Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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

Informatics Professional Services - EL Division/Services professionnels en informatique - division EL
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floo
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Omnibus (BPA, B2B, CECP) IT Profess	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 47419-251689/A	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 1000341689	**Date** 2018-10-05
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$$EL-606-33760	
File No. - N° de dossier 606el.47419-251689	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à** 02:00 PM **on - le** 2018-10-12	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☑ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Mansour, Silvana	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 606el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-9935 ( )	**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**

Canada

This Solicitation Amendment 007 includes answers to questions received from potential Bidders.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 58:

The mandatory criteria tables have a column entitled “Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to Insert Data)”, while the rated criteria tables do not have this column. Are we correct in assuming that within the mandatory “Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to Insert Data)” column, CBSA is wanting just the total number of years associated to the criteria (as per example below), while referencing the project page number under the -page # column? If this is not the case, could CBSA please provide Bidders with what is expected under this column?

		Bidder’s Response	
#	**Mandatory Technical Criteria**	**Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to Insert Data)**	**Insert Page # of Resume**
M.2.2.1	The bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of 10 years of experience working as a Java Programmer/Analyst performing at least 8 of the 11 tasks listed in the Statement of Work, Article 5. Resource Tasks and Deliverables, A.7 Programmer/Analyst (Java) level 3.	The candidate has **15 years, 6 months (186 months)** of relevant experience as demonstrated	**Project 1,** Résumé Page 1 Client Name March 2018 – Present (8 months)

#	Rated Technical Criteria	Scoring Methodology	Points Max	Cross Reference to Proposal (Page #)
R.3.2.1	The bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience over and above the minimum 10 years of experience required in M.2.2.1 as a Java Programmer/Analyst.	10+ to 12 years = 2 points 12+ to 14 years = 4 points 14+ years = 6 points	6	The Candidate has **15 years, 6 months (186 months)** of relevant experience as demonstrated by the following projects: **Project 1,** Résumé Page 10 Client Name March 2018 – Present (8 months)

Answer 58:

Bidders should refer to the RFP Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions, article “3.2 - Section 1: Technical Bid” for a response to this question.

Question 59:

Amendment 1, Q&A # 1 states that in response to M.1.2 vendors can use job titles that are different as long as the tasks and level of experience correspond to those identified in the statement of work. Can you please clarify the following around this response:

A. We were assuming that the table provided on page 145 of the RFP, below M.1.2, is to be completed in response to the M.1.2 requirement. Please confirm our assumption is correct?

B. Can the Crown please define how they would like the vendor community to demonstrate that the tasks and level of experience correspond in instances where they are presenting different job titles? Is there a % of tasks that must be demonstrated?

   Can the Crown further confirm that if a vendor is using the same job title and level (or higher level) to demonstrate the experience no further substantiation is required: i.e. requirement is Platform Analyst Level 2 and the vendor uses a contract/task authorization for a Platform Analyst Level 3

Answer 59:

A. Yes, That is correct. Please refer to Question 50 of Amendment 006.

B. Bidders are not required to provide substantiation of the tasks performed by the same job title and level. If Bidders are presenting different job titles, Bidders must then demonstrate that the resource category meet the level of experience as defined in the Government of Canada TBIPS Supply Arrangement (see below) and has performed at least 50% of the tasks identified in the Statement of Work. Refer to RFP Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions, article 3.2 Technical Bid, sub-article (iv) Previous Similar Projects.

<u>Experience Levels</u>

Level 1: < 5 years of experience
Level 2: 5- < 10 years of experience
Level 3: 10+ years of experience

Question 60:

Paragraph (iv) on page 13 of the RFP states:

"Previous Similar Projects: Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) **a project must have been completed by the bid closing date**; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated. **A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the descriptions of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category. "**

For M.1.1 since Bidders are required to only reference the cumulative billed value within the last 5 years can the Crown please confirm that contracts that are still ongoing meet the required criteria?

For M.1.2 can the Crown please confirm an ongoing contract or task authorization is acceptable as long as the vendor has clearly demonstrated for each role the resource has completed 6 months of work within the last three years?

Answer 60:

For M.1.1 - Confirmed
For M.1.2 - Confirmed

Question 61:

Re: Extension to Closing Date

As there are currently still outstanding questions that could affect candidate selection with **3 business days** left before the bid is due, combined with the fact that we are now heading into Thanksgiving weekend making it very difficult to connect with candidates who are spending time with their families, we are respectfully requesting a 1 week extension to October 16th to allow bidders adequate opportunity to update our response in accordance with the answers to these questions, once the amendment is released.

Answer 61:

An extension has been granted. See amendment 006.

Question 62:

As there are vendor questions still requiring clarification regarding both resource qualification and corporate requirements, will the Crown provide an extension to the 17th of October, in view of the fact that the outstanding questions have impact on external resources and client references who will have limited availability to confirm details and act as signatories over the coming holiday weekend. Additionally questions regarding resource qualification are still outstanding, and allowing for an extension in addition to the needed clarification will ensure that resources are properly selected and vetted against the technical requirements.

Answer 62:

An extension has been granted. See amendment 006.

Question 63:

Paragraph (iv) on page 13 of the RFP states:
"Previous Similar Projects: Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) a project must have been completed by the bid closing date; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated**. A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the descriptions of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is**

described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category. "

For M.1.1 the reference requirements are pretty clear and the highlighted statement doesn't make sense in the context of what that requirement is looking for. Can the Crown please confirm that this statement does not apply to M.1.1?

For M.1.2 we understand that vendors are required to complete the table provided but Q&A 1 on Amendment 1 states that "job titles can be different but tasks and level of experience should correspond to those identified in the statement of work". However it does not identify how we are to provide evidence of this.

Can the Crown please confirm what evidence they would require to demonstrate correspondence to the identified tasks? i.e. would a mapping of the tasks performed by our consultant to 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given resource category be sufficient?

Answer 63:

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED