



**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> System Integration (SI) Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 59017-160009/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20161265	<b>Date</b> 2017-12-21
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XS-005-31998	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 005xs.59017-160009	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2018-01-24</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> McManus, Robert	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 005xs
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 420-2230 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

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

### Questions and Answers

**QUESTION 9:** Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses. 7.4 7.4 Standard Clauses and Conditions. Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions Manual: Definition of Bidder: The Solicitation includes a strict definition of Bidder, excluding Parent, affiliates, subsidiaries and subcontractors. For tax, accounting and legal reasons, global firms operate their global business through local, country specific operating companies. Our ownership structure rolls up to one Global entity, however, by limiting the definition of bidder to our Canadian entity, the Crown is effectively limiting us to only using references from our Canadian operating company to meet the requirements of the RFP.

The Crown has generally allowed the use of the experience of the bidder's "Affiliates". Two (2) recent examples illustrate this practice: the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's recent ESDP procurement and CBSA's Accounts Receivable Ledger (ARL) procurement. By way of example, the following language would be acceptable to the Bidder, and is taken from one of the above noted RFPs:

"The experience of affiliates will be accepted for evaluation purposes in response to these criterion. In such cases, the experience of an affiliate will be considered for evaluation purposes. For the purpose of this evaluation, everyone, including but not limited to organizations, bodies corporate, societies, companies, firms, partnerships, associations of persons, parent companies, and subsidiaries, whether partly or wholly-owned, as well as individuals, and directors, are Bidder's affiliates if:

a) directly or indirectly either one controls or has the power to control the other, or

b) a third party has the power to control both.

Indicia of control, include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, or a business entity created following the acts or convictions specified in this section which has the same or similar management, ownership, or principal employees, as the case may be."

We request that the Crown amend the Definition of Bidder to include Parent, Affiliates and subsidiaries for purposes of meeting all of the reference, corporate experience, practice size and other requirements of the RFP

**ANSWER 9:** This suggestion was raised during the RFI process. However the modification of GC Standard Clauses has, in the past, caused significant confusion and concern amongst Bidders. Therefore, in response to RFI feedback Canada reduced the mandatory requirements under M-1 Corporate Experience, Dynamics CRM Solution Implementation. The request has been reviewed, the RFP remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 10:** 1. Amendment 2, QA #4 advises bidders of a two week extension to the due date. QA #7 indicates a change of date from 2018-01-10 to 2018-01-24; though it points the revision to Section 1.2.3 in Part 1 – General Information, which is the paragraph pertaining to contract periods. Additionally, the Amendment's front page and the Buy and Sell abstract both show an extension to 2018-01-22. Could the client please confirm what the new due date should be?

**ANSWER 10:** Although QA#7 contains an incorrect x-reference, the date is correct. The new closing date is **2018-01-24**. See RFP Change below.

**QUESTION 11:** Regarding the Enterprise Planning 3rd Party Software, during the term of the contract, including option periods, when does OSFI expect that it will make a decision on whether it will or will not invoke the option for the EP software? For example, does OSFI expect it will make a decision after a particular release of the STTR solution has been accepted?

**ANSWER 11:** To clarify, OSFI will acquire the Enterprise Planning Tool software recommended (i.e. proposed) by the selected Bidder. If OSFI can purchase the required Licensed Software at a lower cost under existing GC Supply Arrangements it will do so, otherwise it will exercise the option to purchase the Licensed Software from the Contractor. The decision as to whether to exercise the option and purchase the Licensed Software from the Contractor will be made during the delivery of TA#1 (i.e. within three months of contract award).

**QUESTION 12:** With reference to Annex “B” – Basis of Payment, Section 4.0 Optional Software Licences and Software Maintenance & Support, item 4.2 Additional Software Licences states that OSFI can invoke its option “at any time during the Initial Contract Period or at any time during any Contract Option Period, as applicable.”

Typically, software vendors quote prices for software that are valid for 90 or 120 days. Software vendors rarely, if ever, hold price quotes for three to five years since the product can evolve drastically over such a period of time. The odds are that in three to five years of time the software version quoted in this bid submission would no longer be generally available. Asking vendors to quote software prices that are valid for up to five years will most likely limit the potential number of software vendors willing to participate in this bid submission.

Will OSFI consider changing the pricing criteria:

- a. Use current published pricing for Per User and Entity License with a stated discount off the published price as a means to evaluate the bids
- b. Accept pricing based on the stated percentage discount off the published Per User License and Entity License prices at the time the option is invoked versus an absolute dollar amount at time of bid submission, assuming that the future version of software meets or exceeds the capability of the software as at the time of bid submission?

**ANSWER 12:** The request has been reviewed, the RFP remains unchanged. See also answer #11 above.

**QUESTION 13:** Regarding the Enterprise Planning 3rd Party Software, can OSFI please indicate that if it elects to invoke its option for the 3rd party software that it will pay for the software in whole within 30 days of the licence(s) delivery for the number Per User Licences purchased or for the Entity Licence Price, whatever the case may be?

**ANSWER 13:** The Software Licenses will be paid for as set out in Part 7 – Resulting Contract Clauses, section 7.9 Payment. In accordance with 2035, General Conditions, Canada's standard payment period is 30 days.

**QUESTION 14:** The way that the RFP is structured the optional 3rd Party Enterprise Planning Software comprises over 18% of the Technical Evaluation Criteria, which is significant. The result is that OSFI might end up with potentially the following scenarios:

a. A desirable STTR Solution Systems Integrator but an undesirable Enterprise Planning Software solution, or

b. A less desirable STTR Solution Systems Integrator but a desirable Enterprise Planning Software solution.

The point is that the results of the procurement and the degree that OSFI will be satisfied with the selected SI that will deliver the core STTR system hinges on an optional part of the solution that may never be invoked.

Would OSFI consider restructuring the RFP as follows?

- Part A: STTR Core Solution - Dynamics CRM integrated with SharePoint
- Part B: Optional 3rd Party Enterprise Planning Software

Giving bidders the option of:

- Bidding Part A only
- Bidding Part B only
- Bidding both Part A and Part B

OSFI would then award two contracts, one contract for Part A and one contract for Part B.

**ANSWER 14:** The request has been reviewed, the RFP remains unchanged. See also answer #11 above.

**QUESTION 15:** Reference Attachment 1 To Technical Evaluation Criteria: Proposed Third-Party Software Response Tables. The effort required to respond to this table is significant. Many software providers are reluctant to invest the time and expense of responding when there is no amount of certainty of ever obtaining a return on their investment. This has an indirect consequence of limiting the number of System Integrators that would be in a position to respond to the RFP's core requirement of delivering the STTR system. This appears to be an unintended effect of bundling optional 3rd Party Software as a mandatory requirement in the RFP.

Therefore would OSFI consider restructuring the RFP as follows?

- Part A: STTR Core Solution - Dynamics CRM integrated with SharePoint
- Part B: Optional 3rd Party Enterprise Planning Software

Giving bidders the option of:

- Bidding Part A only
- Bidding Part B only
- Bidding both Part A and Part B

OSFI would then award two contracts, one contract for Part A and one contract for Part B.

**ANSWER 15:** The request has been reviewed, the RFP remains unchanged. See also answer #11 above.

**QUESTION 16:** If OSFI chooses not to invoke the option for the contracted proponent's proposed 3rd Party Enterprise Planning Tool what does OSFI expect will happen or be the case? Will OSFI procure another tool in a separate procurement and would the contractor be required to integrate it into the STTR solution?

**ANSWER 16:** Refer to answer #11 above.

**QUESTION 17:** Reference Annex "A" – Statement of Work page 28 of 94. This section states: " An options analysis conducted by OSFI has determined that this functional gap can be filled by Microsoft Dynamics CRM (and related products, such as ADXstudio) and an as yet to be selected planning tool (e.g., Assistance Software's Assistance PSA, Microsoft Project Server, Upland Tenrox PSA, etc.)"

The mentioning of these three specific products puts pricing pressure on other prospective EP products not mentioned, as well as price pressure on the CRM implementation services since the products mentioned specifically in the RFP appear to have an unfair advantage.

- a. Can OSFI indicate how the three Enterprise Planning Software products mentioned do not have an unfair advantage over Enterprise Planning software products that are not mentioned in the RFP?
- b. Could OSFI make available the results of the Options Analysis that it has conducted for Enterprise Planning 3rd Part Software available to bidders?

**ANSWER 17:** (a) The software products are listed as examples only and DO NOT imply any preference. All proposed software will be evaluated against the same evaluation criteria. Any examples provided do not have any unfair advantage or impact pricing. See also answer to #11 above. (b) The Options Analysis referenced was related to the selection of MS Dynamics and as such is not relevant and will not be provided. OSFI did not conduct a formal options analysis on 3rd Party Software for Planning.

**QUESTION 18:** Reference Annex "A" – Statement of Work page 28 of 94. This section states: " An options analysis conducted by OSFI has determined that this functional gap can be filled by Microsoft Dynamics CRM (and related products, such as ADXstudio) and an as yet to be selected planning tool (e.g., Assistance Software's Assistance PSA, Microsoft Project Server, Upland Tenrox PSA, etc.)"

The mentioning of these three specific products puts pricing pressure on other prospective EP products not mentioned, as well as price pressure on the CRM implementation services since the products mentioned specifically in the RFP appear to have an unfair advantage.

To mitigate this unfair advantage would OSFI consider severing the RFP into two parts as follows?

- i. Part A: STTR Core Solution - Dynamics CRM integrated with SharePoint
- ii. Part B: Optional 3rd Party Enterprise Planning Software

Giving bidders the option of:

- Bidding Part A only
- Bidding Part B only
- Bidding both Part A and Part B

OSFI would then award two contracts, one contract for Part A and one contract for Part B.

**ANSWER 18:** The request has been reviewed, the RFP remains unchanged. See also answers #11 and #17 above.

**QUESTION 19:** Reference SRCL Appendix A to Annex C – Supplemental Security Guide. Security Requirements Checklist (SRCL) Supplemental Security Guide Security Clearances, Part B – Multiple Levels of Personnel Screening: Security Classification Guide. Finding resources that qualify against the Contractor Work Team requirements of the RFP at the Secret Level of Personnel Clearance is extremely difficult, especially for resource located in Toronto who for the most part serve markets outside of the Federal Government

In order to increase the potential number of qualified bidders would OSFI please constrain “Access to site and/or Information” for Secret level clearance in a manner similar to resource that require Reliability Level of Personnel Clearance? That is, adding “No access to OSFI records room or server rooms. No access to Classified information. No privileged access to OSFI Production systems and servers.” This would permit these resources to be cleared at the level of Reliability and increase the number of potential bidders.

**ANSWER 19:** See answer #6.

**QUESTION 20:** Reference SRCL Appendix A to Annex C – Supplemental Security Guide. Security Requirements Checklist (SRCL) Supplemental Security Guide Security Clearances, Part B – Multiple Levels of Personnel Screening: Security Classification Guide. Finding resources that qualify against the Contractor Work Team requirements of the RFP at the Secret Level of Personnel Clearance is extremely difficult, especially for resource located in Toronto who for the most part serve markets outside of the Federal Government. Being able to locate such resource at time of bid submission might be impossible.

In order to increase the number of potential qualified bidders would change the requirement to have Secret clearance at time of TA #1 Contractor Onboarding rather than at the time of bid submission?

**ANSWER 20:** The requirement for Contractor Work Team resources to be Security Cleared at the time of RFP was identified to perspective Bidders in the RFI which was published in August 2017 so that Bidders could initiate clearances as required. To avoid the risk of delays at the time of contract award or the commencement of work this requirement will remain unchanged.

**QUESTION 21:** With regard to M-2, item b, Bidders are to describe the proposed high-level role and responsibilities of each member of the Bidding Team with respect to fulfilling each of the areas of requirements described in Statement of Work (SOW), including but not limited to b. Rich Text Control Software (SOW 8.2); and c. Spelling / Grammar Checking Software (SOW 8.3).

As OSFI will be providing the Rich Text Control Software and the Spelling/Grammar Checking Software, could OSFI please confirm that they will remove them from the M-2 requirement?

**ANSWER 21:** The RFP has been corrected. See RFP Change below.

**QUESTION 22:** Part 3 of the RFP states, for financial bids, Canada requests that Bidders provide soft copies in MS Excel format, in the format and as protected as published. Attachment 42 was published within a PDF document. Will OSFI be distributing the RFP in its original format: Word/Excel? If not, please confirm Bidders can submit their full responses in PDF format alone.

**ANSWER 22:** As per section 3.1 Bidders are required to submit their Financial Proposal in MS Excel Format (protected). Bidders should replicate the Pricing Tables contained in Attachment 4.2 – Financial Evaluation Criteria of the RFP. Canada will not issue the documents in Word or Excel format.

### **RFP Changes**

1. At Page 1
  - **DELETE:** 2018-01-22
  - **And INSERT:** 2018-01-24
  
2. At Attachment 4.1 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, requirement M-2 Bidding Team
  - **DELETE:**
    - b. Rich Text Control Software (SOW 8.2); and
    - c. Spelling / Grammar Checking Software (SOW 8.3).