

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des
soumissions - TPSGC
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**Invitation to Qualify/
Invitation à se qualifier**

Comments - Commentaires

Title - Sujet "HRP-RHP" ITQ - Gate 2 - HR and Pay Next Gen		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 24062-190560/C	Amendment 4	Date 2019-01-04
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 24062-190560		GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG 24062-190560
File No. - N° de dossier 682xe.24062-190560	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-01-18		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Heure Normale de l'est (EST)
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pelchat, Marco		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 682xe
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 665-7128 ()		FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Secrétariat Conseil du Trésor du Canada 90 Elgin Ottawa, ON K1A0R3		

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée Voir aux présentes	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

NOTE FOR INTERESTED SUPPLIERS

This Solicitation Amendment 004 document will serve to:

- 1- Make modifications to the ITQ document Attachment 2
- 2- Provide the interested suppliers with the questions and answers received.
- 3- Publish the Microsoft Word version of the ITQ (Note, in case of changes, the .pdf version of the document takes precedence).

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”.

MODIFICATIONS

1- Modifications to the ITQ document - Attachment 2:

Delete – Evaluation Criteria R9.3 in its entirety
 Insert – Evaluation Criteria R9.3 as modified below:

R9.3. SUPPORT MODEL

Requirement			
In a document or presentation of no more than 15 pages, the bidder must demonstrate that incidents and service requests impacting the proposed solution will be resolved efficiently and effectively, taking into account the GC's context. This environment includes the need to service and support multiple GC organizations, each with their own help desk, as well as the existence of a GC central pay support office.		Weighting	2%
		Evaluation Method	Bid
Evaluation Criteria			
Not Acceptable (0 pts)	Acceptable (5 pts)	Good (7 pts)	Excellent (10 pts)
The information provided does not, or insufficiently, demonstrates how incidents and service requests will be resolved efficiently and effectively.	The information provided includes a proposed incident management process which describes, for each step of the incident identification, troubleshooting and resolution process: 1. The proposed integration points between the GC and the bidder, and, 2. The proposed split of responsibilities	Acceptable plus: The information provided includes proposed roles and responsibilities for departmental support organizations as well as for the GC central pay support office.	Good plus: The information provided includes a recommended escalation management process detailing the various levels of support and who would own each level of support. The information provided also includes a description of the roles and responsibilities for departmental support

	between the GC and the bidder.		organizations as well as for the GC central pay support office as it relates to the escalation management process.
Bid Response			
Bid Self-Assessment			
Not Acceptable	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TRACK LOG OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PROVIDED TO DATE

<u>QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</u>	<u>PROVIDED ON DOCUMENT</u>
Questions and Answers 1 to 3	Amendment 001
Questions and Answers 4 to 6	Amendment 002
Questions and Answer 7 to 10	Amendment 003

Question #11: Criteria R8.4 - Is this question about how we will be able to effectively manage key Phase II outputs (Validate Solution, Successful Pilot, Implementation and change Management, Target Service & Operating Model and Detailed costing) to ensure a smooth transition to the full deployment?

Answer #11: Through R8.4, the GC is evaluating the bidder's approach to: value, performance and benefits management; ensuring the bidder will successfully deliver the needed Phase II business outcomes. This approach could include, but is not limited to: defining planned benefits, tracking the performance of implemented solution(s), measuring return on investment and total cost of ownership, comparison against industry benchmarking... Generally, this comes with a methodology, reports and tools.

Question #12: Section 9 - From the Government of Canada perspective, do service management and support both relate to how Canada interfaces with the Software Vendor for any functional or technical questions, tickets, issues and concerns? If so, is 9.2 Service Management related to the Government of Canada Interface experience with the Software Vendor, while 9.3 Support Model is related to the process for resolution once the Software Vendor has been contacted via the 9.2 Service Management process?

Answer #12: Through R9.2, the GC is evaluating the bidder's overall approach to, and maturity of, its service management framework, which does include how the bidder would manage and successfully resolve any functional or technical questions, tickets, issues and concerns. The response to R9.2, while demonstrating how it meets the criteria, is expected to highlight the bidder's generic service management framework.

Through R9.3, the GC is rather evaluating the bidder's service management strategy capabilities by asking to demonstrate what is the bidder's proposed support model for the GC. The model and incident management process should indeed describe the proposed process for resolution once

the Software Vendor has been contacted via the channels highlighted in R9.2, but do so taking into account the current GC context and environment. The proposed incident management process should therefore describe the proposed split of responsibilities between the bidder and the GC.

Criteria R9.3 is modified under this amendment (see above)

Question #13 : For the Security Clearance and Support Model related to security clearance requirements (referred to in sections 2.4 and R4.3 Scalability and Portability)

1. Can Canada confirm the security requirement for bidders will be Protected B?
2. Should Canada clarify that the security requirement is to be higher than Protected B, when and how will bidders be notified and will they be provided sufficient time to respond?
3. With regard to Corporate oversight, Management, Consultants, and the Vendor's Support Team who may be located in a "Follow-the-Sun" model- what are the implications of Protected B and of Secret?

Answer #13: For the Security Clearance and Support Model related to security clearance requirements (referred to in sections 2.4 and R4.3 Scalability and Portability)

1. Current requirements are set at Protected B Medium Medium (PBMM) for core departments; see (link) for GC security level description; however the NextGen Solution has an Enterprise solution scope which also includes organizations such as CSIS, FINTRAC and CSE that, should they adopt the NextGen solution, will require a higher security level than PBMM.
2. The government of Canada requires both Protected B solutions for the majority of the departments and higher security requirements solutions for a minor set of departments. As per question 4.3, bidders will be awarded a higher score for the ability to handle both Protected B and higher.
3. Generally, the Government of Canada requires cleared personnel to support any system with protected information, however, it is up to the bidder to describe any techniques or tools that may exist where vendors can access systems without the need to access data which can lower the required clearance level.

Question #14: R.8.2 Approach to Planning Pilots – This requirement mentions a "Fully operational pilot". Could Canada provide more details for this requirement, specifically (but not limited to):

A) Definition of the size/scope of the pilot:

- Does a Fully operational pilot refer to a complete replacement and transfer onto the pilot of some employee group onto the new (pilot) platform?
- Does a pilot refer to a small government department, and how many employees would represent such a department?
- Does a pilot refer to a sub-group of employees (a given job category or union membership) within a department?

B) Definition of fully operational

- Does it include the actual production of live paycheques/bank deposits/remittances?
- Does it include conversion of data from a legacy system?
- Does it include the replacement of any time/scheduling tool used by the pilot community?

Alternatively, does a pilot signify a fully operation “boardroom pilot” or proof of concept executing parallel employee transactions and pay calculation but not include removing employees from current HR and pay system?

Answer #14: For R8.2 Approach to Planning Pilots, please see additional details below:

Pilot

- A *fully operational pilot* refers to the execution of the work required to deliver a certain number of new HR & Pay business capabilities to a certain number of employees (pilot population).
- The delivery of the capabilities could include, but may not be limited to, the implementation and configuration of a new HCM solution, the migration of the needed data, the onboarding of the targeted employees onto the new solution, any required business and change management activities, etc.
- A fully operational pilot represents an actual production system. Given the high likelihood that Pay would be one of the chosen business capabilities for the pilot, the pilot would indeed include the actual production of live paychecks, bank deposits and remittances.
- As described above, a *fully operational pilot* refers to the execution of the work required to deliver the new business capabilities to the pilot population. As such,
 - if conversion of data from a legacy system is required to deliver the business capabilities, then yes, the pilot would include this within its project scope;
 - if the replacement of any time/scheduling tool used by the pilot population is required to deliver the business capabilities, then yes, the pilot would include this within its project scope.
- The new solution would replace, for the targeted business capabilities, existing HR and Pay solution used by the pilot population. However, the old solution would not be decommissioned to allow for easy rollback, should the pilot be unsuccessful.

Pilot Population

- The GC has not yet finalized the choice of the population for the pilot and is expecting to hear bidders' recommendations on this as part of their response to R8.2.
- The GC is currently exploring various pilot scenarios that follow an iterative implementation approach, ensuring pilots would provide both: 1. A meaningful representation of larger scale implementations, as well as 2. An environment in which any failures would be limited in scope and learnings acquired quickly.

Gate 3 Proof of Concept

- In preparation for potential pilots in Phase II, it is likely that the response to Gate 3 will include setting up a *proof of concept executing parallel employee transactions and pay calculation but not include removing employees from current HR and pay system*. Ideally, the proof of concept would be configured using anonymized data from one of the chosen pilot populations.

Question #15: Please confirm if delivery of the pilot is scheduled during Phase II? Is there an expected timeline to have this first pilot functional?

Answer #15: The delivery of one or more Pilots is scheduled for Phase II. The timelines for Phase II are currently being refined and will be shaped in part by the feedback received as part of Gate 2. Given the current HR & Pay context, the GC would like to successfully implement Pilots as quickly as reasonably possible.

Question #16: Since Canada is looking for a recommendation for 'select, plan, cost and deliver' what is the timing of Phase II, and when will the information provided from their Phase I definition be available? The timing and definition of the pilot will impact the selection and response.

Answer #16: Phase I is scheduled to end at the latest in September 2019. The information developed during Phase I is being shared publicly as early as possible at each gate. Bidders are invited to ask specific questions if they feel some pieces of information are required and have not been released yet.

The timelines for Phase II are currently being refined and will be shaped in part by the feedback received as part of Gate 2.

Question #17: At **R8.2 Approach to Planning Pilots**, The government mentions two (2) "Fully operational pilots". Would Canada please confirm if two pilots refer to two from the same Bidder; or one selected from two different Bidders? In addition if two (2) are required from the same Bidder would the two pilots be realized within the same department? Eg. two different employee groups/unions/locations.

Answer #17: This question is still being discussed internally and the GC welcomes bidders' recommendations regarding this question. The current thinking within the NextGen team is that the Pilots would be delivered by the same bidder. The choice of the Pilot population has not yet been determined yet and the Pilots may or may not be realized within the same department. The GC is also still confirming whether there will be one or more Pilots.

Question #18: For the User Exhibitions, would the GC accept the provision of self-contained clickable demos and/or simulated environments. These would provide a consistent and clean experience for each user through a low risk solution requiring minimal training and support.

Answer #18: One of the purposes of the User Exhibitions is to allow users to try out real solutions. For this reason, the GC prefers that bidders provide a real environment that users can use during the User Exhibitions. The GC also recognizes the advantages of simulated environments and welcomes the provision of such solutions to also be used as part of the User Exhibitions.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED