



**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> 010
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> G9292-176717	<b>Date</b> 2019-04-30
<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> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
010

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

---

## 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.**"

---

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

**Question 103:**

**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 103:**

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

**Question 104:**

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 104:**

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

**Question 105:**

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 105:**

*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 106:**

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 106:**

*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 107:**

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 107:**

*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 108:**

**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 108:**

*See Answer 107.*

**Question 109:**

**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 109:**

*No, see Answer 104.*

**Question 110:**

**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 110:**

*See Answer 104.*

**Question 111:**

**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 111:**

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

**Question 112:**

**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 112:**

*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 113:**

**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 113:**

*Confirmed.*

**Question 114:**

**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.”*

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
010

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

**Answer 114:**

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

**Question 115:**

**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 115:**

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

**Question 116:**

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 116:**

*See answer 107.*

**Question 117:**

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 117:**

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

**Question 118:**

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 118:**

*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 119:**

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 119:**

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

**Question 120:**

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 120:**

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

**Question 121:**

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 121:**

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

**Question 122:**

**Reference #1:** Amendment # 008 - *Question/Answer 94: With regard to Workstream #1 – Business Services and Workstream #2 – Project Management Services – Rated Requirement RTC1, b) (ii) 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.*

- 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 122:**

- a) *For similar resource categories, 10+ years of experience in the category is to be demonstrated.*
- b) *See Answer 107.*

**Question 123:**

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 123:**

*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.**