

### Amendment 009

This ITQ Amendment 009 serves to provide answers to questions 41 - 48, regarding the Invitation to Qualify (ITQ) EN920-190988/G.

Bidders are reminded that bids can be sent, by the closing date, to epost Connect :  
[TPSGC.DGAreceptiondessoumissions-ABBidReceiving.PWGSC@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:TPSGC.DGAreceptiondessoumissions-ABBidReceiving.PWGSC@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca)

Or the Generic HR to Pay Inbox:  
[TPSGC.PAApprovalRHalaPAYE-APHRtoPAYProcurement.PWGSC@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:TPSGC.PAApprovalRHalaPAYE-APHRtoPAYProcurement.PWGSC@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca)

**IMPORTANT REMINDER FOR INDUSTRY:** To facilitate search for industry all current and future postings related to Stabilizing Phoenix innovations and the HR and Pay Next Generation solution will include “**HRP-RHP**” in the title. Please note that vendors can subscribe to tender notice updates (RSS, ATOM, e-mail) using the keyword “**HRP-RHP**”.

#### TRACKING LOG OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PROVIDED TO DATE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	PROVIDED IN DOCUMENT
Questions and Answers 1 to 3	Attachment found in Amendment 002, but document titled Amendment 001
Questions and Answers 4 to 8	Amendment 003
Questions and Answers 9 to 12	Amendment 004
Questions and Answers 13 to 21	Amendment 005
Clarification on the parallel release of the 6 RFIs and this ITQ	Amendment 006
Questions and Answers 22 to 39	Amendment 007
Question and Answer 40	Amendment 008
Questions and Answers 41 to 48	Amendment 009

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
41	<p>The mandatory requirement (j) defined in Stream 6 currently reads:</p> <p>6. j) The bidder must demonstrate that the solution is accessible to users, specifically with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to a training environment</li> <li>• Develop and identify hosting solution for online courses</li> <li>• Learning Management System</li> <li>• Accessible to high security departments (CSIS, CSE, RCMP)</li> <li>• Accessibility to people with disabilities (WCAG compliant)</li> <li>• Available across Canada</li> </ul> <p>This assumes all bidders will be proposing a hosted solution to meet these requirements.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The requirement shall remain.</p>

	<p>We kindly request that the Crown revise the wording of this requirement to read:</p> <p>6. j) If the bidder is proposing a hosted solution, the bidder must demonstrate that the solution is accessible to users, specifically with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to a training environment</li> <li>• Develop and identify hosting solution for online courses</li> <li>• Learning Management System</li> <li>• Accessible to high security departments (CSIS, CSE, RCMP)</li> <li>• Accessibility to people with disabilities (WCAG compliant)</li> <li>• Available across Canada</li> </ul>	
42	<p>In the Reference projects section of the ITQ for User Experience, it is stated that: "The bidder must provide client reference information that demonstrates that the proposed improved user experience solution is viable for an employee population of approximately 300,000. The bidder must provide client reference information that they successfully implemented the solution that they are proposing."</p> <p>This size of employees is also referred to in the Technical architecture question: "The bidder must demonstrate that the solution is scalable for different volumes of users on multiple systems (Case Management Tool and Phoenix for example) within the Federal government: 300,000; 360,000; 450,000."</p> <p>Can you please confirm that you are looking for information that confirms that these solutions can scale to these sizes of user populations, but that reference projects do not need to have achieved these numbers of users? We ask because there are no other employers in Canada who have anywhere near these numbers of employees and therefore Canadian reference projects are not available with these user numbers.</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> Canada is looking for client reference information that confirms the proposed solutions can be scaled to these sizes of user populations. The reference projects do not need to have achieved these numbers of users but the bidder must certify that their proposed solution is scalable to the identified number of users.</p>
43	<p>Will the government expand the proof scope of criteria 3.c) Payroll Operations to include</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> Bi-monthly payroll processing will be accepted.</p>

	bi-monthly in addition to bi-weekly? Any vendor should be able to accommodate both with no issues, however by constraining to bi-weekly only this limits the valid references that a vendor can use.	
44	Regarding Section 3.c) - Lowering the Queue: Will Canada consider references compliant if the reference is for payroll operations for a client whose volume of employees receiving a pay check exceeds 15,000, and due to jurisdictional requirements, the payroll operations are weekly or monthly?	<b>Yes.</b> Weekly and monthly payroll processing will be accepted. Bi-weekly is not a factor in experience at this stage.
45	Can PSPC please provide a list of e-mail addresses requiring access (for evaluation purposes) to our secure file sharing system for the requirements requesting links to files and/or URLs?	Respondents will be contacted during the evaluations to request access for e-mail addresses.
46	Will Canada kindly consider extending the ITQ submission date to December 17, 2018?	No extension granted.
47	In reference to 3.c) - Lowering the Queue: The bidder must provide two references where it has been contracted to <b>process</b> payroll operations for clients where the bi-weekly payroll exceeded 15,000 employees receiving a pay check.  Question: Would Canada clarify that it requires two references where the bidder was contracted to design, implement or process payroll operations for clients where the biweekly payroll exceeded 15,000 employees receiving a pay check?	Criteria 3.c) is only asking for experience in <b>processing</b> payroll operations, not designing or implementing them, with 2 references to back this up. Canada is not looking for experience in designing or implementing payroll operations.
48	In the Robotics section 1.b) we are asked to supply a copy of our commercial agreement between ourselves and the subcontractor, in this case a product vendor. While we are happy to supply proof that we authorized and qualified to deliver the product we cannot share our commercial confidential legal agreements. Will Canada please remove the requirement or modify it such that it matches the proof required in other sections?	For this criteria <b>and any other criteria contained in this ITQ</b> , Bidders can mask the confidential details, or simply have an email from the solution provider confirming the agreement exists.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**