

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. 008
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client G9292-176717		Date 2019-04-23
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 2019-05-14		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

AMENDMENT NO. 008

This amendment is raised to answer Bidders' questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question 94:

With regard to Workstream #1 – Business Services and Workstream #2 – Project Management Services – Rated Requirement RTC1, b) (ii)

For “similar resource categories”, the RFP requests that the bidder provide EITHER the resource category and level OR demonstrated experience of 10+ years in this category. Is it therefore sufficient to state that the resource category was, for example, “B.1 Business Analyst Level 3” if the resource was carrying out senior business analyst activities? Is it still necessary to demonstrate 10+ years of experience as a Business Analyst? If so, could you clarify the form in which the demonstration of experience should take? Also, when the criterion requests 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”, is the RFP requesting this information in order to demonstrate 10+ years of experience as a Business Analyst or just for the contract that was worked on for the Bidder?

Answer 94:

For similar resource categories 10+ years of experience in the category is to be demonstrated. The start and end dates and a brief description of the services to be provided will be used to evaluate the 10+ years of experience.

Question 95:

Regarding RTC1:

In amendment #5, changes have been made to RTC1. Previously the requirement had requested that experience claimed must be from between January 1, 2012 and the bid closing date. However this aspect of the criterion appears to have been dropped. Could you please confirm if relevant experience should still be from between these dates?

Answer 95:

For RTC1, relevant experience does not need to be between January 1, 2012 and bid closing date.

Question 96:

In regards to WS1 and WS2 MTC1 item c):

If a firm uses a reference contract which has one (1) resource category with fifteen (15) resources and maps that category to two (2) or more resource categories that are similar as the resource categories listed in the SOW would this be compliant?

Answer 96:

A bidder would be deemed compliant, provided that it could map 80% of the tasks in the reference contract to two or more resource categories that are similar to the resource categories listed in the SOW.

Question 97:

In regards to WS1 and WS2 MTC1 item c),

- a) Will the Crown consider different variations of TBIPS resource categories (i.e. Project Manager – Release Manager in this bid solicitation) as unique resource categories?
- b) As a follow up to question a) above, will the Crown consider the following scenario as three (3) unique resource categories if they have been defined as follows in the awarded TBIPS contract:
 - (i) Programmer Analyst – Java
 - (ii) Programmer Analyst – .Net
 - (iii) Programmer Analyst – Cognos

Answer 97:

These types of categories are unique but “similar” rather than the “same”.

Question 98:

Regarding Workstream 1 – Business Services MTC1 c) - Please confirm which of the scenarios would be deemed complaint regarding item c):

Scenario #1

Reference #1 of required 2 - meets items a & b for c) has same or similar categories listed equaling - 10 Business Analysts, 4 Technical Writers = 14 placements on reference #1

Reference #2 of required 2 - meets items a & b for c) has same or similar categories listed equaling 1 BPR Consultant - 1 placement = 1 placement on reference #2

Total of 15 placements over 2 references

Scenario #2

Reference #1 of required 2 - meets items a & b for c) has same or similar categories listed equaling - 10 Business Analysts, 5 Technical Writers = 15 placements on reference #1

Reference #2 of required 2 - meets items a & b for c) 0 placement same or similar categories

Total of 15 placements in one reference

Scenario #3

Reference #1 of required 2 - meets items a & b for c) has same or similar categories listed equaling - 10 Business Analysts, 5 Technical Writers = 15 placements on reference #1

Reference #2 of required 2 - meets items a & b for c) has same or similar categories listed equaling - 1 BPR Consultant, 11 Business Analysts, 3 Business Architect = 16 placements on reference #2

Total of 30 placements over 2 references (15 for each reference)

Answer 98:

Scenario #1 – Non-compliant

Scenario #2 – Non-compliant

Scenario #3 – Compliant provided claimed experience is between January 1, 2012 and bid closing date.

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
008

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 99:

In reference to **“Amendment 002 – Answer 3”**

“...Canada will remove the resource categories P.13 Independent Information Technology Project Review Team Leader and P.14 Independent Information Technology Project Reviewer from this requirement.”

Can Canada please clarify if these categories have been removed from the entire RFP (pricing no longer needs to be submitted for these 2 categories) or if these categories have simply been removed from the MTC and RTC corporate evaluation requirements (pricing still needs to be submitted for these 2 categories)?

Answer 99:

These two resources categories have been deleted in their entirety from this requirement.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.