

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. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client G9292-176717		Date 2019-04-11
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.
006

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. 006

This amendment is raised to answer Bidders' questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question 37:

Reference: MTC1 g) and Form M1 g)

Will Bidders be allowed to use similar resource categories and task equivalencies (task equivalencies to either the TBIPS tasks or RFP's SOW tasks)?

Answer 37:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 38:

For Workstream 1 – Business Services, Mandatory Technical Criteria, **MTC1**, Bidder's Corporate Experience, bidders must have billed for at least 15 resources that are the same as the resource categories listed in the Statement of Work of this requirement. Please advise if the category must match but not necessarily the level (for example the current ESDC Business Services Tier 2 that this RFP will replace, only lists Business Analyst Level 2 and not Business Analyst Level 3 resources).

Answer 38:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 39:

Section 4.3 (e) (ii) of the bid solicitation describes the methodology to be used by vendors when substantiating professional services rates during the evaluation process. As part of this methodology it states "in relation to the invoice in (i), evidence from the Bidder's customer that the services identified in the invoice include at least 50% of the tasks listed in the Statement of Work for the category of resource being assessed....."

This would imply that alternate categories can be used to substantiate a professional service rate as long as the 50% of tasks is met.

Given this methodology is in place to assess the professional service rates, can vendors assume that in responding to RTC1 on both Workstream 1 – Business Services and RTC1 Project Management Services alternate categories can be used to demonstrate the required resource categories as long as 50% of the Statement of Work tasks for that category can be demonstrated?

Answer 39:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 40:

With respect to RTC1, for both Streams 1 and 2, can the Crown confirm that Bidders are required to demonstrate that they have provided resources (and identify the number of resources provided in the category) in the resource categories listed under RTC1 irrespective of level of resource (i.e. 1, 2 or 3) given the fact that the tasks are the same whereas the level refers to years of experience and GC TBIPS contracts vary in terms of levels required by resource category. Some TBIPS and similar contracts only require a single level by resource category including the current ESDC contracts for this requirement.

Answer 40:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 41:

For RTC1, Workstreams 1, item a) *"The name of each resource and the resource category and level they were billed for by the Bidder; and b) A signed certification from the resource that they had previously worked for the Bidder in a resource category the same as those listed in the Statement of Work of this requirement"* – We have a TBIPS contract that only has level 2 in one of the business categories. Therefore this client has been engaging senior resources under this Level 2 category and the resources are actually doing level 3 work. Can you please confirm that a resource that has worked in the same TBIPS category doing Level 3 work, but was engaged under the Level 2 instead of Level 3 because of contract restriction, will be accepted for points in RTC1?

Answer 41:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 42:

Similarly for MTC1, Workstream 1, item (c), *"Must have billed for at least 15 resources that are the same as the resource categories listed in the Statement of Work in this requirement."*: Please confirm that as stated, if some of the 15 billed resources are the same TBIPS category but a Level 2 instead of Level 3, that this will be compliant. Please confirm?

Answer 42:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 43:

With respect to MTC1 and MTC4, for both Streams 1 and 2, can the Crown confirm that the requirement for "two separate IM/IT contracts" includes any contracts that included similar resource categories undertaking similar tasks to those included in Annex A, the Statement of Work and that Bidders can demonstrate this requirement with contracts issued under TBIPS, TSPS, or other contracts established in the public or private sector to meet similar requirements.

Answer 43:

For MTC1 – See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

For MTC 4 - Correct. Bidders may use any contract to demonstrate experience delivering and supporting business transformation services for an outside client's IM/IT project.

Question 44:

Regarding Amendment 2 – The answer to question 1 is unclear, as the first and second sentence provide two different requirements. Can the Crown please confirm that it should read as follows:

The Bidder must demonstrate same or similar by mapping at least 80% of the SOW tasks of this bid solicitation to a minimum of two resource categories on each respective IM/IT contract. In the event that 80% equals a decimal (for example 4.8 tasks), we would round down (i.e. accept 4 tasks as being equivalent).

Answer 44:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 45:

Regarding RTC1 for Workstream 1 and Workstream 2 – Asking vendors to have provided this many resources under each category at that specific level is extremely restricting, and highly favours the incumbents who are currently providing resources under these categories and levels currently. Many vendors have contracts where they provide services in categories that are very similar, but may have a different title (i.e. a Project Coordinator, level 3 has very similar duties to a Project Scheduler, level 3). We respectfully request that the Crown allows vendors to submit resources that are in similar categories, as long as they demonstrate that these resources have performed 50% of the tasks listed in Annex A – Statement of Work.

Answer 45:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 46:

Reference #1: RTC2, RTC3 and Amendment #3

In Amendment #3, the MTC#1 and RTC#1 reference contracts' experience period has been changed to be experience within the period from 2012 to bid submittal, rather than contracts awarded within that period. Does this change (contracts active during the period rather than awarded), apply to the Bidder's Client Demand Manager's requirements as well - e.g. **RTC2** "Only experience claimed between January 1, 2012 and bid closing date" and **RTC3** "...only contracts awarded between January 1, 2010 and bid closing date."

Answer 46:

See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 47:

Corporate contract experience requirements are noted as within a time period from January 2012 or January 2010 to "bid closing date". Would the Crown consider changing "bid closing date" to "RFP published date", March 2019. With every submission date extension, the Bidder's numbers have to be recalculated to the new end date. Having a firm timeframe/end date reduces Bidders' recalculation efforts.

Answer 47:

After consultation with our stakeholders, we do not anticipate any further extensions and the evaluation criteria will remain as written.

Question 48:

For MTC1, for both Streams, Amendment No. 002, Question 1 allows for mapping of 80% of the SOW tasks to demonstrate that the Bidder has provided the same or similar resource category.

- a) We are assuming that Form M1 is to be used to include the mapping. Can the Crown please confirm that Form M1 will be modified to record this information? If not, can the Crown confirm that Bidders are permitted to submit a table in a cross-referenced Appendix to substantiate the mapping?
- b) In addition, can the Crown please confirm that no mapping is required if the contract being used to demonstrate experience is a TBIPS contract?

Answer 48:

- a) *Bidders are permitted to submit a table in a cross-referenced Appendix to substantiate the mapping. Mapping of 80% of the SOW tasks is only required for resource categories similar to, not the same as, those outlined in the SOW.*
- b) *Confirmed. See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.*

Question 49:

For Workstream 1 and 2, under RTC1 the Crown has requested that Bidders demonstrate recent experience providing up to five resources per resource category per Stream in order to be awarded maximum points.

Can the Crown please confirm that Bidders can demonstrate that they have provided resources in the same and/or similar categories using the mapping method accepted under Question 1 in Amendment No. 002, namely mapping 80% of the tasks related to the resource category in the relevant Statement of Work?

Answer 49:

Confirmed. See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 50:

For RTC1, under Workstream 2, Project Management Services, the Crown requests that Bidders demonstrate experience providing Project Schedulers.

Will the Crown please accept a Project Manager and/or a Project Administrator as demonstration of this experience, where 80% of the SOW tasks can be mapped to demonstrate the Bidder provided the same or similar type of resource for this resource category?

Answer 50:

Confirmed. See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 51:

For MTC1 for both Streams, the Crown requests that Bidders use two separate IM/IT contracts to demonstrate experience.

Can the Crown please confirm that an IM/IT contract, for the purposes of this requirement, is defined as any contract that “demonstrates experience delivering and supporting business transformation services for an outside client’s IM/IT project,” which is the wording used in MTC4?

Answer 51:

An IM/IT contract must be related to a particular activity required to address a specific Information Technology (IT) need.

Question 52:

Typically when amendments are received, a response is provided in the form of Q&As, and any corresponding impact to the Mandatory and Rated Technical criteria is provided at the same time.

Can the Crown please confirm that it will be providing Bidders with revised versions of Attachment 4.1 and 4.2 to reflect the changes made in the Q&As?

Answer 52:

Confirmed. See Solicitation Amendment 005 for revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Question 53:

These RFPs incorporate the following definition of Bidder by referencing Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC) (04 (2007-11-30):

"Bidder" means the person or entity (or, in the case of a joint venture, the persons or entities) submitting a bid to perform a contract for goods, services or both. It does not include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the Bidder, or its subcontractors".

We assume from this definition that Bidders are not permitted to cite experience from a firm with which the Bidder intends to sub-contract some or all of the work under individual taskings under the resulting contracting vehicle. Please confirm. If our understanding is correct, would the Crown consider allowing experience cited by a firm/organization that will be subcontracting with an invited supplier? This would apply to both the mandatory and rated requirements.

As it currently stands, not permitting sub-contractor experience significantly impacts our (and other firms') ability to respond to this RFP, as some of the highly relevant experience gained within previous engagements was partially completed by subcontractor organizations.

Answer 53:

As stated in the definition, Bidders cannot use the experience of a sub-contractor.

Question 54:

In regards to WS2 MTC1 item c), can the Crown confirm if the following scenarios would be compliant:

- a) Firm provides contract reference demonstrating 7 resources in the Project Manager category and 8 resources in the Project Executive category for a total of 15 resources.
- b) Firm provides contract reference demonstrating 2 resources in the Project Manager category and 2 resources in the Project Executive category and 11 resources in other categories not listed in the SOW for WS2 for a total of 15 resources.
- c) Firm provides contract reference demonstrating 2 resources in the Project Manager category and 2 resources in the Project Executive category and 1 resource in the Project Scheduler and 10 resources in the Change Management Consultant for a total of 15 resources.

Answer 54:

- a) *Compliant.*
- b) *Non-compliant.*
- c) *Compliant.*

Question 55:

Under Amendment No. 2 for the above mentioned solicitation in Q&A #1, the Crown indicated that:

"Canada will allow bidders to demonstrate, using two separate IM/IT contracts, where **15** resources were provided from at least two of the same or similar resource categories outlined in the SOW (i.e. at least two categories for each contract), as long as these contracts meet the balance of the requirements (a and b)."

This differs from the response given to this same question under Amendment No. 2 for the Set-Aside Program for Aboriginal Businesses (SPAB) version of this solicitation (solicitation no. G9292-176717/B), where the Crown instead indicates that:

"Canada will allow bidders to demonstrate, using two separate IM/IT contracts, where **10** resources were provided from at least two of the same or similar resource categories outlined in the SOW (i.e. at least two categories for each contract), as long as these contracts meet the balance of the requirements (a and b)."

We recommend in the spirit of fair, open, and transparent procurement that the Crown amend the non-SPAB version of this RFP so that bidders may demonstrate (using two separate IM/IT contracts) the provision of **10** resources from at least two of the resource categories outlined in the SOW.

Answer 55:

The number of resources for the Set-aside solicitation (G9292-176717/B) was reduced to reflect the scope of the requirement which is smaller than the open solicitation (G9292-176717/A). As such, the number of resources will not be reduced for G9292-176717/A..

Question 56:

It is recommend that the Crown amend RTC3 for both workstreams to allow for contracts awarded prior to January 1st, 2010 to be considered for evaluation purposes. Given that the Crown is requiring 14+ years of experience to achieve full points on this criterion (as per Q&A 15 under Amendment 3), it is not possible to achieve this score within the timeframe specified by the requirement.

Answer 56:

Canada will allow for contracts awarded prior to January 1, 2012, provided that the experience claimed is between January 1, 2012 and bid closing date.

Question 57:

Regarding MTC1: Would the Crown please confirm that bidders need only provide information (including name, resource category, level, and brief description of tasks and responsibilities) for 15 resources per contract, rather than the total number of resources for each contract?

Answer 57:

The resource information requested in MTC1 is for 15 resources per contract, rather than the total number of resources per contract.

Question 58:

Reference: Amendment 003, Question and Answer #15

Regarding Question and Answer #15, the Crown has provided a response that states that a Client Demand Manager must have 14+ years of experience to score full points. Because a minimum of 5 years is required for MTC2, it is believed that the rating scale for RTC2 item b) starts with 5+ years to award points for experience on top of MTC2. With Answer #15, a gap has been created in the rating scale where a Client Demand Manager with 5+ to 10 years of experience does not obtain points. Would the Crown please re-evaluate its response and consider reinstating the original scale where 9+ years of total experience is awarded the maximum number of points?

Answer 58:

The answer to Question 15 should have stated, "The years over the mandatory 5 years of experience will be rated. To obtain full points the proposed Client Demand Manager must have an additional 4+ years of experience for a total of 9+ years."

Question 59:

Regarding Workstream both Workstreams 1 & 2 (Business Services, and Project Management Services), as described in the ESDC as and when requested Project Management contract (G9292-176717/A), MTC4 calls for a very broad range of experiences to demonstrate (showing 7 items, numbered a) to g)). As certain of these items are not normally found in general business transformation engagements (item e) Organization Change Management in particular), there we request that a compliant MTC4 may be satisfied through more than one reference.

Answer 59:

One or more projects can be used to demonstrate experiences MTC4 a) to g).

Question 60:

The requirement to valid experience to 80% for MTC1 is very limiting for example the Business Analyst category has 22 items meaning we would be required to map to 18 of which in this category also includes tester experience and some are specific to ESDC. We request that the 80% mapping be reduced to more common used Tier 2 criteria of 50%.

Answer 60:

After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written. To demonstrate mapping, non-ESDC projects will be accepted.

Question 61:

RE: Answer 1, AMD 002

Answer 1, AMD 002 states: "*The Bidder must demonstrate [the] same or similar [category] by mapping at least 80% of the SOW tasks of this bid...*". Some of the SOW tasks are ESDC / Government of Canada specific; for example, task h) in the Business Continuity SOW states: "*Interpret enterprise requirements of disaster recovery to ensure compliance to ESDC and TB standards*".

As the corporate requirements do not require the bidders' experience to be from the GoC, please confirm that resources who completed tasks such as these adhering to industry and organizational best practices and standards will be accepted.

Answer 61:

The Crown will accept,

Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist (Level 3) Task:

h) Interpret enterprise requirements of disaster recovery to ensure compliance to ESDC and TB Standards, as well as industry and organizational best practices and standards.

Question 62:

Reference #1: G9292-176717/B (Set Aside)

- a) Would the Crown please confirm that the required number of resources has been changed to 10 resources?
- b) If the answer to a) above is yes, is it also applicable to RFP ESDCG9292-176717/A (Non Set Aside)?

Answer 62:

- a) *For RFP G9292-176717/B, the number of resources has been changed from 15 to 10.*
- b) *For RFP G9292-176717/A, the number of resources remain unchanged at 15.*

Question 63:

MTC2: We are assuming that the same Client Demand Manager resource can be proposed to handle both streams. Can the Crown confirm?

Answer 63:

Confirmed.

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006

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

Question 64:

The crown has stated that: Canada will allow bidders to demonstrate, using two separate IM/IT contracts, where 15 resources were provided from at least two of the same or similar resource categories outlined in the SOW (i.e. at least two categories for each contract), as long as these contracts meet the balance of the requirements (a and b). The Bidder must demonstrate **same** or similar by mapping at least 80% of the SOW tasks of this bid solicitation to a minimum of two resources from each respective IM/IT resource category. In the event that 80% equals a decimal (for example 4.8 tasks), we would round down (i.e. accept 4 tasks as being equivalent). As part of MTC1 bidders are asked to provide the information requested using FORM M1.

FORM M1 asks for a brief description of the services performed by the resources using 2 to 3 sentences maximum. However, the answer provided by the Crown states for the **same** category 80% of SOW tasks of this bid solicitation must be mapped. The Business Analyst SOW has over 16 tasks.

Please confirm that the 2 to 3 sentence description of services performed is acceptable for **same** TBIPS categories.

Answer 64:

See revisions to the evaluation criteria that have been made through Solicitation Amendment No. 005.

*The 2 to 3 sentence description of services performed is acceptable for **same** TBIPS categories. For **similar** resource categories, the 2 to 3 sentence description of services performed is acceptable in addition to mapping 80% of the SOW tasks to the proposed resource category.*

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.