



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

**Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada**
1713 Bedford Row
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.É.)
B3J 1T3
Nova Scotia
Bid Fax: (902) 496-5016

**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 DOCUMENT CONTAINS
A SECURITY REQUIREMENT.

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Atlantic Region Acquisitions/Région de l'Atlantique
Acquisitions
1713 Bedford Row
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.É.)
B3J 3C9
Nova Scot

Title - Sujet COA Testbed Development	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7707-175924/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7707-17-5924	Date 2017-11-07
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$HAL-208-10224	
File No. - N° de dossier HAL-6-77256 (208)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-11-15	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Atlantic Standard Time AST
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: LeBlanc, JoAnne	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur hal208
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (902) 440-0279 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (902) 496-5016
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
W7707-175924/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W7707-17-5924

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
002
File No. - N° du dossier
HAL-6-77256

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
hal208
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

This Solicitation Amendment No. 2 is being raised to address the following change.

Refer to: **ANNEX A – STATEMENT OF WORK**
7.1 Initial Task Date of Delivery
The date of delivery for the initial task is December 31, 2017.

Delete: In its entirety.

Insert: **ANNEX A – STATEMENT OF WORK**
7.1 Initial Task Date of Delivery
The date of delivery for the initial task is **March 23, 2018**.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM BIDDERS AND CORRESPONDING ANSWERS

Question 1

Is there currently an incumbent (Contractor) providing these services and if so what is the current contract value?

Answer 1

No. There is no contract currently in place for these services.

Question 2A

In Annex H, page 37, Table P2: The Resource (average score of best three resources): Is the three best resources must be the same for the whole table? **Or** only for each Row (P2.1, P2.2, P2.3...)? Or there is no restriction, meaning that the three best resources may vary even for different sub-items of a given row (ex: p2.2a, p2.2b, p2.2c, etc.)?

Answer 2A

The best three resources may vary.

Question 2B

We understand that for each technology expertise requested, if all three best resources have each 12 months of experience, the maximum point will be given and if a resource has less than 12 month, this resource will get 0 point before averaging the three resources' score. Is that understanding correct? If not, can you clarify?

Answer 2B

That understanding is correct.

Question 3

The call for tender mentions 840 hours for at least 2 resources (software dev intermediate level). Specifically, $840/2 = 420$ hrs = 56 days to 7.5 hrs per day (normal working day at the federal level). Based on the table on page 30, only information available on level of effort required (estimated). This is the longest effort mentioned in the chart. We can note that they mention that it takes at least 2 resources, so it could be 3 resources, which would decrease the duration even more. Hence our question.

So, is there only work scheduled for a maximum of 56 days (2 resources) over 3 years? Or they plan more work and they estimate how much, in effort or budget.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W7707-175924/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

W7707-17-5924

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

File No. - N° du dossier

HAL-6-77256

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

hal208

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Answer 3

The estimated usage shown represents the annual estimated hours.

Question 4

The minimum work guarantee shows an amount of 50 000\$, which can represent typically 5% or 10%, leading to a total estimated budget of 500 000\$ or 1 000 000\$. Does it represent 5% or 10%? Would it be possible to know the estimated budget for this project? This is not in line with the amount of days described at page 30.

Answer 4

The estimated budget is not being disclosed for this solicitation.

Question 5

The RFP shows a deliverable on December 31, 2017, which is surprising since the contract may well be awarded after December 1st. Is it possible to consider moving this date to the right? (Delaying so the work can realistically be done for the remaining time)?

Answer 5

Yes it can be moved March 23, 2018.

Question 6

Is it possible to get a readable picture of the figure 1 at page 27 of 40 (Appendix A)? Some elements in the PDF document (the RFP) are just unreadable.

Answer 6

Figure 1 attached as a PDF.

Question 7

Section P2.3 and section P2.4 refer to a specific vendor technology in terms of virtualization, container management and cloud service management. These vendor specific tools are very similar to industry leading implementations from both VMWare and Microsoft. It is much more typical for vendors to have resources with training and experience with VMWare and Microsoft offerings, than with the Open Source tools. Arguably the named open source tools have taken functionality development from VMWare, who created the approach to virtualization. Skill migration between vendor tools is not significant and by naming one tool it is possible that the vendor pool who can bid on this RFP in a competitive manner is being significantly minimized. It is recommended VMWare offerings be given equal scoring/weighting.

Answer 7

In section P2.3 of the evaluation criteria there are 3 technologies listed, one of which is VMWare, all three have equal weight, we use all 3 of these (or potentially will) and they are very different in detail.

In section P2.4 of the evaluation criteria OpenShift and OpenStack are the core cloud computing technologies used in COA-T.

All other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.