Specialist/Analyst – Automated Testing, Level 3, RTC38:

Delete:

RTC38	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience developing and maintaining test plans, scenarios, scripts and data from system use cases and functional designs.

Insert:

RTC15	The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience identifying and documenting software defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server, and/or IBM Rational ClearQuest, and/or HP Quality Center.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 18:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.2 – POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA: RTC6 and RTC13.

The above referenced Rated technical Criteria state:

> "The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing integration, functional, system, regression testing, and verifying test results against a system with Siebel User Interface."

Given that CIC notes in the Statement of Work that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, would CIC allow experience against a system with other CRM User Interfaces to meet the requirements of RTC6 and RTC13?

Answer 18:
Although it is stated that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, the referenced rated criteria reflect our current technical environment. We do not foresee changes to those requirements.

Question 19:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.2 – POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA: RTC7, RTC14, RTC24, and RTC 37.

The above referenced Rated technical Criteria state:

> "The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing integration, functional, system, regression testing, and verifying test results against a system with Siebel Integrated technical platforms using:…"

Given that CIC notes in the Statement of Work that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, would CIC allow experience against a system with other CRM integrated platforms to meet the requirements of RTC7, RTC14, RTC24, and RTC37?

Answer 19:
Although it is stated that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, the referenced rated criteria reflect our current technical environment. We do not foresee changes to those requirements.

Question 20:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.2 – POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA: RTC23 and RTC36.

The above referenced Rated technical Criteria state:

> "The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience performing integration, functional, system, regression testing, and verifying test results against a Siebel based application."

Given that CIC notes in the Statement of Work that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, would CIC allow experience against other CRM based applications to meet the requirements of RTC23 and RTC 36?

Answer 20:
Although it is stated that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, the referenced rated criteria reflect our current technical environment. We do not foresee changes to those requirements.

Question 21:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.2 – POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA: RTC31 and RTC44.

The above referenced Rated technical Criteria state:

> "The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience developing automated test scripts using Rational Functional Tester.

Given that CIC notes in the Statement of Work that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, would CIC allow experience using other software test automation tools similar to Rational Functional Tester to meet the requirements of RTC31 and RTC44?

Answer 21:
Although it is stated that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, the referenced rated criteria reflect our current technical environment. We do not foresee changes to those requirements.

Question 22:
Reference ATTACHMENT 4.2 – POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA: RTC32 and RTC45.

The above referenced Rated technical Criteria state:

> "The proposed resource should clearly demonstrate experience using Rational Quality Manager (RQM).

Given that CIC notes in the Statement of Work that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, would CIC allow experience using other collaborative, web-based tools similar to Rational Quality Manager to meet the requirements of RTC32 and RTC45?

Answer 22:
Although it is stated that CIC Technology infrastructure will change with time, the referenced rated criteria reflect our current technical environment. We do not foresee changes to those requirements.

Question 23:

In reference to Q&A #4, by allowing experience with any UML tool, CIC may receive consultants who don't have the relevant experience that CIC needs. UML "is a general-purpose, developmental, modeling language in the field of software engineering, that is intended to provide a standard way to visualize the design of a system". The purpose of Sparx EA within the CIC environment on the QA team is as a repository management tool. As such, by allowing any general UML tool to be accepted for RTC4, RTC11, RTC21 and RTC34, this would allow for the use of non-repository UML tools and result in experience that isn't relevant. Our understanding is that CIC is looking for experience with a tool that is used as a document management repository. Therefore, to ensure CIC receives candidates who have the appropriate experience that reflects the nature of the original requirements, we would like to request that CIC consider the following change:

> **DELETE:**
> Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository) or UML
>
> **INSERT:**
> Sparx Systems Enterprise Architect (requirements and design change repository) or IBM ReqPro

Answer 23:
CIC is not using EA Sparx as a document management system, therefore RTC4, RTC11, RTC21 and RTC34 will remain unchanged.

Question 24:
RTC32 and RCT45 on the grids for the automated testers (L2 and L3) ask for experience with Rational Quality Manager (RQM). Would the Crown accept experience with other Rational testing tools—for example, a combination of Rational Test Manager, Rational ClearQuest, Rational ClearCase, and/or Rational ReqPro?

Answer 24:
We do not consider the suggested tools as equivalent to Rational Quality Manager (RQM).

Question 25:
All four categories have rated requirements for identifying and documenting software defects using Microsoft Team Foundation Server (specifically RTC8, RTC15, RTC25 and RTC38). Because this requirement deals specifically with defect management and tracking, we would request that the requirement be amended to allow for similar tools, including IBM Rational ClearQuest and HP Quality Center.

Answer 25:
RTC8, RTC15, RTC25, and RTC38 amended. See Revisions 1, 2, 3, and 4. of this Solicitation Amendment No. 004.

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