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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Defence Communications Division. (QD)
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III, 8C2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet LEISC	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8486-184104/C	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 011
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8486-184104	**Date** 2018-02-14
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$$QD-038-26555	
File No. - N° de dossier 038qd.W8486-184104	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2018-03-02**	**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: Weronski, Radek	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 038qd
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-1774 ( )	**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**

The amendment 011 is raised to answer questions from potential bidders and update the RFP if necessary.

Questions from Potential Bidders and Answers from Canada:

Q107

Reference: Annex A (SOW)

Section 4.11.4 applies only to CIs for which the LEISC Contractor supplies “full support”. The Answer to Question 98 states that Section 4.11.2 also only applies to CIs for which the LEISC Contractor supplies “full support”. Is it correct to interpret that Section 4.11.3 also only applies to CIs for which the LEISC Contractor supplies “full support”?

A107

GIDEP is a collaboration program not a deliverable. The contractor must use and participate in GIDEP for the CIs for which the LEISC Contractor supplies “full support”. This can however use the common GIDEP Database to perform obsolescence queries for other Cis in order to provide SoS advice.

Q108

Reference: ATTACHMENT 3 to PART 4, AMENDMENT 007, and AMENDMENT 009

The second sentence of Section 1.3.3 of Attachment 3 to Part 4 states: “Bidders shall provide resumes for the key personnel identified in Appendix 6 to Annex A.” The Answer to Question 19 states: “These Key personnel are the resources identified in Attachment 3 to Part 4, Table A3-5.” This gives rise to the following questions:

a. Will Canada correct the second sentence of Section 1.3.3 of Attachment 3 to Part 4 to read: “Bidders shall provide resumes for the key personnel identified in Table A3-5”?

b. We interpret, based on the Answer to Question 19, that it is now mandatory to provide a complete set of resumes in response to Table A3-5. Is this a correct interpretation?

c. Considering the Answer to Question 19, will Canada clarify the difference between Sections 1.3.3 and 1.4.5 in Attachment 3 to Part 4? We interpret Section 1.3.3 to mean that it is mandatory to complete Table A3-5 and that the resources in Table A3-5 are then scored in accordance with Section 1.4.5. Is this a correct interpretation?

A108

Paragraph 1.3.3 sets how to meet the mandatory requirement with respect to personnel qualifications. It does not need to be modified. Paragraph 1.4.5 establishes the result that will be evaluated from Appendix 6 to Annex A as a part of the technical evaluation. If a resume from article 1.4.5 is missing then the mandatory and minimum score requirement will not be met and the bid will be deemed technically non-responsive.

Q109

Reference: ATTACHMENT 3 to PART 4, AMENDMENT 007, and AMENDMENT 009

Question 88 sought clarity on various leadership roles noted in Annex A. Given that Section 1.3.3 of Attachment 3 to Part 4 (as clarified by the Answer to Question 19) indicates that the term key personnel is restricted to those personnel listed in Table A3-5, and that only key personnel will be evaluated in Bid Evaluation and that resumes are only required for the key personnel, we have the following questions:

a. Notwithstanding the importance of the leadership positions noted in Annex A, they are not key personnel as defined in Section 1.3.3 of Attachment 3 to Part 4. Is this correct?

b. The resources to be identified in the Proposal in accordance with the Answer to Question 88 will not be evaluated as they are not encompassed within Section 1.3.3 of Attachment 3 to Part 4. Is this correct?

c. If the answer to the previous question is affirmative, how will Canada objectively assess whether a bidder has the necessary resources to execute the core work?

d. The Answer to Question 88 states “(the resources) must be identified in the bid …” and “They will be nominated by the contractor at contract award.” Please explain the distinction between identifying in the bid and nominating at contract award.

A109

Canada expects the core work key resources to be identified and shown to meet the core work requirement. The resources will be evaluated as part of the overall PMP and SEMP and will be rated as a part of the rated evaluation in 1.4.1 to 1.4.4 where applicable.

Q110

The Answer to Question 23 raises further questions:

It states that Depth of Knowledge is not used in the rated part of the evaluation. However, Section 1.4.5 of Attachment 3 to Part 4 of the RFP, which describes the rated requirement for Resource Capability Requirement states “The rating scale is based on an evaluation of … depth of knowledge …” and “depth of knowledge … will be evaluate …”. Will Canada reconcile the Answer to Question 23 and Section 1.4.5 of Attachment 3 to Part 4 of the RFP, and remove the conflict?

It states that the Depth of Knowledge is used as part of the evaluation for the mandatory requirements. Depth of Knowledge is described in Section 1.2 of Appendix 6 to Annex A. This Appendix is for Task Resource Categories. Other than the two uses of depth of knowledge noted in the preceding question which are found in a rated requirement, all uses of the term Depth of Knowledge in the RFP are found in Appendix 6 to Annex A. Therefore Depth of Knowledge does not appear to be used in the evaluation of any mandatory requirements. However, since the Answer to Question 19 now appears to mandate that eight task-based resource must be put forward in Table A3-5 and that these resources will then be rated in accordance with Section 1.4.5 of Attachment 3 to Part 4 we note a further conflict with the Answer to Question 23. It will be necessary to develop the resumes in accordance with the guidance provided in Appendix 6 to Annex A, which includes Depth of Knowledge. Since the Answer to Question 23 states that Depth of Knowledge is not used in the rated part of the evaluation, how will knowledge be assessed when evaluators employ the scoring criteria in Section 1.4.5 of Attachment 3 to Part 4? We require this information in order to submit appropriate resources. Without clarity in the scoring criteria, this rated requirement becomes less objective.

A110

The answer remains Depth of knowledge is a mandatory criteria for each resource. It is therefore not rated: it is a pass fail in all case. The rated criteria for resources is tied to breadth of knowledge. The bid must demonstrate that the resource meets the mandatory requirement for depth of knowledge for senior resources as mandated in Table A3-5 and as identified in Appendix 6 to Annex A for each senior resource type.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.