



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. 012
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-172450	Date 2019-04-30
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 () -
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. 012

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

NOTE TO BIDDERS: A Word version of Solicitation Amendment 008 and/or this Solicitation Amendment is available by sending a request by email to carole.holden@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca.

RFP REVISIONS:

REVISION 1

The MTC1 'Levels' have been removed. See Revision 1.1 that follows.

MTC1 article 3 i) has been revised to replace "...provide the first and last name of the resource" to "provide the first and last name of each resource". See Revision 1.1 that follows.

REVISION NO. 1.1

At Attachment 4.1 – Technical Criteria, Part A: Mandatory Corporate Experience – The Bidder

Delete MTC1 in its entirety.

Insert:

MTC#	Mandatory Technical Criteria	Bidder's Response (Reference to Substantiating Materials Included in Bid)
MTC1	<p>Bidder's Experience</p> <p>Using one or more reference Contract(s), the Bidder must demonstrate that it has provided informatics professional services in the past seven years as of bid closing date as follows:</p> <p>1. Each Contract identified must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Have been with a single client; b) Have an initial minimum value of \$2,000,000.00 (CDN) excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments; c) Have an initial minimum Contract Period of one year, not including amendments; d) Have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years as of bid closing date; e) Have provided services that are the same or similar to a Programmer Analyst in which the resource has a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of one year. The Bidder must demonstrate similar resource categories by mapping at least 50% of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the reference contract. In the event that 50% 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 50% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement; and 	

MTC#	Mandatory Technical Criteria	Bidder's Response (Reference to Substantiating Materials Included in Bid)
	<p>f) Have provided services that are the same or similar to a Tester in which the resource has a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of one year. The Bidder must demonstrate similar resource categories by mapping at least 50% of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the reference contract. In the event that 50% 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 50% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement.</p> <p>It is acceptable if an identified Contract demonstrates either a Programmer Analyst or a Tester as long as each of these resource categories is demonstrated through a reference Contract that meets all the requirements of MTC1.</p> <p>2. The Contract(s) identified must have a cumulative total of at least 2000 billable days for the resource categories including Programmer Analyst and Tester covering a period of three years.</p> <p>3. The Bidder must provide the following information for each Contract identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The name of the client organization; b) The project name under which services were provided (if applicable); c) The client's full name; d) The client's title, email address and telephone number; e) The Contract number or reference number; f) The start and end dates for the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments; g) The total initial minimum value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments; h) The resource categories provided under the Contract and a brief description of their tasks; i) The first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation (for categories outside of the SOW, provide the first and last name of each resource); j) The total number of days billed per resource under the Contract; and k) For similar categories, the mapping of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the reference contract. <p>The information listed above should be submitted with the bid using Form M1. If any of the information is not submitted, the Contracting Authority will inform the Bidder of a time frame within which to provide the information. Failure to provide the information listed above within the time frame provided will render the bid non-responsive.</p> <p>Note to Bidder: The reference Contract(s) must have been contracted with the Bidder submitting a bid for this requirement. "Bidder" means the person or entity</p>	

MTC#	Mandatory Technical Criteria	Bidder's Response (Reference to Substantiating Materials Included in Bid)
	(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.	

REVISION NO 2:

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Part B: Point Rated Corporate Experience, the Bidder, article RTC1 3. g):

Delete

- g) The description of the services provided including specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified tasks.

Insert:

- g) The description of the services provided (2-3 sentences) including the first and last name of each resource, and the specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified tasks.

REVISION NO 3:

At Form R1:

Delete:

- g) The description of the services provided including specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified tasks.

Insert:

- g) The description of the services provided (2-3 sentences) including the first and last name of each resource, and the specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified tasks.

REVISION 4

At Form M1:

Delete in its entirety

Insert:

FORM M1 BIDDER'S EXPERIENCE
<p>In accordance with the requirements of mandatory evaluation criterion MTC1, provide the following information for each Contract identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The name of the client organization; b) The project name under which services were provided (if applicable); c) The client's full name; d) The client's title, email address and telephone number; e) The Contract number or reference number; f) The start and end dates for the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments;

- g) The total initial minimum value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments;
- h) The resource categories provided under the Contract and a brief description of the tasks;
- i) The first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation. For categories outside of the SOW, provide the first and last name of each resource;
- j) The total number of days billed per resource under the Contract; and
- k) For similar categories, the mapping of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the reference contract. Leave k) blank for same categories and for categories outside of the SOW.

REVISION 5

At Form M2:

Delete in its entirety

Insert:

**FORM M2
CLIENT MANAGER**

In accordance with the requirements of mandatory evaluation criterion MTC2, provide the following information for each Contract identified:

- a) The name of the client organization;
- b) The project name under which services were provided (if applicable);
- c) The client's full name;
- d) The client's title, email address and telephone number;
- e) The Contract number or reference number;
- f) The start and end date of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments;
- g) The total initial minimum value (excluding applicable taxes) of the Initial Contract Period, not including amendments;
- h) The resource categories provided under the Contract; and a brief description of their duties;
- i) The first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category. For categories outside of the SOW, provide the first and last name of each resource;
- j) The total number of days billed per resource under the Contract; and
- k) For similar categories, the mapping of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category in the reference contract. Leave k) blank for same categories and for categories outside of the SOW.

REVISION 6

At Solicitation Amendment 011:

Delete Question and Answer 42 in its entirety.

Insert:

Question 42:

Reference: MTC1

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 (revised): The MTC1 'Levels' have been removed. See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 012.

REVISION 7

At Attachment 4.1 – Technical Criteria, Part A: Mandatory Corporate Experience – The Bidder; article 2. h) of MTC2:

Delete:

- h) The resource categories and level provided under the Contract; and a brief description of their duties:

Insert:

- h.) The resource categories provided under the Contract; and a brief description of their duties:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 56:

Given that a majority of our projects are of a classified nature, and hence on a 'need to know basis', project references will not be provided by our clients. Would it possible to use the contracting authority as a reference who will/can confirm the SOW categories and financial info for the project, as project details will not be released?

Answer 56:

Canada requires confirmation from clients on all work performed. Information will be treated as protected B and all appropriate safeguards will be in place to ensure the confidentiality of information.

Question 57:

Reference: – RTC1, 2. c) "The services provided by 50% of the resource identified in 1. above must include: i) For Programmer/Analysts "same or similar" tasks are identified as Tasks a., b., c. and g. in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation; and ii) For Testers "same or similar" tasks are identified as Tasks b., d., h. and i. in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation."

Can the Crown please clarify what is required for RTC1, 2.c)?

Answer 57:

For 50% of the resources identified in RTC1, 1., the bidder must clearly indicate how it has met the SOW tasks of this requirement identified in RTC1 2.c). For services that are the same and for services that are similar, it is the bidder's responsibility to clearly indicate how the tasks of the reference contract meet the tasks identified in 2.c).

Question 58:

RTC5 Bidder Experience with new technologies: This criterion states *'Using one or more referenced Contract(s) that have been completed or are ongoing in the last seven years as of bid closing date, the*

Bidder should demonstrate that it has experience providing services for the following new technologies: a) Cloud technologies; b) UX Services; and c) Agile Software Development 'AND '... b) Have an initial minimum value of \$1,000,000.00 excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments ...' further awarding 5 points, to a maximum of 10 points, for each new technology. In order to earn the maximum points for this rated criteria the bidder must demonstrate, for each new technology, two contracts valued \$1,000,000.00 CDN (excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments) with a minimum contract period of one year (not including amendments), and have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years. Respectfully, the requirement to demonstrate these new technologies using contracts completed or ongoing in the last seven years is not practical. The need to demonstrate the criteria for these new technology areas, has not been required in contracts prior to this past year, making it very difficult for a bidder to have multiple contracts with an initial value of minimum \$1M. Would the Crown please consider: 1) reducing the contract value for the two reference contracts in each new technology area to \$500,000.00 (excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments); or 2) reduce the number of references for each new technology to a single (one) contract valued at \$1,000,000.00 (excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments)? Please advise.

Answer 58:

The crown has considered your request however the requirement remains the same. These technologies are mainstream in both private and public organizations and are the norm for most if not all technology requirements for the past several years.

Question 59:

Could the Crown please clarify if the referenced contracts for the RTC5 - Bidder experience with new technologies sections need to be same ones used in the mandatory sections or does it apply to any contract from the bidder?

Answer 59: It applies to any contract from the bidder.

Question 60:

Re: MTC1

This criterion requests that the Bidder demonstrate that it has provided (whichever relevant service) in the past seven years. Is Transport Canada requesting that the Bidder demonstrate SOME experience corresponding to the relevant criteria, or THROUGHOUT the entire 7 years, corresponding to the relevant criteria. Given that the criterion requests one or more reference contracts, we are presuming that the entire 7 years of experience is requested (otherwise it would not be necessary to use more than one contract). Is this the correct interpretation or is one contract that meets the criteria sufficient?

Answer 60:

The interpretation is incorrect. Please refer to MTC1 where it states "Using one or more reference Contract(s), the Bidder must demonstrate that it has provided informatics professional services in the past seven years as of bid closing date as follows:"

Question 61:

Re: RTC1

Could you please clarify if resource names are required for the contracts addressing RTC1? The criterion does not specifically ask for resource names but does in sub-criterion g) ask for specific timelines by resource.

Answer 61: Confirmed. The name of each resource is required. See Revisions 2 and 3 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 62:

In regards to RTC2, RTC3 and RTC4, would the Crown also accept a written statement from a Contract Authority for the additional 5 points?

For example: "If the Bidder includes a written statement from the Project, Technical or Contract Authority..."

Answer 62:

Canada will not accept a written statement from the Contract Authority for the additional 5 points.

Question 63:

Some of our relevant experience is with Crown Corporations and private sector clients. Normally these non Federal Government organizations issue a Master Services Agreement (MSA) with no Initial Value. Callups are then issued and awarded under this MSA each with their own value as they are awarded. Would the Crown accept that the sum of the awarded callups during the initial contract (MSA) term would be equivalent to the Initial Contract Value of a Federal Government contract? This would only apply where no "Initial Contract Value" is provided.

Answer 63:

Canada will accept the value of the first call-up issued against an MSA. The call-up will be treated the same as a reference contract; and must meet the evaluation criteria from Attachment 4.1.

Question 64:

RTC2, RTC3, and RTC4 will award points where Bidders include a written statement from each client organization attesting to the application of the proposed plan for a specific contract. Individuals working in the capacity of a Project or Technical Authority are occasionally replaced, and their successor is not always in a position to provide such an attestation. Will the Crown also accept a written statement from the client Contracting Authority to satisfy these requirements?

Answer 64: See Answer 62 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 65:

Amendment 008 modified MTC1-1e and MTC2-1c to add the following:..."*For same resource categories, Canada will automatically consider referenced resource categories, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 50% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement.*"

As part of the submission, Bidders are required to complete Form 1 for MTC1 and Form 2 for MTC2. Item h in mandatory criteria MTC1, MTC2 and Forms 1 and 2 require Bidders to identify the resource categories and levels provided under the Contract and a brief description of the tasks.

If a Bidder is using TBIPS contracts to respond to MTC1 and MTC2 are they still required to provide the brief description of tasks portion given Canada automatically considers TBIPS resource categories to be 50% aligned to the SOW tasks.

Answer 65:

Although Canada will automatically consider reference resource categories, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 50% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement, bidders are still required to provide the brief description of tasks under MTC1, 3.h) and the brief description of duties under article MTC2, 2.h)

Question 66:

The bid preparation instructions on page 10 includes an instruction to provide Section IV: Additional Information. Can Canada please identify what information must be included as part of the Additional Information documentation.

Answer 66: There is no specific information to include in "*Section IV: Additional Information (if applicable)*".

Question 67:

With respect to RTC5, bidders must demonstrate experience with the listed technologies, using a contract reference that has an initial minimum dollar value of \$1M, not including amendments. Government contracts, particularly Tier 2 contracts, are rarely initially issued for the whole contract value. We find expenditure is typically increased in increments through subsequent amendments. For example, we currently hold a Tier 2 contract that was initially issued for \$400K, but is now valued over \$1M through amendments. Since the contract is a Tier 2 contract, we can fully expect that the value over the life of the contract will be over \$2M. In this case, the initial dollar value of the contract is not reflective of the size of the project, nor corporate capability. Would the Crown consider allowing bidders to demonstrate experience through contracts with a value of \$1M or more, including amendments, excluding applicable taxes in order to be compliant for this criterion (RTC5), provided all of the other criteria are demonstrated? To be clear the project we are referring to is expected to possibly reach \$50 million over 7 years on the Tier 2 contract.

Answer 67: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 68:

Re: MTC1

The Crown's response to Question #45 has caused confusion on how Bidders must demonstrate compliance to MTC1. In this question, the Bidder was requesting clarification from the Crown to determine if the delivery of resources under identical TBIPS categories - regardless of the level - would be accepted.

This response is concerning to industry because Bidders may choose to demonstrate compliance using Contracts other than TBIPS (e.g. Private Sector Contracts) where the resource categories do not indicate a level scale such as TBIPS. In these cases, the RFP states "The Bidder must demonstrate similar resource categories by mapping at least 50% of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category identified in the reference contract". As a result, the Crown may have a situation where a Bidder demonstrates compliance of a junior level QA resource to Tester Level 3 by mapping tasks performed, AND another Bidder's resource provided in a TBIPS Tester Level 2 category performing the identical SOW tasks could be rejected.

A) Would the Crown please confirm that a resource delivered under an identical TBIPS resource category, regardless of the level, would be accepted to demonstrate compliance to MTC1, as long as more than 50% of the RFP SOW Tasks were performed?

B) If the Crown will not accept a Level 2 TBIPS resource when a Level 3 is requested in MTC1, please clarify how Bidders are to demonstrate compliance to the Level.

Answer 68: The 'Levels' have been removed from MTC1. See Revision 1 of this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 69

For RTC1, the Crown has indicated that Form R1 should be used to demonstrate that the Bidder has experience simultaneously providing resources as indicated in the RTC1 response. Points A-F in Form R1 request information consistent with demonstrating Bidder experience with simultaneous deployments,

however point G requests that Bidders provide "The description of the services provided including specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified tasks." We respectfully request that point G be removed from Form R1. Four Programmers/ Analysts and two Testers are requested to be demonstrated, including a breakdown of services and timelines per three month period is an overly arduous task which does not assist in demonstrating to the Crown the Bidder's capacity to deploy resources, and would be more in line with demonstrating resource skills, which is not the intent at this point in the procurement process.

Answer 69:

Article 3.g) of RTC1, and article 3.g) of Form R1 are not being removed. However, they were revised to indicate that 2-3 sentences is acceptable for a description. See Revisions 2 and 3 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 70

Reference RTC1, and Q&A36 of Amendment 011

Question 36 asks: "Regarding RTC1, will the Crown allow Bidders to demonstrate similar categories by mapping at least 50% of the SOW tasks?"

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

- (a) We are using Non-TBIPS Contracts with Non-TBIPS Named Categories to address the resource requirements of RTC1. Please confirm that to address 2. b) or 2. c), we need only to demonstrate that the services provided by our resources have been the same or similar to the four tasks identified in 2. b) or 2. c)?

- (b) We are using TBIPS Contracts with Non-TBIPS Named Categories to address the resource requirements of RTC1. Please confirm that to address 2. b) or 2. c), we need only to demonstrate that the services provided by our resources have been the same or similar to the four tasks required for 2. b) or for 2. c)? For example, we have System Analysts and Web Developers that have provided services that were the same or similar to the four tasks required for 2.b) or for 2. c). We see no reason that this experience does not meet the requirement as stated in 2. b) or in 2.c).

Answer 70 (a) and 70 (b): Confirmed. See Answer 57 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 71:

Reference MTC1 and RTC1, and Q&A45 of Amendment 011

Question 45 asks: "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 states: Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

MTC1 clearly indicates the resource category and resource level required to meet the requirement of MTC1. RTC1 clearly indicates the resource category required to meet the requirement of RTC1 with no mention of resource level. The author of Question 36 as inadvertently, or by design, included RTC1 in their "level" question. Please confirm that as originally written, RTC1 requires the named category or categories indicated regardless of the level? To insert a level requirement at this stage of the solicitation process would, we believe, be introducing a new requirement not initially identified as relevant by the Crown.

Answer 71:

MTC1 has been revised to remove the 'Levels'. See Revision 1 in this Solicitation Amendment. There are no "Levels" associated with RTC1.

Question 72:

Reference FORM M1 BIDDER'S EXPERIENCE (i)

As per Amendment 008, Bullet i) states: "The first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation (for categories outside of the SOW, provide the first and last name of the resource);"

Could you please confirm our understanding of what is required for i):

- 1) No mapping of similar categories occurs in i), this is to be done in k) [k) added in Amendment 008]?
- 2) The following information is to be provided for Resources that are the same or similar to the SOW Categories:
 - first and last name
 - the Category identified in the reference contract
 - the SOW Category being claimed
- 3) for categories outside the SOW, the following information is to be provided:
 - first and last name
 - the Category identified on the referenced contract

Answer 72: Please see Revision 4 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 73:

Reference FORM M2 CLIENT MANAGER (i)

Bullet i) states: "The first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation;"

Could you please confirm our understanding of what is required for i):

- 1) No mapping of similar categories occurs in i), this is to be done in k) [k) added in Amendment 008]?
- 2) The following information is to be provided for resources that are the same or similar to the SOW Categories:
 - first and last name
 - the Category identified in the reference contract
 - the SOW Category being claimed
- 3) for categories outside the SOW, the following information is to be provided:
 - first and last name
 - the Category identified on the referenced contract

Answer 73: Please see Revision 5 from this Solicitation Amendment

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME