



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

Quebec

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

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

**Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Services Procurement-Instruments Management
Division/Approvisionnement de services-Gestion des
instruments

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

11C1, Place du Portage III

Gatineau

Quebec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet ACCOUNT VERIFICATIONS OF PAYMENTS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 51019-174003/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 51019-174003	Date 2017-11-16
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZQ-021-31950	
File No. - N° de dossier 021zq.51019-174003	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-11-27	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
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: Kamanayo, Gatsimbanyi	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 021zq
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-3343 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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
51019-174003/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
51019-174003

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
002
File No. - N° du dossier
021zq 51019-174003

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
021zq
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

This amendment 002 is issued to share the questions received from some Bidders and their answers to all invited Bidders:

Question 1:

MT1 – Would the Crown consider the experience of the Bidders resources to qualify as Bidders' experience?

Answer 1:

No, for MT1, the projects submitted for evaluation must have been completed by the bidding entity. For MT2, the experience submitted for evaluation need not have occurred with the bidding entity.

Question 2:

RT2 – The requirement that all experience of significant review of recipient/contribution agreement audits only qualify if they are in the health care field significantly limits the competitiveness of this bid as a large number of these types of audits have historically been concentrated in a limited number of firms. As this criteria is being evaluated twice in RT2 (both under a) and b)), we respectfully request, that RT2 a) be amended to be read as

“Significant reviews of recipient/ contribution audits (project value of \$10,000 or more) completed during the period beginning six years prior to the original bid posting date and ended on the date of bid closing....”

Answer 2:

This criterion will remain unchanged.

Question 3:

RT3 – The requirement that all experience of significant review of recipient/contribution agreement audits only qualify if they are in the health care field significantly limits the competitiveness of this bid as a large number of these types of audits have historically been concentrated in a limited number of firms. As this criteria is being evaluated twice in RT3 (both under a) and b)), we respectfully request, that RT3 a) be amended to be read as

“Significant reviews of recipient/ contribution audits (project value of \$10,000 or more) completed during the period beginning six years prior to the original bid posting date and ended on the date of bid closing....”

Answer 3:

This criterion will remain unchanged.

Question 4:

RT4 – The requirement that all experience of significant review of recipient/contribution agreement audits only qualify if they are in the health care field significantly limits the competitiveness of this bid as a large number of these types of audits have historically been concentrated in a limited number of firms. We respectfully request, that RT4 a) be amended to be read as

“Significant reviews of recipient/ contribution audits (project value of \$10,000 or more) completed during the period beginning six years prior to the original bid posting date and ended on the date of bid closing....”

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
51019-174003/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
51019-174003

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
002
File No. - N° du dossier
021zq 51019-174003

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
021zq
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Answer 4:

This criterion will remain unchanged.

Question 5:

Based on the SoW, we understand that VAC requires the services of a Contractor to perform account verification, i.e. testing of (typically monthly) amounts claimed by third parties prior to being certified for Section 34 of the Financial Administration Act, whereby the Contractor is required to intake claims from third parties and perform initial account verification procedures, as opposed to conducting a recipient audit which is performed after the account verification (and payment).

Mandatory MT1 for the Bidder, states "The Bidder must demonstrate experience in the conduct of Recipient/Contribution Agreement Audits by providing descriptions of two (2) projects that are relevant to the Statement of Work..." Can the Crown please confirm that the Bidder must provide **two account verification projects** to meet MT1 criteria, and not generic Recipient/Contribution Agreement audits?

Answer 5:

For MT1, the projects submitted for evaluation should be experience in the conduct of recipient / contribution agreement audits, i.e. not limited to account verification projects. More direct experience will be evaluated in the point rated criteria.

Question 6:

We noted that, for the purposes of MT1, "experience of the bidder, its parent, subsidiaries, or other affiliates of the Bidder, or its subcontractors will be considered". In our experience with similar requirements for federal government departments, Bidder's experience doesn't include sub-contractor's experience. There is an increased risk that, by leveraging experience of sub-contractors for bid purposes, the Crown will not have access to the required expertise as Bidders become dependent on their sub-contractors to continuously meet the Crown's requirements. Can the Crown confirm that for the purposes of meeting Bidder's the mandatory and rated criteria, the Bidder's experience (with parent/subsidiaries/other affiliates) will only be considered?

Answer 6:

Confirmed, for the requirements of MT1. Projects submitted for evaluation must have been completed by the bidding entity.

Question 7:

Section 10 of Annex A (Statement of Work) outlines the IT requirements related to the contract. As the information to be processed at the Bidder's facilities can be considered sensitive (i.e. privacy and health concerns), can the Crown confirm that it is requesting that the Bidder holds a valid facility clearance at the level of Secret to delivery this project?

Answer 7:

The information referenced in the RFP will be protected B.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.