



**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TBIPS - IT Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> G9292-176717/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 007
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> G9292-176717	<b>Date</b> 2019-04-17
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-380-34737	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 380zm.G9292-176717	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-05-14	<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b>	
<b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Cook, Gail	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 380zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 858-9369 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-2675
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>  EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT CANADA	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> (type or print) <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

---

## AMENDMENT NO. 007

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

### **RFP REVISIONS:**

**1. At Page 1 of the RFP, Solicitation Closes:**

Delete: 2019-04-30

Insert: 2019-05-14

**2. At Attachment 4.2 – Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 – Business Services and Workstream 2 – Project Management Services, RTC1 – Bidder's Experience Providing Resources:**

**Delete:**

<b>RTC1</b>	<p><b>Bidder's Experience Providing Resources</b></p> <p>The Bidder should demonstrate that it has recent experience providing resources needed for the same or similar resource categories listed in the Statement of Work of this requirement to outside clients.</p> <p>"Outside Clients" are defined as legal entities that are not a parent, subsidiary or affiliate of the Bidder. This definition is applicable to all members of any Joint Venture submitting a bid.</p> <p>For the purposes of this rated criterion, where the Bidder is a Joint Venture, services billed by any Joint Venture member will be considered.</p> <p>Similar resource categories are to be demonstrated by mapping at least 80% of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the bid. In the event that 80% of the tasks results in a decimal (for example 4.8 tasks), the number of tasks would be rounded down (i.e. 4 tasks would be accepted as being equivalent). For some resource categories, Canada will automatically consider referenced resource categories, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 80% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement.</p> <p>To demonstrate this experience, the Bidder must submit as part of its bid:</p> <p>a) For same resource categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) The name of the resource;</li><li>(ii) The resource category and level; and</li><li>(iii) The TBIPS contract number for the referenced resource categories.</li></ul> <p>b) For similar resource categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) The name of the resource;</li><li>(ii) The resource category and level or demonstrated experience of 10+ years in that category, the start and end dates of the experience, a brief description of the services provided by the resource, and the name of the Client for whom the services were provided; and</li><li>(iii) The mapping of tasks for a similar resource category.</li></ul>
-------------	---

**Insert:**

<b>RTC1</b>	<p><b>Bidder's Experience Providing Resources</b></p> <p>The Bidder should demonstrate that it has recent experience providing resources needed for the same or similar resource categories listed in the Statement of Work of this requirement to outside clients.</p> <p>“Outside Clients” are defined as legal entities that are not a parent, subsidiary or affiliate of the Bidder. This definition is applicable to all members of any Joint Venture submitting a bid.</p> <p>For the purposes of this rated criterion, where the Bidder is a Joint Venture, services billed by any Joint Venture member will be considered.</p> <p>Similar resource categories are to be demonstrated by mapping at least 80% of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the bid. In the event that 80% of the tasks results in a decimal (for example 4.8 tasks), the number of tasks would be rounded down (i.e. 4 tasks would be accepted as being equivalent). For some resource categories, Canada will automatically consider referenced resource categories, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 80% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement.</p> <p>To demonstrate this experience, the Bidder must submit as part of its bid:</p> <p>a) For same resource categories <b>and levels</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) The name of the resource;</li><li>(ii) The resource category and level; and</li><li>(iii) The TBIPS contract number for the referenced resource categories.</li></ul> <p>b) For similar resource categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) The name of the resource;</li><li>(ii) The resource category <b>and</b> demonstrated experience of 10+ years in that category, the start and end dates of the experience, a brief description of the services provided by the resource, and the name of the Client for whom the services were provided; and</li><li>(iii) The mapping of tasks for a similar resource category.</li></ul>
-------------	---

---

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

**Question 65:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.1 Business Analyst -Level 3, MTC5 requires a certification in business analysis. In order not to exclude many Business Analyst who may not have a certification but otherwise desirable project experience in some cases, would the crown consider making MTC5 certification “as identified at time of TA as essential”?

**Answer 65:**

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

**Question 66:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.1 Business Analyst -Level 3, MTC6 requests demonstrated experience using 5 projects each a minimum duration of 6 months within the last five years. Would the crown consider expanding the validity period to “within the last 10 years” as relevant experience for legacy system modernization efforts can reach back farther than 5 years or have been gained on longer duration projects? Alternately would the crown consider allowing equivalency for project durations, for example a project with eighteen (18) months duration would be considered as equivalent to 3 projects?

**Answer 66:**

*After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written. MTC6 will only be applied when experience with specific technologies, software and tools is identified in the TA as essential.*

**Question 67:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.2 Business Architect -Level 3, MTC3 – for the 6 listed activities , would the crown consider experience within at 4 of 6 listed activities to allow greater flexibility in demonstrating relevant project experience?

**Answer 67:**

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

**Question 68:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.2 Business Architect -Level 3, MTC3, activity d), would the crown consider modifying “external entities and external systems” to “external or internal entities and external or internal systems” as many GoC systems are “self encapsulated” and may not have external entities or external systems that interact with the business?

**Answer 68:**

*Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.2 Business Architect -Level 3, MTC3, activity d) is revised as follows:*

- d) *describing the organization's core business processes that transcend functional and organizational boundaries, identifying and describing external **or internal** entities and external **or internal** systems that interact with the business. The processes specification must also describe the people, resources and controls involved in the process;*

**Question 69:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.2 Business Architect -Level 3, MTC5 requires accreditation. In order not to exclude many Business Architects who may not have accreditation, would the crown consider making MTC5 accreditation “as identified at time of TA as essential”?

**Answer 69:**

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

**Question 70:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.2 Business Architect -Level 3, MTC6 requests demonstrated experience using 5 projects each a minimum duration of 6 months within the last five years. Would the crown consider expanding the validity period to “within the last 10 years” as relevant experience for legacy system modernization efforts can reach back farther than 5 years or have been gained on longer duration projects? Alternately would the crown consider allowing equivalency for project durations, for example a project with eighteen (18) months duration would be considered as equivalent to 3 projects?

**Answer 70:**

*After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written. MTC6 will only be applied when experience with specific technologies, software and tools is identified in the TA as essential.*

**Question 71:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist- Level 3, MTC4 requests demonstrated experience using 5 projects each a minimum duration of 6 months within the last five years. Would the crown consider expanding the validity period to “within the last 10 years” as relevant experience for legacy system modernization efforts can reach back farther than 5 years or have been gained on longer duration projects? Alternately would the crown consider allowing equivalency for project durations, for example a project with eighteen (18) months duration would be considered as equivalent to 3 projects?

**Answer 71:**

*After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written. MTC4 will only be applied when experience with specific technologies, software and tools is identified in the TA as essential.*

**Question 72:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.5, Business Process Re-Engineering Consultant – Level 3, MTC1 requires experience “in a government setting”. Would the crown consider adding “and/or private sector” to be consistent with similar mandatory requirements for other grids in this workstream?

**Answer 72:**

*MTC1 will be revised as follows:*

*The proposed resource must have at least 10 years demonstrated experience, within the last 15 years, as a Business Process Re-engineering Consultant in a government **and/or private sector** in an IM/IT environment, where the proposed resource identified and documented potential processes for streamlining to gain efficiencies.*

**Question 73:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.5, Business Process Re-Engineering Consultant – Level 3, MTC2 d) development of process improvement metrics used for “benefits management realization plans” . Could the crown please provide a definition of “benefits management realization plans”

**Answer 73:**

A benefits realization plan is created by an initiative (programme or project) and provides “a consolidated view of the benefits forecast by type/ category and which represents the baseline against which benefits realization can be monitored and evaluated.”

*It usually includes:*

- *Details of the scale of benefits forecast to be realized*
- *Timeline for benefits to be realized, by period*
- *Metrics to be used to assess benefits realization*
- *Actions to mitigate threats to benefits realization*
- *Reporting and benefit review schedule*
- *Any associated benefit realization budget and links to benefits maps*

**Question 74:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.5 Business Process Re-Engineering Consultant – Level 3, MTC3 and MTC 4 requires a certification in business process mapping and TOGAF or Business Architecture Guild accreditation respectively. In order not to exclude many BPR Consultants who may not have a certification or accreditation but otherwise desirable project experience, would the crown consider making MTC3 certification and MTC4 accreditation “as identified at time of TA as essential”?

**Answer 74:**

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

**Question 75:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.7 Business Transformation Architect – Level 3, MTC3 and MTC 4 requires accreditation in organizational change management and TOGAF or Business Architecture Guild accreditation respectively. In order not to exclude many BTAs who may not have accreditation but otherwise desirable project experience, would the crown consider making MTC3 accreditation and MTC4 accreditation “as identified at time of TA as essential”?

**Answer 75:**

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

**Question 76:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.7 Business Transformation Architect- Level 3, MTC5 requests demonstrated experience using 5 projects each a minimum duration of 6 months within the last five years. Would the crown consider expanding the validity period to “within the last 10 years” as relevant experience for legacy system modernization efforts can reach back farther than 5 years or have been gained on longer duration projects? Alternately would the crown consider allowing equivalency for project durations, for example a project with eighteen (18) months duration would be considered as equivalent to 3 projects?

**Answer 76:**

*After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written. MTC5 will only be applied when experience with specific technologies, software and tools is identified in the TA as essential.*

**Question 77:**

Reference Appendix C to Annex A, Resources Assessment Criteria and Response Table – Workstream 1 – Business Services, B.14 Technical Writer - Level 3, MTC3 requests demonstrated experience using 5 projects each a minimum duration of 6 months within the last five years. Would the crown consider expanding the validity period to “within the last 10 years” as relevant experience for legacy system modernization efforts can reach back farther than 5 years or have been gained on longer duration projects? Alternately would the crown consider allowing equivalency for project durations, for example a project with eighteen (18) months duration would be considered as equivalent to 3 projects?

**Answer 77:**

*After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written. MTC3 will only be applied when experience with specific technologies, software and tools is identified in the TA as essential.*

**Question 78:**

The following questions are related to Appendix C to Annex A - Resource Assessment Criteria and Response Table - Workstream 1 - Business Services to clarify requirements and/or to propose changes to align with industry standards by role and availability of relevant skills in the market.

a) **B.1 Business Analyst - Level 3**

With respect to this category will the Crown:

- MTC1 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a 10 year period recognizing most transformation projects with IM/IT elements are several years in duration;
- MTC5 - Modify the requirement from “an internationally recognized organization (e.g. IIBA, PMI)” to “a recognized organization” to allow for national certifications as well as corporate certifications that align with recognized industry standards”; and
- MTC6 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

b) **B.2 Business Architect - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC3 - Modify the wording of “must have at least 5 years demonstrated experience, within the last 15 years, in **each** of the activities below” to “ must have at least 5 years demonstrated **combined** experience, within the last 15 years, **for the activities** below”;
- MTC5 - Modify the requirement from “an internationally recognized organization such as TOGAF ...” to “ a recognized organization” to allow for national certifications as well as corporate certifications that align with recognized industry standards”; and
- MTC6 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

c) **B.4 Business Continuity /Disaster Recovery Specialist - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC1 - Modify the requirement “must have at least 10+ years demonstrated experience as a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist in an IM/IT environment ” to “must have a minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience as Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist within the last 10 years as an IM/IT Consultant” ;
- MTC3 - Modify the wording of “must have a minimum of 2 projects each demonstrating experience, within the last five years, in **each** of the activities below” to “ must have a minimum of 2 projects each demonstrating **combined** experience, within the last five years, **for the activities** below”;
- MTC4 - Modify the requirement to 2 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a five year period to align with MTC3's requirements.

d) **B.5 Business Process Re-engineering Consultant - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown consider:

- MTC1 - Modify from “in a government setting” to “in a government **or private sector setting**” to be consistent with the requirements of other categories;
- MTC3 and MTC4 - Replace the current requirements to request a relevant certification or training from a recognized organization such as IIBA, PMI or corporate organization with methodology based on industry standards; and
- MTC5 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

e) **B.7 Business Transformation Architect - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC3 - Modify the wording of “must demonstrate experience, within the last 10 years, in **each** of the activities below” to “ must demonstrate **combined** experience, within the last

ten years **for the activities** below"; and

- MTC3 - Modify the current requirements to request a relevant certification or training (in organization change, transformation architecture, management consulting) from a recognized organization, or corporate organization with methodology based on industry standards.

f) **B.14 Technical Writer - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC5 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**Answer 78:**

a) **B.1 Business Analyst - Level 3:**

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

b) **B.2 Business Architect - Level 3:**

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

c) **B.4 Business Continuity /Disaster Recovery Specialist - Level 3:**

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

d) **B.5 Business Process Re-engineering Consultant - Level 3:**

- *MTC1 has been revised as requested.*
- *For MTC3, MTC4, and MTC5, after consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*

e) **B.7 Business Transformation Architect - Level 3:**

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

f) **B.14 Technical Writer - Level 3:**

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

**Question 79:**

The following questions are related to Appendix C to Annex A - Resource Assessment Criteria and Response Table - Workstream 2 - Project Management Services to clarify requirements and/or to propose changes to align with industry standards by role and availability of relevant skills in the market.

a) **P. 1 Change Management Consultant - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown consider:

- MTC3- Modify "documenting processes, roles and responsibilities" to "documenting change impacts to the current state and identifying future state capabilities for elements impacted by change such as people, organization, process, technology";
- MTC4 - Modify the requirement from "an internationally recognized accreditation" to "a recognized organization" to allow for national certifications as well as corporate certifications that align with recognized industry standards"; and
- MTC5 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

b) **P.5 Project Executive - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown consider:

- MTC2, MTC5, MTC6 - Combining these requirements into a single requirement that requests a valid certification or designation good standing from a recognized organization such as : PMP, PRINCE2, MSP, PgMP, PfMP, MOP, PRAXIS and/or a diploma or degree in project management (e.g. Masters in Project Management);
- MTC7 - Modify (or eliminate in favour of a professional certification as noted above) this requirement to recognize a diploma or degree (in Commerce, Science or Arts) from an accredited college or institution. The current requirement would eliminate **experienced** Project Executives with relevant experience (over 15 years) with business transformation in an IM/IT environment; and
- MTC8 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**c) P.9 Project Manager - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown consider:

- MTC1 - eliminating duplicate activities, see a) and d) Project Dashboards;
- MTC6 - Expanding the requirement to request a valid certification or designation good standing from a recognized organization such as : PMP, PRINCE2, MSP, PgMP, PfMP, MOP, PRAXIS and/or a diploma or degree in project management (e.g. Masters in Project Management); and
- MTC7 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**d) P.9 Project Manager, Release Manager - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC3 - Expanding the requirement to request a valid certification or designation good standing from a recognized organization such as : PMP, PRINCE2, MSP, PgMP, PfMP, MOP, PRAXIS and/or a diploma or degree in project management (e.g. Masters in Project Management); and
- MTC4 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**e) P.10 Project Scheduler - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC5 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**f) P.12 Risk Management Specialist - Level 3**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC1 - Modify the requirement from "greater than 10 years demonstrated experience, within the last 15 years working as a Risk Management Specialist" to " greater than five years demonstrated experience within the last 15 years working as a Risk Management Specialist in an IM/IT combined with more than ten years of experience in an IM/IT environment;
- MTC4 - Modify the requirement to state: "completion of Risk Assessments for 3 government and/or private sector projects within the last five years"; and
- MTC5 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**g) P.13 Independent Information Technology Project Review Team Leader - Level**

With respect to this category, will the Crown:

- MTC1 - Modify the amendment to reflect number (e.g. five) of reviews completed at level rather than duration given the short duration of most reviews and the likelihood that 10 years of consecutive years of experience completing reviews would eliminate experienced Senior Leaders;
- MTC2 - Modify the requirement to add "the Treasury Board CIOB Independent Review Program (IRP) Methodology **or an equivalent methodology**";
- MTC2 and MTC3 - Align requirement to request the same number of reviews in both (e.g. a minimum of 3 versus 5 or 6); and
- MTC5 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**h) P.14 Independent Information Technology Project Reviewer - Level 3**

With respect to this category:

- MTC1 - Modify the amendment to reflect number (e.g. five) of reviews completed at level rather than duration given the short duration of most reviews and the likelihood that 10 years of consecutive years of experience completing reviews would eliminate experienced Senior Leaders;
- MTC2 P13 and P14 - Align dollar value requirements. One states \$5M, one \$25M;
- MTC3 - Modify the requirement to add "the Treasury Board CIOB Independent Review Program (IRP) Methodology **or an equivalent methodology**"; and
- MTC4 - Modify the requirement to 3 (versus 5) projects of 6 months in duration within a ten (versus five) year period.

**Answer 79:**

- a) *P. 1 Change Management Consultant - Level 3:*
- *After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*
- b) *P.5 Project Executive - Level 3:*
- *For MTC2 and MTC5 – MTC2 has been removed.*
  - *For MTC 6 - After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*
  - *For MTC7 and MTC8 - After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written*
- c) *P.9 Project Manager - Level 3:*
- *MTC1 d) will be removed as it is a duplicate of MTC1 b)*
  - *For MTC6 and MTC7 - After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*
- d) *P.9 Project Manager, Release Manager - Level 3:*
- *After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*
- e) *P.10 Project Scheduler - Level 3:*
- *After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*
- f) *P.12 Risk Management Specialist – Level 3:*

- *For MTC1 and MTC5 - After consultation with our stakeholders, the evaluation criteria will remain as written.*
  - *MTC4 will be modified as follows:  
The proposed resource must demonstrate completion of Risk Assessments for 3 Project Complexity and Risk Assessment (PCRA) rated Government of Canada and/or private sector projects within the past 5 years.*
- g) *P.13 Independent Information Technology Project Review Team Leader – Level 3 has been deleted from this requirement.*
- h) *P.14 Independent Information Technology Project Reviewer - Level 3 has been deleted from this requirement.*

**Question 80:**

With regards to Appendix C of Annex A, RTC1 P9. Project Manager – Release Manager – Level 3 is not a category under TBIPS and P9. Project Manager is already represented within the same requirement. We recommend either removing P9. Project Manager – Release Manager – Level 3 completely or increasing the bench strength requirement within the P9. Project Manager category to ten (10) resources.

**Answer 80:**

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

**Question 81:**

Regarding MTC4: The phrase "benefits management plan" is not a common industry term and is open to a wide variety of interpretation. Would the Crown please clarify what is required here?

**Answer 81:**

*See Answer 73.*

**Question 82:**

For both Workstreams 1 and 2 (Business Services and Project Management Services), MCT4 items f) (Workstream 1 - Business Services) and g) (Workstream 2 - Project Management Services) refer to demonstrating proponent experience in delivering and supporting multiple elements including:

Stream 1 - MCT4, "f) Experience developing benefits management plan including metrics and ongoing monitoring and support; and..."; and

Stream 2 - MCT4, "g) Experience developing PMO benefits plan including metrics and KPI's to ..."

In these evaluation criteria, does the Crown;

1. refer to PMI and Prince approaches to "Benefits Realization Planning" (in a project delivery context); or,
2. refer to engagements where Crown's benefits provided to citizens and business through Income Security Programs or other re-training or development activities (as provided by ESDC), or other programs delivering personnel benefits internally (i.e. health, dental, other benefits provided by GoC departments) were maintained or enhanced.

We assume you mean the former, rather than the latter.

**Answer 82:**

*The Crown refers to PMI and Prince approaches to "Benefits Realization Planning" (in a project delivery context).*

**Question 83:**

The requirement RTC1 identifies 2 similar categories P5 Project Manager and P5 Project Manager, Release Manager required for full point allocation. Given that there is no TBIPS category for Project Manager, Release Manager and the Crown has indicated that the same resource categories procured through the TBIPS vehicle will automatically be deemed 80% aligned, the response required to achieve maximum points for this requirement is somewhat unclear. In the interest of clarity, we request that Canada either, 1) eliminate the Project Manager, Release Manager role since it is not a legitimate TBIPS category, or 2) allow for vendors to cite up to 10 instances where they have provided Project Manager (s), Level 3.

**Answer 83:**

*To achieve full point allocation, similar resource categories are to be demonstrated by mapping 80% of the SOW tasks for P5 Project Manager, Release Manager.*

**Question 84:**

*For RTC1, Workstreams 1, reference Amendment 5 "The Bidder should demonstrate that it has recent experience providing resources needed for the same or similar resource categories listed in the Statement of Work of this requirement to outside clients.... Similar categories are to be demonstrated by mapping at least 80% of the SOW tasks. For some resource categories Canada will automatically consider referenced resource categories, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 80% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement."*

Bidders are to provide demonstration (a) for same resource category and demonstration (b) for similar resource categories. Can you please confirm that a resource that has worked in the same TBIPS category under the Level 2 instead of Level 3 falls in the "same category" type of demonstration or in the "similar category" type of demonstration?

**Answer 84:**

*For RTC1, Bidders are to demonstrate Level 3 of the same TBIPS category to fall under the "same category". Bidders are to demonstrate Level 3 of a similar resource category by mapping 80% of tasks OR a similar resource category by mapping 80% of tasks AND 10 years of experience to fall under the "similar category".*

**Question 85:**

For MTC1, Workstreams 1, item (c), Amendment 5: "Must have billed for at least 15 resources that are the same or similar as the resource categories listed in the Statement of Work in this requirement.": Can you please clarify in the case where some of the 15 billed resources are the same TBIPS category but a Level 2 instead of Level 3, if mapping of 80% of tasks to the RFP SOW is required?

**Answer 85:**

*For MTC1, the requirement to specify the level has been deleted.*

**Question 86:**

For MTC1 & RTC1, in order to demonstrate 80% equivalency of the SOW tasks, can the Crown please confirm vendors are required to map only the tasks associated with the resource category per referenced contract, and not required to map the tasks of each individual resource placed on the referenced contract?

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
007

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

For example; please confirm the following would be compliant.

Mapping the contract resource category

Vendor A provided Project Managers to Client Z using contract 123.

Contract 123 defined Project Manager tasks as detailed below, and is 80% mapped to the SOW outlined in this RFP;

Task 1...(mapped to SOW)  
Task 2...(mapped to SOW)  
Etc. (mapped to SOW)

The following five (5) resources were placed at Client Z as Project Managers and performed the tasks outlined above;

John Smith  
Jane Doe  
....  
...  
...

**Answer 86:**

*Confirmed.*

**Question 87:**

We would request that the Crown remove the requirement for matching resource category **levels**. Performing equivalent resource category tasks should be sufficient to assure the Crown of relevant experience, without the number of years/levels constraint; please confirm the requirement for resource level matching has been removed through Amendment 05 revised Attachment 4.1.WS 1&2.

**Answer 87:**

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

**Question 88:**

The previous version of this solicitation included a Project Manager (Level 2), which is not present in the current RFP, as well as a Project Scheduler (Level 2), which has been changed to a Project Scheduler (Level 3). Therefore, could the crown please confirm that it would be acceptable to reference either Level 3 **or** Level 2 resources for MTC1 and RTC1 as long as the category is the same? In this case, would Bidders be required to map to at least 80% of the tasks of the resource category identified in the RFP, or would it be considered the same category?

**Answer 88:**

*For MTC1, the requirement to specify the level has been deleted.*

*For RTC1, if the category is the same and the level is different, bidders is required to demonstrate 10+ years of experience.*

**Question 89:**

For MTC4: The way this requirement is currently worded, it is unclear whether Canada is looking for Bidders to reference their experience providing resource teams who have performed items (a) through (g) on a single client contract, or whether Bidders are required to reference their experience as a firm, providing a solution or managed service that included items (a) through (g). We understand that based on Question & Answers 22 and 31, Bidders are requested to reference their **corporate** experience delivering and supporting business transformation services for an outside client's IM/IT project, and that Canada will not be evaluating experience against resource categories. However, given the fact that this is RFP is intended to result in the award of a task-based contract for the provision resources, please confirm that it is acceptable for companies to reference the experience of their resources who have performed items (a) through (g) on a single client contract to substantiate this requirement?

**Answer 89:**

*For MTC4, Bidders must reference their corporate experience to satisfy this criterion.*

**Question 90:**

Would the crown consider reducing the MTC1 requirements for both PM and Business Services to one (1) IM/IT Contract if the Value of the Contract performed has been \$15 million dollars over the course of 5-10 years instead of 2 separate contracts with a value of \$5M?

**Answer 90:**

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

**Question 91:**

Regarding RTC1: The Crown has amended this criterion to require "[t]he TBIPS contract number for the referenced resource categories." Should a bidder choose to use a contract reference which does not fall under the TBIPS federal government supply vehicle, can the Crown confirm that the relevant private sector, provincial, or municipal authority contract number will satisfy this requirement?

**Answer 91:**

*Confirmed.*

**Question 92:**

Regarding RTC2: Providing names for 40 or more individual resources requires significant time from our sales and proposal teams, as they will need to obtain permission from each individual resource prior to including their names in any response to a government solicitation. Would the Crown consider removing this requirement from the criterion?

**Answer 92:**

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

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
007

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 93:**

In reviewing the financial evaluation process, it isn't clear how the Crown has established this process to ensure best value to the Crown. For example, incumbent suppliers know the rates they won with last time around, and in spite of the Crown increasing slightly the weighting on price (from 35% to 40%), incumbents are the only ones capable of competing on this requirement, so the increase in financial weighting will have little to no impact. Additionally, this approach to financial evaluation only encourages suppliers to play pricing games to ensure good scores on the financial proposal. For example, there are certain resource categories that will rarely be used under the resulting contract. So in spite of the weightings, bidders will insert unrealistically low rates for these resource categories and inflate the price of resources they intend to use more frequently. This doesn't ensure best value.

Would the Crown consider revising the financial proposal? If the Crown were to ask for the per diem rates for each resource category, remove the arbitrary weightings and points, and then evaluate a select number of categories without disclosing which categories to suppliers, this will ensure that each supplier will propose honest rates without being influenced by the weightings currently in the financial proposal template. This will also ensure the Crown receives honest pricing and fair value from suppliers.

**Answer 93:**

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

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**