

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/B		Amendment No. - N° modif. 010
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client G9292-176717		Date 2019-04-30
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-380-34738		
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. 010

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

RFP REVISIONS:

1. **At Attachment 4.1, Mandatory Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 – Business Services and Workstream 2 – Project Management Services, MTC4, Bidder's Experience Delivering and Supporting Business Transformation Services:**

Delete:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that it has experience delivering and supporting business transformation services for an outside client's IM/IT **project**."

Insert:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that it has experience delivering and supporting business transformation services for an outside client's IM/IT **contract**."

2. **At Attachment 4.2, Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 – Business Services, RTC1, Point Rating:**

Delete:

Point Rating
Up to a maximum of 30 points will be awarded as follows:
B.1 Business Analyst – Level 3
1 resource = 1 point
2 resources = 2 points
3 resources = 3 points
4 resources = 4 points
5 resources = 5 points
B.2 Business Architect – Level 3
1 resource = 1 point
2 resources = 2 points
3 resources = 3 points
4 resources = 4 points
5 resources = 5 points
B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist – Level 3
1 resource = 1 point
2 resources = 2 points
3 resources = 3 points
4 resources = 4 points
5 resources = 5 points
B.5 Business Process Re-Engineer – Level 3
1 resource = 1 point
2 resources = 2 points
3 resources = 3 points
4 resources = 4 points
5 resources = 5 points

Point Rating	
B.7 Business Transformation Architect – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
B.14 Technical Writer – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
Maximum Points Available:	62
Minimum Points Required:	43

Insert:

Point Rating	
Up to a maximum of 18 points will be awarded as follows:	
B.1 Business Analyst – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
B.2 Business Architect – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
B.5 Business Process Re-Engineer – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
B.7 Business Transformation Architect – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
B.14 Technical Writer – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
Maximum Points Available:	50
Minimum Points Required:	35

3. At Attachment 4.2, Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Workstream 2 – Project Management Services, RTC1, Point Rating:

Delete:

Point Rating	
Up to a maximum of 30 points will be awarded as follows:	
P.1 Change Management Consultant – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
P.5 Project Executive – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
P.9 Project Manager – Level 3	
1 resource= 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
P.9 Project Manager – Release Manager – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
P.10 Project Scheduler – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
P.12 Risk Management Specialist – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
4 resources = 4 points	
5 resources = 5 points	
Maximum Points Available:	62
Minimum Points Required:	43

Insert:

Point Rating	
Up to a maximum of 18 points will be awarded as follows:	
P.1 Change Management Consultant – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
P.5 Project Executive – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
P.9 Project Manager – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
P.9 Project Manager – Release Manager – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
P.10 Project Scheduler – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
P.12 Risk Management Specialist – Level 3	
1 resource = 1 point	
2 resources = 2 points	
3 resources = 3 points	
Maximum Points Available:	50
Minimum Points Required:	35

4. At Attachment 4.2, Point-Rated Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 – Business Services and Workstream 2 – Project Management Services, RTC3:

Delete:

RTC3	Bidder's Contract Management Experience The Bidder should demonstrate that it has recent experience managing separate IM/IT contracts simultaneously with an overlap of at least 12 months between them. Each contract claimed should have had a minimum value of \$1.5M	Points will be awarded for the number of contracts that overlapped by at least 12 months. 2 contracts = 5 points 3 contracts = 8 points 4 contracts = 10 points 5 contracts = 12 points >5 contracts = 15 points
-------------	---	---

	<p>(amendments and applicable taxes included).</p> <p>To demonstrate this experience the Bidder must provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The name of the organization the contract was with;b) The Customer Reference contact information;c) The Contract number;d) The value of the Contract (applicable taxes included);e) The Contract start and end dates; andf) A list of the resource categories provided under the contract. <p>Customer References may be contacted by Canada to verify the information provided in response to this criterion. See sub-article 3.2 Technical Bid, paragraph (iv) Customer Reference Contact Information of this bid solicitation for further instruction.</p> <p>Customer References are only required for the past two years from date of bid closing.</p> <p>Only experience claimed between January 1, 2012 and bid closing date will be considered for evaluation purposes.</p>	
--	---	--

Insert:

RTC3	<p>Bidder's Contract Management Experience</p> <p>The Bidder should demonstrate that it has recent experience managing separate IM/IT contracts.</p> <p>Each contract claimed should have had a minimum value of \$1.5M (amendments and applicable taxes included).</p>	<p>Points will be awarded for the number of contracts managed.</p> <p>2 contracts = 5 points 3 contracts = 8 points 4 contracts = 10 points 5 contracts = 12 points >5 contracts = 15 points</p>
-------------	--	---

	<p>To demonstrate this experience the Bidder must provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The name of the organization the contract was with;b) The Customer Reference contact information;c) The Contract number;d) The value of the Contract (applicable taxes included);e) The Contract start and end dates; andf) A list of the resource categories provided under the contract. <p>Customer References may be contacted by Canada to verify the information provided in response to this criterion. See sub-article 3.2 Technical Bid, paragraph (iv) Customer Reference Contact Information of this bid solicitation for further instruction.</p> <p>Customer References are only required for the past two years from date of bid closing.</p> <p>Only experience claimed between January 1, 2012 and bid closing date will be considered for evaluation purposes.</p>	
--	--	--

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question 104:

In reference to Workstream 2 – Project Management Services, RTC1, Project Manager – Release Manager Level 3:

When substantiating the Project Manager – Release Manager Level 3 with scenario b) providing a “similar resource category”, (iii), it is now necessary for Bidders to show 80% task mappings to the RFP’s SOW tasks for that category. Since the category of P.9 Project Manager – Release Manager does not exist under TBIPS, all Bidders will be required to map all 5 resources for this category. In addition, the RFP SOW for this category lists 25 tasks. Given that many non-TBIPS or non-government contracts typically have 5-10 SOW tasks, it is unrealistic to expect Bidders to successfully map 20/25 tasks to meet the 80% threshold. We request that Canada identify 5 to 10 of the most important tasks for the role of Project Manager – Release Manager Level 3 and request that Bidders map 80% of those most important tasks identified.

Answer 104:

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

Question 105:

Further to the response in Amendment 7, Question 84, can Canada confirm that if a Bidder is demonstrating a “similar category” at Level 3 that it is not necessary to also demonstrate the resource has 10+ years’ experience? For example, if a Bidder were to demonstrate experience providing a Business Architect Level 3, by providing a Business Consultant Level 3, and demonstrating an 80% mapping of tasks, that would be sufficient to meet the criteria of RTC1? i.e. No additional demonstration of the resource’s 10+ years’ of experience is necessary?

Answer 105:

For a “similar” resource category at Level 3, the Bidder is to demonstrate an 80% mapping of tasks and 10+ years of experience.

Question 106:

Amendment 7, Question 84 implies that if Bidders are using a similar category at a Level 3 to demonstrate compliance with a particular resource category that it is not necessary to further demonstrate the resource’s 10 years of experience. If this is the case, will Canada accept a Senior level resource procured through the TSPS, THS or ProServe SA/SO vehicles to be equivalent to TBIPS Level 3? For example, would Canada consider a resource placed in the category Change Management Consultant, Senior under the TSPS Supply Arrangement to be equivalent to the Change Management Consultant – Level 3 under TBIPS, and therefore demonstrating the resource has 10+ years’ experience is unnecessary?

Answer 106:

For a “same” resource category at Level 3, only TBIPS resource categories are acceptable. Resource categories from other vehicles are considered “similar” and an 80% mapping of tasks and a demonstration of 10+ years of experience is required.

Question 107:

In Amendment 007, Rated Requirement RTC1, item b) ii) was amended to read: *"The resource category **and** demonstrated experience of 10+ years in that category"*.

Can Canada confirm that the following example would be considered acceptable substantiation for *"demonstrated experience of 10+ years in that category"*?

"John Doe – Senior Project Manager – 12 years, 6 months of experience as a Project Manager"

Answer 107:

As stated in RTC1 b) to demonstrate experience for similar resource categories, the Bidder must submit:

- (i) The name of the resource;*
- (ii) The resource category **and** 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*
- (iii) The mapping of tasks for a similar resource category.*

Therefore, the statement "John Doe – Senior Project Manager – 12 years, 6 months of experience as a Project Manager" would be insufficient.

Question 108:

For RTC1, where Bidders are referencing Level 2 resources instead of Level 3 resources and are therefore required to demonstrate 10+ years in that category, how should this be demonstrated? Would it be sufficient to provide a table summarizing the resource's experience, with client names, dates, and role of the resource?

Answer 108:

A table summarizing the following would be sufficient:

- i. The name of the resource;*
- ii. The resource category **and** 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*
- iii. The mapping of tasks for a similar resource category.*

Question 109:

With regard to Workstream #1 – Business Services – Rated Requirement RTC1, bii)

For "similar resource categories", the RFP requests that the bidder provide demonstrated experience of 10+ years in this category. Could you please provide feedback as to what form this demonstration of experience should take? Is it sufficient to state that the resource has 10 years of experience in the category or is it expected that an entire resume will be required, mapping tasks to the relevant category for over 10 years? (this would be an enormous amount of work).

Answer 109:

See Answer 108.

Question 110:

RE: RTC1, AMD 007

Combined in this amendment and the previous one, the Crown changed RTC1 so that resources in similar categories now must a) demonstrate 10+ years of experience; AND b) their SOW tasks for the Bidder's Contract Reference must be mapped to 80% of the RFP SOW tasks.

It is unclear how the Crown wishes Bidders to demonstrate 10+ years of experience of the individual resources who fulfilled these placements under the Bidder contract(s), as it changes the response to this criterion from a Corporate Reference-based response to demonstration of an individuals' experience which is Resource-based.

In previous TBIPS RFPs similar requirements (e.g. Solicitation #01B68-17-0280) accepted Bidders' certification to demonstrate compliance. This would allow Bidders' responses to R1 to remain focused on the Corporate Reference and the similarity of the SOW tasks for the category to the RFP SOW which is being substantiated.

Would the Crown accept a Bidder signed certification that they have vetted and confirmed the individuals being used in "similar categories" have 10+ years of experience in the category?

Answer 110:

No, see Answer 105.

Question 111:

RE: RTC1, AMD 007, Q&A#84 & Q&A#88

In Q&A 84 & 88, the Crown states that Bidders are only to demonstrate the 10+ years of experience in the role for similar categories when the level of experience is less than Level 3/Senior. Please confirm that where Bidders are using contract references with similar resource categories that are at a Senior Level (Level 3) it is not required to further demonstrate that the individuals have 10+ years of experience in the category.

Answer 111:

See Answer 105.

Question 112:

RE: Appendix C to Annex A - Workstream 1 – Business Services - B.1 Business Analyst, MTC5:

There are many internationally recognized business analysis certifications, diplomas, and degrees, aside from the IIBA (CBAP) and the PMI (PBA) certifications, which are utilized by top resources in the field. Currently, requirement MTC5 greatly limits the number of qualified resources, resulting in the Crown not receiving the benefit of having access to qualified candidates in a timely manner.

Would the Crown consider removing MTC5 OR rephrase as follows "*The proposed resource must demonstrate certification in business analysis from an internationally recognized organization or a degree/diploma in a relevant field (e.g. Business Administration, Business Analyst). A copy of the certification/degree/diploma must be provided with the resume*"?

Answer 112:

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

Question 113:

RE: Appendix C to Annex A - Workstream 1 – Business Services - B.5 Business Process Re-engineering Consultant, MTC3 and MTC4:

Workstream 1 – B.5 Business Process Re-engineering Consultant asks for both a Business Process Mapping Certification and an accreditation from an internationally recognized organization. Many Business Process Re-Engineering Consultants will not obtain both, as there is a significant overlap in knowledge between the accreditations and certifications that would qualify in this category.

As such, to avoid redundancy and increase the pool of qualified, senior resources, please merge MTC3 and MTC4 into one requirement that reads, *“The proposed resource must have a Business Process Mapping Certification or an accreditation from an internationally recognized organization such as TOGAF or the Business Architecture Guild. A copy of the certification or accreditation must be provided with the resume.”*

Answer 113:

Canada agrees to merge MTC3 and MTC4 into one requirement that reads, “The proposed resource must have a Business Process Mapping Certification or an accreditation from an internationally recognized organization such as TOGAF or the Business Architecture Guild. A copy of the certification or accreditation must be provided with the resume.”

Question 114:

RE: Appendix C to Annex A - Workstream 1 – Business Services - B.7 Business Transformation Architect MTC3 and Workstream 2 – Project Management Services – P.1 Change Management Consultant, MTC4:

For Workstream 1 – B.7 Business Transformation Architect MTC3 and Workstream 2 – P.1 Change Management Consultant MTC4 please confirm that the Crown would accept the following accreditations:

- Certified Change Management Professional (CCMP)
- Change Management Specialist (CMS)
- Certified Problem and Change Manager (CPCM)
- Change Management Certificate Program from the Association for Talent Development
- Prosci Change Management Certification
- APGM Organizational Change Management Foundation
- AIM Change Management Certification

Answer 114:

Confirmed.

Question 115:

RE: Appendix C to Annex A - Workstream 2- Project Management Services – P.2 Project Executive, MTC5 and MTC6:

It is rare for a Project Executive to hold this many certifications/degrees, and as written, these requirements preclude many highly qualified resources. With such a small pool of resources, there is a significant risk to the Crown come delivery (due to delays), as finding project executives with this many certifications could ultimately cause delays to the project. As such, would the Crown please amend MTC5 and MTC6 to one requirement, which reads:

“The proposed resource must hold a valid certification in Project, Program and/or Portfolio Management from an internationally recognized institute. Certifications that are acceptable are PMP, PgMP, PfMP, MSP, MOP, PRAXIS. A copy of the certification must be provided with the résumé.”

Answer 115:

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

Question 116:

RE: Appendix C to Annex A - Workstream 2 – Project Management Services – P.2 Project Executive, MTC7:

This Project Executive grid already requires heavy certification requirements. In order to provide the client full benefit of access to top resources in the market, please confirm that for MTC7 any relevant undergraduate or graduate degree will be accepted.

Answer 116:

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

Question 117:

Regarding Amendment 007 for RTC1 item b), (ii) – For similar resource categories, the Crown is asking that Bidder's demonstrate that the resource has 10+ years in that category. The only way to demonstrate this experience is to provide resumes for each individual resource that the Bidder is referencing, meaning that Bidders who submit a response for both Workstream 1 and Workstream 2, would need to potentially obtain 60 individual updated resumes. This requirement very much favours the incumbent companies who are employee-based vendors and is not aligned with the GoC's mandate for an open and fair procurement process. As the services required under this contract will be for an as and when requested basis, many suppliers use an independent contractor based model rather than an employee based model. Requiring vendors to obtain up to 60 resumes from resources who provided services 7 years ago is unnecessarily onerous. Therefore, will the Crown accept the cross-referencing and a client reference to demonstrate the similar resource categories?

Answer 117:

See answer 108.

Question 118:

We are encouraged that the crown has selected a financial evaluation (RFP Para 4.3) for each workstream using firm per diem rates provided by the responsive bids establishing a lower median band limit of (-) 10% if three or more bids are determined responsive. We feel this financial evaluation discourages potential bidders from proposing unreasonably low rates. We understand the crown has at its disposal various mechanisms (including vendor performance) to further obligate bidders to honor the rates proposed over the period of any contract, however it can be frustrating for clients and their respective initiatives to enact such actions after contract award. To service and support major initiatives by ESDC through this set of contracts, we recommend that the basis of selection (RFP Para 4.4) by the crown be modified to seventy (70) technical score and thirty (30) financial score to further encourage appropriate financial bidding practices by responsive bidders.

Answer 118:

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

Question 119:

For Workstream 1 and 2, please provide clarification with regards to MTC4. Q&A#21 states "Bidders must cite one singular contract, per Workstream, that demonstrates experience a) to g)". Q&A#59 "one or more projects can be used to demonstrate experiences MTC4 a) to g)". Please confirm that Bidders must cite one singular contract, per Workstream that demonstrates experience a) to g) and that one or more projects can be referenced under this singular contract.

Answer 119:

We confirm that Bidders must cite one singular contract, per Workstream that demonstrates experience a) to g) and that one or more projects can be referenced under this singular contract.

Question 120:

Workstream 2 Project Management Services

RTC3 requests that bidders provide five (5) \$2Million "12 month overlapping" contracts. As it is written, this criterion excludes companies that have supplied many more IM/IT contracts in the National Capital Region, valued over \$2 Million. As a proud Aboriginal Supplier to the Canadian government, we find the specificity of criterion gives the appearance that this work is suited only to an incumbent supplier. Granting an unfair advantage to an Aboriginal Supplier, in a pool of qualified companies that is already notably underrepresented (fewer than 10 of us able to consider this work as a possibility) undermines what is supposed to be an open, fair, transparent and competitive process. In its current form, this criterion is too restrictive for Aboriginal vendors, despite our strong history with the Federal Government. We respectfully request that the Crown remove the overlapping timeframe for Aboriginal Suppliers on G9292-176717/B.

Answer 120:

See answer 90. Canada agrees to remove the overlapping timeframe.

Questions 121:

Workstream 2 Project Management Services

Similarly, **RTC1** requests that Aboriginal Suppliers demonstrate that they have provided 30 resources to score full points. Our company has provided well over 100 resources to the Federal Government in a vast array of IM/IT positions. As it is currently stated, our company is unable to score points that would allow us to pass on the solicitation, even though as a proud Aboriginal Supplier, we are capable of fulfilling all of the requirements set out in MTC1, MTC2, MTC3, MTC4, and RTC2. Again, this high threshold seems more appropriate to the general services stream (G9292-176717/A), but when applied to the SPAB Streams (G9292-176717/B) contributes to the appearance that the requirements are constructed in such a way that an incumbent supplier is the only firm capable of meeting them, and we believe this presents an unfair advantage. We respectfully request that the Crown reduce the volume of resources required for RTC1 to a maximum of (15) fifteen, so that we can participate on this solicitation and increase competition.

Answer 121:

Canada agrees to revise RTC1. See revision 2. and 3. of this solicitation amendment.

Question 122:

With respect to RTC1, the latest amendment (007) allows firms to name resources proposed by the Bidder in Level 2 roles and 1) for same roles demonstrate 10 years experience naming clients and providing a description of services and/or 2) map 80% of the SoW for similar resources and demonstrate 10 years experience naming clients and providing a description of services. Bidders are to provide the response in the format of their choosing.

We request that RTC1 be amended to more objectively evaluate the Bidder's ability to demonstrate capacity and that RTC1 consist of naming resources placed by the Bidder (to a maximum of five resource)s in each resource category, irrespective of level, for the following reasons with no mapping or demonstration of ten years experience required for both RTC1.

a) As it stands now the Crown may receive what amounts to up to 80 resources gridded (task and years of experience) which will be impossible to evaluate in an objective and consistent manner for point rating purposes since Bidder's are determining the response format and content which will result in an evaluation that most certainly is open to challenge (i.e. CITT) and this places an undue burden on Bidders and on the Crown.

b) MTC1 does not require resource levels nor does the requested resource list related to the Client Demand Manager under RTC2 aligning with the evaluation of capacity to meet demand; and

c) TBIPS contracts vary widely in terms of the levels of resource categories included.

A Bidder's capacity is best demonstrated by the number of resources provided by resource category, not the level (or years of experience) since this is contract specific.

Amending this requirement will eliminate the subjectivity of evaluation, the significant volume of work required to provide this level of detail to this amended requirement and realign RTC1 with the objective of demonstrating capacity and capability to respond to the volume expected by ESDC.

Answer 122:

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

Question 123:

For Workstream 2, the Crown has requested that Bidder's demonstrate, under RTC1 - the provision of up to 5 resources provided for the category P.9 Project Manager - Release Manager. As noted by another Bidder this category does not exist under the TBIPS arrangement. As such there are no comparable TBIPS contracts against which the list of tasks provided can be mapped. Will the Crown consider eliminating this category and requesting an additional 5 named resources P.9 Project Manager resources?

Answer 123:

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

Question 124:

For Workstream 1, the Crown has requested that Bidders' demonstrate, under RTC1 - the provision of up to 5 resources provided for the category B.4 Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Specialist. Although part of the TBIPS Business Services group, this is a unique skill set that is seldom provided by the same Bidder that would provide the other Business categories. We respectfully request that ESDC remove the RTC1 requirement for this category.

Answer 124:

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

Question 125:

Reference #1: Amendment # 008 - *Question/Answer 95: With regard to Workstream #1 – Business Services and Workstream #2 – Project Management Services – Rated Requirement RTC1, b) (ii) Answer 95: 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.*

- a) Please confirm Bidders are to use Level 3/Senior resources for demonstration to this requirement.
- b) Please confirm the indication of L3 or Senior will suffice for the demonstration of 10+ years of experience. Otherwise, Bidders would have to provide detailed resource resumes to indicate the resources' 10+ years of experience.

Answer 125:

- a) *For similar resource categories, 10+ years of experience in the category is to be demonstrated.*
- b) *See Answer 108.*

Question 126:

As per Question and Answer 85 in Amendment 007, "For MTC1, the requirement to specify the level has been deleted". Therefore, since the level at which the resource performed the work is not relevant to this particular requirement, would Canada please confirm that in the case that a resource is considered to have worked under a "similar category" and under a different level, Bidders would only be required to map 80% of the tasks performed to ESDC's SOW, but would not have to demonstrate that the resource has 10+ years of experience?

Answer 126:

Confirmed. For MTC1, Bidders are only required to map 80% of the tasks performed to ESDC's SOW for similar resource categories.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.