

**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/B		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 012
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> G9292-176717		<b>Date</b> 2019-05-07
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-380-34738		
<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> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2019-05-24</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> 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> <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</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>

## AMENDMENT NO. 012

This amendment is raised to answer Bidders' questions.

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

#### **Question 130:**

Workstream 2 Project Management Services - MTC1 requires that bidders map resource equivalencies to 80% same or similar SOW tasks. Most of the workstream roles have between 16 to 21 tasks which is significant given that TBIPS tasks for those same resource categories normally average between 6 to 8 tasks. While this 80% threshold to SOW tasks may be appropriate for G9292-176717/A (where companies are drawing on much larger, national corporate contracts) the additional burden of mapping to 80% of the ESDC SOW tasks is not reasonable and unnecessarily onerous for a PSAB requirement. Our firms represent a much smaller segment of the IM/IT marketplace in Ottawa. To be fair to the Aboriginal suppliers and encourage competition, and given that the minimum bar for eligible projects is already very high (multi resource projects, minimum \$\$ threshold), we respectfully request that Canada reduce the "similar" SOW task mapping requirement under MTC1 to 50% equivalency for "similar" tasks to the TBIPS standard tasks rather than the ESDC SOW tasks

#### **Answer 130:**

Given that ESDC will require resources at any time who have experience with these tasks it is important that bidders demonstrate they have access to such resources. For that reason, the requirement will stay as-is

#### **Question 131:**

The Q&As from AMENDMENT NO. 010 (107 and 108) are unclear on what format to use to effectively respond to requirement RTC1(b) for similar resources.

Can Canada confirm that the following format would be acceptable to substantiate RTC1(b) – Similar Resource Categories?

RTC1(b) – Similar Resource Categories – B.2 Business Architect, Level 3		
i.	The name of the resource	1. John Doe
ii.	The resource category	Senior Business Architect – Has over 10 years of experience in the category.
	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.	<b>Brief Description of Services Provided:</b> John Doe is a Senior Business Architect with over 10 years of experience providing transformation services to... etc.  <b>Demonstrated Experience of 10+ Years in that Category/Dates of the Experience/Client Name:</b>  John Doe has <b>14 years, 3 months</b> of experience as a Senior Business Architect providing the services

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
012

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

		described above for the following projects:  <b>Project 1</b> Client ABC – Contracted by <b>Vendor X (current bidding Vendor)</b> Aug 2011 – Present (7 years, 9 months)  <b>Project 2</b> Client XYZ Jan 2005 – June 2011 (6 years, 6 months)
iii.	The mapping of tasks for a similar resource category	Senior Business Architect services were provided to Client ABC, Please refer to <b>Table 1</b> below.

**Answer 131:**

*This example of substantiation would be acceptable. Please note that the requirement for 10+ years of experience has been removed from RTC1 through Solicitation Amendment No. 011.*

**Question 132:**

As per Q&A 127, the requirement to demonstrate 10+ years of experience for RTC1 is removed.

To clarify, is this only for Level 3 resources in a same or similar category? Are we still able to use Level 2 resources to meet this requirement and, if so, do these resources require a demonstration of 10+ years of experience?

**Answer 132:**

*For RTC1, Bidders are only required to map 80% of the tasks performed to ESDC's SOW for similar resource categories. The requirement for level has been removed.*

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