



**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 SECURITE

**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> IPS: 7 Workstreams / 7 Volets	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> T8086-172450/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 011
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> T8086-172450	<b>Date</b> 2019-04-18
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-626-34855	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 626zm.T8086-172450	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2019-05-15</b>	
<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> Holden, Carole	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 626zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 858-9217 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**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> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<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 (type or print)</b> <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. 011

This amendment is raised to answer bidders' questions.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

#### Question 34:

The Crown provided the following answer to Q&A #11: "Each Contract identified must have provided services that are the same or similar to the resource categories specified in MTC1 for a given workstream. Each resource must have a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of one year. The Bidder must demonstrate that the tasks are the same or similar by mapping at least 50% of the Statement of Work tasks of this bid solicitation. In the event that 50% equals a decimal (for example 4.8 tasks), the number would be rounded down." In the statement of each resources having a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of 1 year, does this apply to all resources used to demonstrate 2000 cumulative billable days, or only to the workstream specific resources (i.e. Programmer/Analyst (2 or 3) and Tester (3))?

#### Answer 34:

The 120 billable days in article MTC1, 1. e) and f) only apply to the categories that are the same or similar to the workstream specific categories. The cumulative 2000 billable days from article MTC1, 2 must include the categories that are the same or similar to the workstream specific categories but can also include resource categories outside the workstream.

#### Question 35:

The Crown provided the following answer to Q&A #11: "Each Contract identified must have provided services that are the same or similar to the resource categories specified in MTC1 for a given workstream. Each resource must have a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of one year. The Bidder must demonstrate that the tasks are the same or similar by mapping at least 50% of the Statement of Work tasks of this bid solicitation. In the event that 50% equals a decimal (for example 4.8 tasks), the number would be rounded down." Does this imply that the bidder needs to demonstrate 50% of the SOW tasks even if the contract(s) are for the exact same categories? Or only demonstrate 50% of the SOW tasks if using similar categories?

**Answer 35:** Please see Solicitation Amendment 008, Revisions 1 to 7, MTC1 e) and f).

#### Question 36

Regarding RTC1, will the Crown allow Bidders to demonstrate similar categories by mapping at least 50% of the SOW tasks?

**Answer 36:** Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

#### Question 37:

Regarding RTC1

- (i) Can the Crown please confirm if the required resources need to be the same resources provided for 24 months in order to score maximum point, as long as all contract demonstrated meet the rest of the requirement?

**Answer (i):** No, they do not need to be the same resources.

- (ii) Will the Crown allow to demonstrate the required number of resources provided for 24 months using different resources (example for WS#2: Provided 4 PM resources for a 12 month period and 4 different PM resources for the next 12 months)?

**Answer (ii):** Yes, that is acceptable

- (iii) Does the 3 month period allocating points need to be consecutive or can they be across multiple years (example: 4 PMs for 12 months in 2015 and 4 PMs for 12 months in 2017)?

**Answer (iii):** Each 3-month period allocating points must be consecutive

- (iv) Regarding e), if a resource was provided for the initial contract period (i.e. 12 months) and provided for an additional 12 months once an option period was exercised, how will the Crown be able to see the "simultaneous" periods of time if only the start and end date of the initial contract period is provided?

**Answer (iv):** For RTC1 the identified contract must have an initial contract period of at least 3 months (not including amendments). RTC1 doesn't stipulate that that the bidder must meet the requirements of RTC1 within the initial contract period.

- (v) Will the Crown accept resources that have been on contract with the same client through the bidder for 24 months even if they were contracted through different contracts (i.e. Resource #1 was on contract #1 for 12 months and then again on contract #2 for an additional 12 months)?

**Answer to (v):** Yes, that is acceptable.

**Question 38:**

For all workstreams, MTC1 states that the contract(s) identified must have a cumulative total of at least 2,000 billable days for the resource categories including [WS specific] covering a period not more than three years. If two contracts are used in response to MTC1, please confirm that the 2,000 days required can be cumulative between the two contracts presented (for example, in a scenario where Contract A and Contract B are presented: Contract A is 1,000 days and Contract B is 1,000 days; this would be deemed compliant). Please confirm?

**Answer 38:** Confirmed

**Question 39:**

Given firms may now pursue submitting a bid for this stream given the lowered dollar amount, would the crown please provide a two week extension to allow appropriate time to prepare.

**Answer 39:** The bid closing date was extended until May 15, 2019.

**Question 40:**

Response to question 8 indicates that "Reference contracts from the federal government, from other levels of government such as provincial and municipal, from outside Canada, and from the private sector are acceptable as long as they meet all the criteria of MTC1."

Please confirm that while references from outside of Canada may be acceptable, they must be a reference as delivered by the Bidder - and does not include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the Bidder, or its subcontractors.

**Answer 40:** Confirmed

**Question 41:**

In relation to WS1: RTC1 states that the references used must map directly to Annex A of the bid Solicitation "same or similar".

As Agile development is a new concept to software development in the Government of Canada and is delivered in smaller iterative and incremental ways, it is our concern that the Crown will not receive a competitive amount of responses to this Work Stream due to the difficulty of showcasing ten (10) Programmer/Analysts, simultaneously, within the past three (3) years, working exclusively on Agile projects.

Would the Crown please consider modifying the criteria and accept... working on projects with a mix of Agile and Waterfall development?

**Answer 41:** Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 42:**

**Reference:** MTC1 - all streams

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

**Answer 42:** Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 43:**

**Reference:** MTC2 - Client Manager MTC2 c) "1. Each Contract identified must: Be a Contract with a minimum of ten resources of which one was a Database Analyst/ IM Administrator and one was a Technology Architect resources from the Bidder" - followed by "It is acceptable if an identified Contract demonstrates either a Database Analyst/ IM Administrator or a Technology Architect as long as each of these resource categories"

The wording for this requirement is similar to the MTC1 requirement that was amended to indicate that each contract does not have to demonstrate both RFP WS specific resource categories. May we request that the current MTC2 wording be amended to indicate each contract does not have to demonstrate both RFP WS specific resource categories.

**Answer 43:**

Canada confirms that for MTC1 and MTC2 in all workstreams, each reference contract does NOT have to demonstrate both workstream specific resource categories. The two workstream specific categories can be demonstrated through individual reference contracts or through the same reference contract.

**Question 44:**

Regarding RTC1: requiring resources to be mapped to the 4 specific tasks identified in the requirement is very limiting and favours the incumbents. To ensure an open and fair process, would the Crown please remove the requirement for mapping to those specific bullets and have all resources named mapped to at least four of any of the tasks identified in Annex A for each resource category?

**Answer 44:**

There are no incumbents performing these tasks as this requirement is for new work within Transport Canada. Canada has considered your request however the requirement remains as is. The tasks identified in article RTC1 2.c) for each resource category were carefully chosen as they demonstrate the bidder's experience providing same or similar tasks, which represent the services that the successful bidder will be providing as part of a task authorization.

**Question 45:**

As the SOW tasks listed for the resources categories can be and have been performed by both Level 2 and Level 3 resources, would the Crown allow bidders to use Level 2 or Level 3 resources for MTC1 and RTC1 as long as they demonstrate the required number of tasks?

**Answer 45:** Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged

**Question 46:**

RTC1 requires bidders to have provided multiple resources within specific resource categories simultaneously for a 24-month period in order to score maximum points. All of the resources cited must also meet specific tasks listed in Transport's SOW, which are very specific for most streams. Bidders may have experience providing the required number of resources (who meet the SOW requirements) within the last 7 years, but not necessarily simultaneously as they are restricted to their clients' needs/requirements and can only provide the resources when the clients need them. Would the Crown please remove the requirement for all resources to be provided simultaneously.

**Answer 46:** Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged

**Question 47:**

Due to the delay in receiving the official revisions for MTC1 and MTC2 as Amendment #4 indicated would be coming, would the Crown please grant a 2-week extension.

**Answer 47:** The bid closing date was extended until May 15, 2019.

**Question 48:**

**All Streams - MTC1/RTC1 item 2 b) and c):**

Please confirm that if bidders are using a TBIPS contract where they provided resources in the exact same TBIPS resource category as the Crown is requesting in this bid solicitation to demonstrate billable hours in a resource category, the bidder does not need to map tasks to the SOW as per items 2 b) & 2 c), as these resources have already demonstrated alignment to the role. This will save the evaluators time, as it is for this purpose that the TBIPS resource catalogue was created (to create a standard category definition/base SOW).

**Answer 48:**

Confirmed for MTC1. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 008, Revisions 1 to 7, MTC1, 1. e) and f).

The requirement remains unchanged for RTC1.

**Question 49:**

**Re: AMD 5 – Question 15: All Streams - MTC1, item 2:**

With this answer, the Crown has confirmed that any resource category outside of the workstream-specific categories requested may be used to demonstrate the required 2000 billable days. The requirement as originally written required Bidders to *“provide a cumulative total of at least 2000 billable days for the resource categories **including** ... (WS specific categories)... covering a period of not more than three years”*. As written, bidders could use OMNIBUS contracts to prove they have delivered of similar services, where this could include as little as 1 resource for less than 6 months in a required category to meet the minimum threshold, and the other “cumulative days” could be made up of roles not relevant to this RFP's scope of services.

In order to ensure that Bidder contracts used to respond to MTC1 demonstrate experience specifically relevant to the workstreams requested by Transport Canada, we ask that the Crown require Bidders to demonstrate 2000 billable days in the workstream-specific categories.

**Answer 49:** Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 50:**

**RTC2/RTC3/RTC4 – “Written Statement”:**

As written, these Criterion require that Bidders collect written statements from potentially up to 9 federal government employees per stream (potentially up to 63). This is a significant effort for both Bidders and the Crown. Also, many federal departments have policies that do not allow them to provide recommendations – which this could be considered. This could negatively impact both Bidder deadlines and the references they use, resulting in requests for extensions and even challenges following evaluation.

These Criterion already require Bidders to provide a Client Reference Contact who will verify the Bidders claimed experience to substantiate complete to the requirements.

Therefore, can the Crown please remove the requirement for a “Written Statement” and adjust the scoring schema accordingly?

**Answer 50:** Canada is not seeking recommendations but rather confirmation in writing from client references that the strategy was indeed implemented. The requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 51:**

**All Streams – RTC1:**

It is our understanding that 5 points are awarded based on each 3-month period where the bidder simultaneously provides the required resource categories, and that these 3-month periods should be consecutive. Therefore, simultaneously providing the resources for 8 consecutive 3-month periods would result in maximum points, with a total time period of 24 months simultaneously providing the required resources (5 points x 8 consecutive 3-month periods = 40 points).

Would the Crown please confirm this understanding is correct and that a Bidders' response to RTC1 should identify the overall 24-month period (for the reference contracts that are ongoing or completed in last 7 years), and list the resources who billed for work provided under the required categories (to demonstrate at least the minimum number required by the workstream) in each consecutive 3-month.

**Answer 51:** Yes, the bidder should identify the overall 24-month period (for the reference contracts that are ongoing or completed in last 7 years), and list the resources who billed for work provided under the required categories (to demonstrate at least the minimum number required by the workstream) in each consecutive 3-month. Each 3-month period must be consecutive.

**Question 52:**

**Extension:**

Due to the high level of effort associated with submitting detailed corporate responses for up to 7 workstreams, in addition to the upcoming holiday long weekend that will make it difficult to reach client references to request permission to submit their information in response to various requirements in this bid solicitation, would the Crown please provide a two week extension to May 15, 2019?

**Answer 52:** The bid closing date was extended until May 15, 2019.

**Question 53:**

Please refer to Question and Answer 11, as well as MTC1, MTC2 and RTC1 which require the bidder to provide resource categories, levels, and a description of the tasks demonstrating that tasks are mapped to at least 50% of the SOW tasks. It is Bidder's understanding that the Statement of Work tasks in the RFP are similar to the tasks listed under TBIPS SA for each category identified in the workstreams. Would the Crown confirm that the Bidder is not required to demonstrate 50% Statement of Work tasks for contracts issued to the Bidder under TBIPS SA with same resource categories required in the workstream?

**Answer 53:**

Confirmed for MTC1 and MTC2. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 008, Revisions 1 to 7: MTC1, 1. e) and f); and MTC2 1.c).  
For RTC1, the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 54:**

Reference - Rated Requirements for all Workstreams RTC2, RTC3, RTC4 and the associated forms:  
If the Bidder includes a written statement from the Project or Technical Authority that the Contract Management Plan was actually implemented as proposed for the referenced Contract

Could we please request clarification as to what will suffice to address a "...written statement"? Would the following signed client statement address this requirement?

<b>Description of the Risk Mitigation Strategy and how it was implemented</b>
<b>Description of the Contract Management Plan and how it was implemented</b>
<b>Description of the Talent Management Plan and how it was implemented</b>
<i>The signature below, confirms that BIDDER has actually implemented the attached 3 Plans, as proposed for the referenced Contract, as included BIDDER response to the bid solicitation Transport Canada (RFP #T8086-172450/A):</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Risk Mitigation Strategy (RTC2);</li><li>2. Contract Management Plan (RTC3); and</li><li>3. Talent Management Plan (RTC4).</li></ol>
<b>Signature:</b> <b><u>(or email confirmation)</u></b>

**Answer 54:** This approach is acceptable.

**Question 55**

Reference: RTC # 2 g) A description of the Contract Management Plan detailing how it was implemented

- a) Is this referenced requirement in addition to the Mandatory Plans provided?

**Answer to a):** Confirmed

- b) Is this something the Bidder must provide in addition to the mandatory plans?

**Answer to b):** Confirmed

- c) Is this something that the client must sign off?

**Answer to c):** The client must validate in writing that the bidder did implement the plan.

- d) Is the Client required to provide this content?

**Answer to d):** The bidder is required to provide this content.

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