



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

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT/CE DOCUMENT CONTIENT
UNE EXIGENCE DE SÉCURITÉ

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Informatics Professional Services Division / Division
des services professionnels en informatique

Les Terrasses de la Chaudière

10, rue Wellington, 4ième

étage/Floor

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS - IT Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation G9292-176717/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client G9292-176717	Date 2019-04-04
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-380-34737	
File No. - N° de dossier 380zm.G9292-176717	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-04-30	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: Cook, Gail	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 380zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-9369 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-2675
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT 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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
G9292-176717/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
380zm

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
G9292-176717

File No. - N° du dossier
380zmG9292-176717

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

AMENDMENT NO. 004

This amendment is raised to answer Bidders' questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question 28:

For Workstream 1 and Workstream 2, Mandatory Technical Criteria, **MTC1**, Bidder's Corporate Experience, please confirm that cited placements (15 resources) may be on-going when using Form M1.

Answer 28:

For Workstream 1 and Workstream 2, Mandatory Technical Criteria, *MTC1, Bidder's Corporate Experience, cited placements (15 resources) may be on going, provided that MTC1 (a), (b) and (c), are demonstrated prior to bid closing.*

Question 29:

The SOW mentions for MTC3 "the proposed resource must demonstrate experience in each of the technologies, software and tools identified in the TA as essential", but there is no info on technologies, software, or tools. Do you have any idea what does this mean?

Answer 29:

Since the technology infrastructure changes with time, this criterion will allow new technologies, software, etc. to be evaluated at the Task Authorization stage of the contract.

Question 30:

At Part 4 of the bid solicitation, Financial Evaluation (i) Step 1: it is stated that the median band range is (-10% and +30% of the median) and bidders who propose a rate outside of this band will score 0.

We also noticed that at page 23 of 120, paragraph (e) substantiation of Professional Services Rates, there is a reference to Canada may request price support from all otherwise responsive bidders who have proposed a rate that is at least 20% lower than the median rate bid by all responsive bidders for the relevant resource category or categories. We assume that this statement was included in error as the lower band range is -10% and not -20%. And also bidders proposing rates outside the range will be scoring 0. Can you clarify this statement of page 23 item (e)?

Answer 30:

The Financial Evaluation and the Substantiation of Professional Services Rates are two separate processes. The percentages specified for these items are correct.

Question 31:

Refer to Attachment 4.1, Mandatory Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 (Business Services), and Workstream 2 (Project Management Services), MTC4 – Bidder's Experience Delivering and Supporting Business Transformation Services (in both Streams).

The response requirements for this criteria appear to be more in-line with the activities and responsibilities of a resource or consultant, rather than the activities and responsibilities of a company, as items a) through g) would apply to individual departmental needs as part of their business transformation requirements, and a Bidder cannot speak directly to such specific experience.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
G9292-176717/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
380zm

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
G9292-176717

File No. - N° du dossier
380zmG9292-176717

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Therefore, would the Crown please provide some clarity as to how Bidders are expected to respond to this criteria, i.e. the Bidder should reference their corporate experience delivering the above experience (Business Transformation Services) and should provide Client references for the Crown to verify.

Answer 31:

Bidders should reference their corporate experience delivering and supporting business transformation services for an outside client's IM/IT project.

Question 32:

With respect to RTC1, for both Streams 1 and 2, can the Crown confirm that the Bidder can demonstrate this experience by providing the information outlined under a) and b) requested by resource category under *all* valid contracts held by the Bidder (government or private sector). To be specific, can the Crown clarify that for the purposes of this rated criterion, if services billed under a previous JV, by a single bid member will be considered?

Answer 32:

See Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions, 3.1 Joint Venture Experience and RTC1 which states, “For the purposes of this rated criterion, where the Bidder is a Joint Venture, services billed by any Joint Venture member will be considered.”

Question 33:

For both Streams 1 and 2 the Crown has identified a mandatory requirements related to “technology, software (and) tool” that will be TA specific upon contract award. Given the fact that the availability of resources varies widely depending on requirement for experience with a specific “technology, software (and) tool” will the Crown remove this requirement or modify this requirement in both Streams and 1 to be a rated requirement at time of TA issuance?

Answer 33:

After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.

Question 34:

In the event that a company wins a contract on the Capacity on Demand supply arrangement, would they be precluded from bidding on solutions-based contracts related to ongoing projects within ESDC (Benefits Delivery Modernization, Service Transformation Plan, etc.)

Answer 34:

We do not foresee a reason why winning bidders would be precluded from bidding on future ESDC requirements.

Question 35:

Reference: RTC2 in both Workstream 1 and Workstream 2

Rated Criteria RTC2 awards points for experience simultaneously managing resources containing categories similar to those listed in the Statement of Work for the workstream, with over 40 simultaneous resources required to score full points. If a company were to bid on both Workstream 1 and Workstream 2, this would mean that Bidders would be required to demonstrate experience managing over 40 resources simultaneously related to the Business Services stream and over 40 resources simultaneously related to the Project Management services team. Given that many

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
G9292-176717/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
380zm

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
G9292-176717

File No. - N° du dossier
380zmG9292-176717

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

companies would dedicate a single Client Demand Manager to manage the ESDC account, this creates a situation where Bidders must prove that the Client Demand Manager managed over 80 resources, which is further restricted by the requirement that Bidders can only cite resources placed in either Business Services or Project Management type roles. It is very improbable that a single Client Demand Manager would have managed 40 Project Management resources simultaneously while also meeting the requirement of managing 40 Business Services resources simultaneously.

We understand that ESDC requires that the Client Demand Manager have experience managing large numbers of resources simultaneously, however, we feel that the requirement for those resources to be only in roles related to the Statement of Work to be very limiting. Further, rated criteria RTC1 already requires Bidders to demonstrate their capability and experience providing resources in the relevant categories for each Workstream. Given this, we would like to respectfully request that bullet c) within Rated Criteria RTC2 for both Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 be amended to allow Bidders to demonstrate Client Account Manager experience managing resources on contract regardless of the resource category under which they worked.

Answer 35:

Canada will allow Bidders to demonstrate Client Demand Manager experience managing resources on contract regardless of the resource category under which they have worked.

Question 36:

Reference: Attachment 4.1 MTC1

Would the Crown please consider lowering the two IM/IT contract references' minimum contract value from \$5 Million to \$3 Million? The number of varied requirements applicable to the two IM/IT reference contracts' limits the pool of contract references Bidders' can use. Lowering the value will enable more qualified Bidders to respond to this solicitation.

Answer 36:

After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.