



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

Business Operations Support Systems
Division/Systèmes de soutien des activités
opérationnelles
Portage III 12C1 - 42
11 Laurier Street/11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

| | |
|--|---|
| Title - Sujet System Integration (SI) Services | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 59017-160009/B | Amendment No. - N° modif. 003 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20161265 | Date 2017-12-18 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XS-005-31998 | |
| File No. - N° de dossier 005xs.59017-160009 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-01-24 | |
| Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST | |
| F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: McManus, Robert | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 005xs |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-2230 () | 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 |

System Integration Services for OSFI STTR Project, SBIPS RP# 59017-160009/B

Questions and Answers

QUESTION 6: Annex A, 3.4.6 e) & SRCL – It is noted that in the Statement of Work (Annex A, 3.4.6 e)) “The Contractor may, at its discretion, conduct application construction work off-site at its own location, using its own development processes and tools. The Contractor is not permitted to conduct any work off site of a secure nature which requires the transmission of secure data...” This statement is supported with the SRCL “PART C SAFEGUARDS (SUPPLIER)” with all requirements reflected as “No”; however, PART A, 7. c) reflects the project as “SECRET”, which by default deems this a classified project.

As the SoW clearly states the Contractor is not permitted to conduct any off-site work of a secret nature, and all the PROTECTED/CLASSIFIED work will be done on OSFI’s site, it is requested the SRCL be amended to reduce the “Level of Information” to “Protected B”, which is consistent with the nature of the work that would be permitted at a Contractor’s office.

ANSWER 6: he Common Professional Services SRCL(s) cannot be modified. To clarify the Security requirements, resources will require Secret clearance and Reliability screening as applicable to the resource category and detailed in the Security Classification Guide published with the RFP (pages 228-231 of .pdf file, following the SRCL). The SRCL does not mean that the Contractor's facilities, from which they may choose to do some application construction work using test data, needs to be Secret cleared. Further, the Contractor will not be working with sensitive materials off-site.

QUESTION 7: In the Evaluation Criteria for R-8.6 SharePoint Development Specialist, item c) states the points available with regard to addressing “..each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph d)”. Could the client please confirm that this should read “..each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph c)”?

ANSWER 7: Yes, the RFP has been corrected. Refer to RFP Change below. .

QUESTION 8: In the Evaluation Criteria for R-8.6 SharePoint Development Specialist, item d) states the points available with regard to addressing “..each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph e)”. Could the client please confirm that this should read “..each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph d)”?

ANSWER 8: Yes, the RFP has been corrected. Refer to RFP Change below.

RFP Changes

1. At Attachment 4.1 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table R-8.6 SharePoint Development Specialist

• **DELETE:**

| | | |
|---|----|--|
| c) The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of six months, within the six years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, prototyping and configuring the SharePoint platform version 2013 (or more recent) in client-facing prototyping sessions. | 10 | Up to 10 points per project (maximum 1 project) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10 points – The Bidder’s response:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. addresses each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph d); andii. demonstrates all aspects of the experience of the identified resource by providing a description of the work performed in the role; |
|---|----|--|

| | | |
|--|-----------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 points – The Bidder’s response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. addresses each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph d); and ii. provides information which demonstrates some (but not all) aspects of the experience claimed; • 2 points - The Bidder’s response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. fails to address each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph d); or ii. addresses each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph d) but does not provide any information which demonstrates the experience claimed; or • 0 points – The Bidder’s response does not address the stated point rated criteria in paragraph d). |
| <p>d) The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of six months, within the six years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, working with and developing a managed metadata-based Information Architecture for a SharePoint version 2010 (or more recent) implementation.</p> | <p>10</p> | <p>Up to 10 points per project (maximum 1 project) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points – The Bidder’s response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. addresses each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph e); and ii. demonstrates all aspects of the experience of the identified resource by providing a description of the work performed in the role; • 6 points – The Bidder’s response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. addresses each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph e); and ii. provides information which demonstrates some (but not all) aspects of the experience claimed; • 2 points - The Bidder’s response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. fails to address each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph e); or ii. addresses each item of the point rated criteria in paragraph e) but does not provide any information which demonstrates the experience claimed; or • 0 points – The Bidder’s response does not address the stated point rated criteria in paragraph e). |