



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

or via ePost Connect

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

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

Informatics Professional Services - EL Division/Services

professionnels en informatique - division EL

Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floor

10 Wellington Street

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Professional Services - TBIPS 2	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP597-180057/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20180057	Date 2018-04-10
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-618-32294	
File No. - N° de dossier 618el.EP597-180057	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-04-19	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
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: Laassouli(EL DIV.), Hicham	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 618el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-9817 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA SSI-DIRECTOR GENERAL'S OFFICE (DGO) KENT SQUARE BUILDING 2ND FL., 270 ALBERT ST. OTTAWA Ontario K1A 0S5 Canada	

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 Request for Proposal (RFP) Amendment 006 is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and amend the RFP accordingly.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 45: In Workstream 2 the grid for the Courseware Developer L3 rated 2-3.2 requires that [...The identified resource must have a minimum of five years of experience, within the seven years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing training materials for a PeopleSoft HCM (version 9.1 or more recent) system implementation or upgrade project.] My GCHR was launched in 2013 and many Departments are only now implementing or upgrading to version 9.1. This means there is a very limited pool of Courseware Developers who have more than five (5) years of v9.1 experience. Please consider reducing this to three (3) years of version 9.1 which is more in line with the GC environment and more likely to be centered on (more relevant) My GCHR experience. Otherwise please consider changing the requirement to version 8.9 or higher.

Answer 45: The requirement has been revised. See RFP Change no. 17 below.

Question 46: Considering that most of the CRM resource grids in Stream 3 call for experience in 2011 or higher, please allow the Bidder to present resources that have been on contract within the last three years. MS Dynamics CRM adoption within the Government of Canada has been slower than anticipated so there has not been a great variety of projects that would meet the 2 year window.

Answer 46: The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 47: Please confirm that for WorkStream 3 M-1 that the two Customer References are for MS Dynamics CRM version 2011 or higher as indicated in Appendix 1 to Attachment 2, M-1 Bidder Response Table. This aligns the corporate reference both the five year period indicated in M-1 as well as the resource grids that call for experience with version 2011 or higher.

Answer 47: The RFP has been corrected. Refer to answer #24 and RFP change no. 12 contained in Amendment Number 4.

Question 48: Due to the extent of scope changes to the resource grid for each stream we respectfully request a two week extension in order to provide PSPC a response of suitable quality.

Answer 48: The closing date has been extended to April 19, 2018 and the RFP has been amended to reduce the level of effort associated with demonstration of "Minimum experience in the resource category", refer to RFP Amendments 002 and 003 respectively.

Question 49: Under TBIPS corporate qualifications must be that of the Bidder as a single entity or as a pre-qualified Joint Venture. We are concerned that by allowing a Bidder to put forward mandatory corporate experience that did not involve a direct client relationship for the work being done is not in keeping with principles of TBIPS. How can the experience be considered corporate capability if the Bidder was not in a direct client contract relationship for the work?

Answer 49: See answer #40 and revised answer #17 contained in RFP Amendment Number 5.

Question 50: The requirement M-2 Corporate Capability (Workstream 3) requests bidders demonstrate a Senior Tester (CRM) on contract for 6 months in the last 2 years; however, it is not typical for a Senior Tester to be engaged on a CRM project for the entire duration, and thus they do not typically acquire 6 consecutive months of CRM testing experience on a single project. This is evident in working with numerous Government of Canada clients for Microsoft Dynamics CRM implementations from 2014-2018. As such, we respectfully request the removal of the Senior Tester requirement within M-2, or, a reduction to a period of 3 months in the last 2 years as opposed to 6 months.

Answer 50: To clarify, it is not required that the six months be consecutive, the six months may be the combined total of two or more engagements within the last two years. **See RFP Change no. 18 below.**

Question 51: The requirement M-2 Corporate Capability (Workstream 3) requests bidders to demonstrate a Senior Data Migration Specialist (CRM) on contract for 6 consecutive months; however, it is not typical for a full-time Data Migration Specialist to be provided by the CRM team/vendor. Rather the vendor's CRM SMEs typically consult the internal departmental Data Analyst/IM Leads to achieve the desired migration results, specifically as the client's Data/IM team and clients are the most knowledgeable of their own data and database systems. This is evident in working with numerous Government of Canada clients for Microsoft Dynamics CRM implementations from 2014-2018. As such, we respectfully request the removal of the Data Migration Specialist role within M-2.

Answer 51: If you are referring to the 'Senior Data Conversion Specialist (Dynamics CRM Specialist)'; to clarify, it is not required that the six months be consecutive, the six months may be the combined total of two or more engagements within the last two years. **See RFP Change no. 18 below.**

Question 52: The requirement R-5 Bench Strength requests Bidders to demonstrate a Senior Tester on contract for 6 months in the last 2 years; however, it is not typical for a Senior Tester to be engaged on a CRM project for the entire duration, and thus they do not typically acquire 6 consecutive months of CRM testing experience on a single project. This is evident in working with numerous Government of Canada clients for Microsoft Dynamics CRM implementations from 2014-2018. As such, we respectfully request the removal of the Senior Tester requirement within R-5, or a reduction to a period of 3 months in the last 2 years as opposed to 6 months.

Answer 52: See answer #50 above.

Question 53: The requirement R-5 Bench Strength requests bidders to demonstrate a Senior Data Migration Specialist (CRM) on contract for 6 consecutive months; however, it is not typical for a full-time Data Migration Specialist to be provided by the CRM team/vendor. Rather the vendor's CRM SMEs typically consult the internal departmental Data Analyst/IM Leads to achieve the desired migration results, specifically as the client's Data/IM team and clients are the most knowledgeable of their own data and database systems. This is evident in working with numerous Government of Canada clients for Microsoft Dynamics CRM implementations from 2014-2018. As such, we respectfully request the removal of the Data Migration Specialist role within R-5.

Answer 53: See also answer #51 above.

Question 54: In reference to Workstream 5, R-2.1 and R-3.2, although reference is made to the listed Certifications as Technical, many of the Certifications are associated with Functional resource roles. As the Crown has requested Technical Analyst resource experience, we recommended that Technical certifications such as HANA, Solution Manager, ABAP, BASIS and various Databases also be added to the list as acceptable Certifications.

Answer 54: The RFP was revised to include additional Certifications. Refer to RFP changes no. 13 and 14 contained in Amendment Number 5.

Question 55:

We are asking the following question in an effort to ensure that PSPC has an improved chance of success and that the stated risk can be mitigated. Would PSPC agree to set a minimum mark of 70% for the criteria for R1 (Corporate Reference contracts) and at 70% for R-3 (Corporate Dynamics Practice)?

Answer 55: Refer to Answer#41 under RFP Amendment 005.

Question 56: Amendment #3 to the RFP modified the requirement to demonstrate the requirements of Appendix 1 to Attachment 2, Bidder Response Table which holds common category and role requirements for both Core and Bench resources. When reading the question that elicited this modification however, it was only referring to the onerous requirements to demonstrate the Bench resources. Can Canada kindly confirm that the minimum mandatory requirements must be demonstrated for the Core resources however to demonstrate an adequate level of evidence is provided for these resources with the bid submission?

Answer 56: The RFP Evaluation requirements were amended for all identified resources, refer to RFP Changes no. 4 and 5 contained in RFP Amendment 3.

Question 57: Can the Crown please confirm if we will have access to any personally identifiable information during the course of this project?

Answer 57: To clarify, for development purposes the GC does not use live production data.

Question 58: It is our understanding that resources required to work under this contract will require security clearance and therefore all proposed resources for this RFP must possess active security clearance in order to demonstrate a Bidder's capability to access security cleared resources. Can Canada confirm that while this is not listed an explicit mandatory requirement, security clearance for all 16 proposed resources is a requirement at bid submission and confirm that the security clearance information is to be provided with the technical bid volume?

Answer 58: Yes, the resources provided under the resulting contracts will require valid Security Clearance at time of TA; depending on the work to be delivered the resource must have a valid personnel security screening at the level of Reliability status, Confidential or Secret. However, the Bidder is not required to demonstrate that the Resources identified at time of RFP (to demonstrate Corporate capability) have a valid GC Security screening.

Question 59: Regarding the requirement for all 16 proposed resources to be 'previously contracted by the Bidder', can Canada kindly confirm that the intent is for the resources to have been contracted with the Bidder for a minimum of 6 consecutive months within the last two years, otherwise the requirement may not demonstrate what it is intended to?

Answer 59: To clarify, it is not required that the six months be consecutive, the six months may be the combined total of two or more engagements within the last two years. **See RFP Change no. 18 below.**

Question 60: In reference to Workstream 2: As a supplier of PeopleSoft services to the Federal Government for the past 20 years, it has been our experience that it is very rare for RFPs to be issued for Business Transformation Architects, Project Managers and Help Desk Specialists specializing in PeopleSoft services. In fact, our research backs this up in that in the last 2 or 3 years, we have only found one solicitation, EP911-160455/A, that has all these categories providing PeopleSoft services and 90% of that contract was awarded to one company. We respectfully request that for M2, Bidders be allowed to demonstrate the eight (8) resources in any combination of the categories listed. Similarly, for R3 - Bench Strength, Bidders may also demonstrate the additional eight (8) resources in any combination of the categories listed. These changes will ensure the Crown receives multiple bids from companies that specialize in delivering PeopleSoft services (i.e. have a minimum of 16 PeopleSoft resources on contract in the last two years) while helping the Crown achieve its ultimate goal of a fair and open competitive process.

Answer 60: The evaluation criteria is intended to foster competition while mitigating risks associated with PSPC's anticipated future requirements. The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 61: Amendment 1, Answer# 7 confirmed that the WS5 R1 scoring has been adjusted to reflect a total of 270 points (90 point per contract), but the total overall score was not updated. Please confirm that the entire stream will be scored based on 726 Overall Maximum Points.

Answer 61: Correct, refer to RFP change number 2 contained in RFP Amendment Number 001.

RFP AMENDMENT

17. At Attachment 2 Bid Evaluation Criteria, Appendix 1 to Attachment 2, Bidder Response Tables (Identified Resources, WS2)

DELETE:

Attachment 2-3.2	Minimum experience with PeopleSoft HCM The identified resource must have a minimum of five years of experience, within the seven years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing training materials for a PeopleSoft HCM (version 9.1 or more recent) system implementation or upgrade project.
------------------	---

INSERT:

Attachment 2-3.2	Minimum experience with PeopleSoft HCM The identified resource must have a minimum of five years of experience, within the seven years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing training materials for a PeopleSoft HCM (version <u>8.9</u> or more recent) system implementation or upgrade project, <u>of which at least two years of experience is related to PeopleSoft HCM (version 9.1 or more recent).</u>
------------------	--

18. At Attachment 2 Bid Evaluation Criteria, (for each Workstream 1 – 5), Appendix 1 to Attachment 2, Bidder Response Tables (Identified Resources, WS_)

DELETE:

Attachment 2-__	Previously contracted by the Bidder. The identified resource must have previously been contracted by the Bidder for a minimum period of six months within the last two years. The Bidder must provide the following substantiating information in its bid: a) Customer organization name; b) Customer contact (including name, title, and telephone number or e-mail address); c) Project name; d) Role of the resource on the project; and
-----------------	--

	<p>e) Dates resource worked of contract (start and finish date, mm/yyyy).</p> <p>Note: Resources identified at the time of RFP must have previously been contracted by the Bidder as stipulated. This requirement does not apply to resources proposed after contract award in response to TAs.</p>
--	--

INSERT:

Attachment 2-__	<p>Previously contracted by the Bidder.</p> <p>The identified resource must have previously been contracted by the Bidder for a minimum period of six <u>cumulative</u> months within the last two years.</p> <p>The Bidder must provide the following substantiating information in its bid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Customer organization name;b) Customer contact (including name, title, and telephone number or e-mail address);c) Project name;d) Role of the resource on the project; ande) Dates resource worked of contract (start and finish date, mm/yyyy). <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) <u>The requirement can be demonstrated over one or more Customer Reference Projects.</u>2) Resources identified at the time of RFP must have previously been contracted by the Bidder as stipulated. This requirement does not apply to resources proposed after contract award in response to TAs.
--------------------	---

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.