



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 Division / Division
des services professionnels en informatique

Les Terrasses de la Chaudière

10, rue Wellington, 4ième

étage/Floor

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet IPS - Set-Aside under PSAB	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation T8086-172450/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 010
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-172450	Date 2019-04-15
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-626-34856	
File No. - N° de dossier 626zm.T8086-172450	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-05-15	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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: Holden, Carole	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 626zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-9217 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-2675
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

AMENDMENT NO. 010

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and to answer bidders' questions.

RFP REVISIONS

Revision 1:

At Page 1 of the RFP, Solicitation Closes:

DELETE: 2019-05-01

INSERT: 2019-05-15

Revision 2:

At Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 4.3 Financial Evaluation, (c) Financial Evaluation – Method A, article (ii) Step 2 – Points Allocation;

DELETE: Table 1 – Maximum Points Assigned

INSERT:

TABLE 1 - MAXIMUM POINTS ASSIGNED INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES						
Resource Categories	Contract Period Year 1	Contract Period Year 2	Contract Period Year 3	Option Period Year 4	Option Period Year 5	Total Points
A.7 Programmer/Analyst – Level 2	50	50	50	50	50	250
A.7 Programmer/Analyst - Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
A.11 Tester – Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
B.1 Business Analyst – Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
B.10 Help Desk Specialist – Level 2	50	50	50	50	50	250
B.10 Help Desk Specialist – Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
TOTAL	300	300	300	300	300	1500

Revision 3:

At Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 4.3 Financial Evaluation, (d) Financial Evaluation – Method B, article (i) Step 1 – Points Allocation;

DELETE: Table 3 – Maximum Points Assigned

INSERT:

TABLE 3 - MAXIMUM POINTS ASSIGNED INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES						
Resource Categories	Contract Period Year 1	Contract Period Year 2	Contract Period Year 3	Option Period Year 4	Option Period Year 5	Total Points
A.7 Programmer/Analyst – Level 2	50	50	50	50	50	250
A.7 Programmer/Analyst - Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
A.11 Tester – Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
B.1 Business Analyst – Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
B.10 Help Desk Specialist – Level 2	50	50	50	50	50	250
B.10 Help Desk Specialist – Level 3	50	50	50	50	50	250
TOTAL	300	300	300	300	300	1500

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 29:

Reference – 4.3 Financial Evaluation and 4.4 Basis of Selection

Section 2.6 of the RFP invites Bidders to make suggestions for improvements to the requirement during the solicitation period by outlining the suggested improvement and the reasons for the suggestion. Given this, we would like to address the method of financial evaluation chosen by the Crown outlined in Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection.

The Crown has assigned variable point weighting of the resource categories used for Method A financial evaluation. By assigning variable point weighting to the resource categories, this creates a scenario where Bidders are forced to both raise and drop rates above/below the market value in order to end up with the optimal financial score. For instance, because the Crown has structured the Financial Evaluation to include variable point weighting for different resource categories (25 points for some roles all the way up to 100 points for others), the Bill Rates for the roles that Transport Canada thinks it will use the most (the highly weighted categories) will be the lowest and may not in any way be representative of rates that would be required to attract viable candidates. In essence, roles that are more heavily weighted will be more heavily discounted, simply because the math of the evaluation formula makes it necessary to do that to try to win. Alternatively, by leaving some roles with lower point allocations, it leaves open the door for vendors to hike rates notably above market rates while having a lessor impact on their financial score. More importantly, that means that gradually candidates that should have been placed in a lower paying role (because of the role definition) will migrate to categories with higher paying potential. In the end, resources that should cost market rate or just below will end up costing more than market rate. This could result in notable turnover in the lower paying categories and the client overpaying in the lower weighted categories.

The challenge of resource category weighting resulting in poor resource quality and high resource turnover is seen over and over in supply arrangements that have similar financial parameters. As a result, and in an effort to see Transport Canada be able to secure viable candidates for this project who will serve the duration of their task authorizations, we would like to request that:

- For the financial evaluation, set the point allocations so that all resource categories are weighted equally, eg. 100 points for the initial contract term and each option period thereafter. This avoids scenarios where, because of high point allocations, rates have to be “tanked” simply for vendors to stay competitive on score.

Answer 29: See Revisions 2 and 3 from this solicitation amendment.

Question 30

In a recent town hall meeting, PSPC indicated that they had successfully fulfilled a mandate to drive market prices down, through the use of the median and lower median band pricing model. Various departmental representatives felt that using this pricing model for larger omnibus contracts provided little value to the Crown as there tends to be more gamesmanship involved when pricing heavily weighted resource categories.

Due to the financial method being used in this bid (median band model), it is our belief that TC will not receive bids from firms that are most capable in their respective disciplines, as these firms have established practices, thus tending to operate at higher market rates to reflect the true added value that they bring to a project. Since these firms will be less likely to bid, the median rate will be negatively impacted, moving the median to a lower per diem rate.

Would the Crown consider adding a rated criterion requiring bidders to demonstrate work delivered on a project, the detail and the scale of the work delivered, and quality and timeliness of those deliverables? As an example, could firms demonstrate 2 major projects (>\$2M), within the last 10 years, where the bidders managed the projects directly, or provided project management services through a PMO, where the project was delivered on time and to the clients' satisfaction?

Answer 30: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 31:

With reference to the tables "Maximum Points Assigned", starting on page 20, we are assuming that the point weighting allocation is a reflection of which categories will have the highest utilization. This weighting method tends to create incentive to drive the prices down and generate gamesmanship with the rates, as the bid sets the lower median at 10% below the median rate, which will already drag the price down. Would the Crown consider removing the weighting against the resource categories and evaluate based on the per diem rate only?

Answer 31: See Revisions 2 and 3 from this solicitation amendment.

Question 32:

With respect to RTC2 - Risk Mitigation Strategy, RTC3 - Contract Management Plan, and RTC4 - Talent Management Plan and the requirement for a signed letter from a client attesting to these plans in order to score full points, we find this stipulation extremely limiting due to the fact that clients would have had to ask for this information in their bids in order to be able to speak to a firm's ability in supporting their own strategies/plans. Under the CPSA vehicle (which then transitioned to TBIPS), bidders were prequalified based on these same plans/strategies. As such, it is rarely requested that bidders now again provide the same information that was used to prequalify initially. In review of our RFP repository, we have less than 10 departments/ agencies/Crown corporations asking for this information, within the past 7 years. A technical authority may be well aware that firms have processes/methods used in fulfilling the contract and mitigating risk, however in most cases, they would not be able to speak to the particulars. As the rating of these plans/strategies will already be quite subjective, we request that the Crown consider evaluating the plans based on a firm's past experience in fulfilling contracts that meet the criteria listed in each rated criterion.

Answer 32: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 33: Left blank intentionally

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.