



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. 014
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-172450	Date 2019-05-07
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 2019-05-22	
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. 014

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

CLARIFICATION 1:

For MTC1, MTC2, RTC1, RTC2, RTC3, RTC4, and RTC5 Canada **will accept** the Project Authority, the Technical Authority, or the Contracting Authority as the point of contact for reference contracts.

For RTC2, RTC3, and RTC4 Canada **will accept** the written statements from the Project Authority, the Technical Authority, or the Contracting Authority.

RFP REVISIONS:

REVISION 1.

At Solicitation Amendment 012:

Delete:

Answer 62 and Answer 64.

Insert:

Answer 62: See Clarification 1 from Solicitation Amendment 014.

Answer 64: See Clarification 1 from Solicitation Amendment 014.

REVISION 2.

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Part A: Mandatory Corporate Experience, the Bidder, MTC2, article 2.i):

Delete:

- i) The first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category;

Insert:

- 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;

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 74:

MTC1 - The Crown is requesting that bidders use contracts with a minimum initial value of \$2M to demonstrate compliance to MTC1. This could mean that Bidders can demonstrate compliance with contracts that have an actual billed value of much less than \$2M and therefore do not demonstrate the level of experience Transport Canada requires for this contract. Additionally, many contracts issued under TBIPS for similar services have a minimum initial value of less than \$2M. This includes Transport Canada's own current contracts for some of the services sought by this RFP including, contract T8080-140159 for Testers and Technical Writers that had an initial award value of \$1.7M, but has a current billed value of \$2.6M.

In order to align MTC1 requirements to request demonstration of contracts of similar size and scope, would the Crown please allow bidders to demonstrate compliance using contracts with a minimum **current billed value** of \$2M? Please ensure this question is forwarded to the Transport Canada **Technical Authority** for review as this is a critical question.

Answer 74:

Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged. TBIPS contracts currently in place at Transport Canada do not pertain to this requirement. There are no incumbents to this requirement.

Question 75:

In Amendment 009, Q28 the Crown indicated:

"For Categories outside of the Statement of Work, provide the first and last name of the resource in item i) of Form M1."

Could you please confirm that this should read: "... provide the first and last names of resource(s) in item i) of Form ..." as multiple resources may be used to cross reference, and that no other information is required other than names in section i) of form M1.

Answer 75:

Form M1 was revised. Please see Solicitation Amendment 012, Revision 4.

Question 76:

In response to MTC1; RTC1 and RTC5, the respective forms (Form M1; R1 and R5) all request the Client's full name, title, email address and phone number. The information being asked by these requirements can easily be verified by contracting authorities. Would the Crown please confirm that using the contracting authority as the point of contact for the reference is acceptable for these requirements?

Answer 76:

Confirmed. Please see Clarification 1 from this solicitation amendment.

Question 77:

The Crown is asking for references as demonstrated proof against requirements MTC1; MTC2; RTC1; RTC2; RTC3; RTC4 and RTC5. Many of these require multiple references in order to meet the requirement. The level of effort to write these references and obtain client approval is very extensive. While we recognize the Crown has already granted the vendor community a very healthy extension we would respectfully request that the Crown grant an additional two extension?

Answer 77:

The bid closing date was extended to May 22, 2019. See Solicitation Amendment 013.

Question 78: Left blank intentionally.

Question 79:

Amendment # 11 Q&A 51 is asked and answered in a way that implies the total 24 months required to obtain full points must have occurred consecutively (i.e. Overall 24-month period = 1-Jan-16 to 31-Dec-18).

However the RTC1 requirement and other questions with respect to this same requirement (i.e. Amend # 11 Q&A 37(iii)) would imply that each 3 month period must be consecutive but that the full 24 month period is not required to be consecutive. As an example, if a bidder has demonstrates:

Between 1-Jan-15 and 31-Dec-15; 4 Programmer Analysts and 2 Testers over all 12 months in this period; and

Between 1-Jan-17 and 31-Jan-17; 4 Programmer Analysts and 2 Testers over all 12 months of this period.

Can the Crown please confirm that the bidder would have fulfilled the requirement even though the overall 24-month period is not consecutive?

Answer 79:

Each 3 month period must be consecutive. The overall 24 months does not have to be consecutive. In the scenario identified in the Bidder's question, the Bidder would be assigned full points.

Question 80:

It is our understanding that Transport Canada's Digital Service Directorate (DSD) is looking to engage with partners with the necessary experience to address and deliver on Transport Canada's business and transformation needs with minimal impact to existing business activities.

Given that the RFP requires innovative skills for DSD to deliver on its requirements, and that DSD would benefit from global industry leading practices and experience, would Transport Canada please confirm that References from the bidder's Ultimate Parent company, the company that controls the bidder, be acceptable?

Answer 80:

Canada will not accept references from the Bidder's ultimate parent company. As stated in MTC1, RTC1, RTC2, RTC3, RTC4, and RTC5 "The reference Contract(s) must have been contracted with the Bidder submitting a bid for this requirement. "Bidder" means the person or entity (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."

Question 81:

Page 47 of 89, 3.2, A.11 Tester Level 3, k. Perform coded UI

Could we please request clarification of this Tester task? This would seem to belong with the Programmer/Analyst tasks and more in line with Workstream 6 UX experience of Solicitation T8086-172450/A.

Answer 81:

Automated tests that drive an application through its user interface (UI) are known as coded UI tests (CUITs). These tests include functional testing of the UI controls. They let you verify that the whole application, including its user interface, is functioning correctly. This task description remains unchanged.

Question 82:

In regard to MTC2 (Client Manager), requirement 2h states that bidders are to provide "The resource categories and level provided under the Contract; and a brief description of their duties"

Can the Crown please confirm that requirement MTC2 2h only applies to the resource categories being used to demonstrate the "same or similar" SOW specific categories.

Answer 82:

That is incorrect. Article MTC2 h.) applies to SOW categories and to categories outside of the SOW.

Under article MTC2, 2. h), the bidder must provide the resource categories provided under the Contract; and a brief description of their duties. See Solicitation Amendment 012, Revision 7.

Under article MTC2, 2.i), the bidder must provide the first and last name of the resource cross referenced against the resource category. For categories outside of the SOW, the bidder must provide the first and last name of the resource. See Revision 2 from this solicitation amendment.

Under article k) for similar categories, the bidder must provide the mapping of the SOW tasks of this requirement to the tasks of the resource category in the reference contract. Article k) does not apply for same categories and for categories outside of the SOW.

Question 83:

MTC2 1. e) "Have an initial minimum Contract Period of one year, not including amendments; and". Would the Crown please consider revising the above requirement to allow Bidders to include exercised option years'?

Answer 83: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 84: Left blank intentionally.

Question 85: Left blank intentionally.

Question 86:

For RTC1 – we need more clarification as to how points will be achieved. Bidders are scoring 5 points for 3 consecutive months billing for 8 resources. Each additional 3 months scores an additional 5 points. Bidders need to demonstrate 8 x 3 months periods = 24 months in order to score full. Our understanding is that the 24 months periods does not have to be consecutive. For example, a bidder could demonstrate 3 months consecutives with 8 simultaneous resources in March, April, May 2018 and another 3 months consecutive with 8 simultaneous resources in Sept, Oct, Nov 2018 etc.... Is our understanding accurate?

Answer 86:

Please see Question and Answer 79 from this Solicitation Amendment.

Question 87:

Our plan to bid has changed significantly based on recent amendments. This is to request an extension of the closing date of this solicitation to May 30 as these responses represent significant effort on our part.

Answer 87:

The bid closing date was extended to May 22, 2019. See Solicitation Amendment 013.

Question 88:

Reference Amendment #12 Q&A #57

Question 57: Reference 1: RTC1, 2. c) **"The services provided by 50% of the resources 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).

Answer #57 does not address what is meant by "**The services provided by 50% of the resource identified in 1.**

- Does that mean 50% of the resources 4 Programmer Analysts and 2 Testers?
- 50% of the SOW tasks? - The tester has 13 SOW tasks and we are asked to provide equivalencies for 4 (b.,d.,h., and i), so the 50% can not relate to the SOW tasks

Sorry but it is not clear what that requirement means.

Answer 88:

The purpose of the following example is to outline RTC1, articles 2. b) and 2. c). This example only uses the category Programmer/Analyst. It doesn't mention the other category or the other requirements of RTC1. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that all the requirements of RTC1 are met in order to be awarded the points.

Ex: To demonstrate 4 Programmer/Analysts for RTC1. b), Bidder X, must demonstrate through one or more reference contract that the services provided by each of the 4 Programmer/Analyst were the same or similar to any four of the SOW tasks for Programmer/Analyst from Annex A of this bid solicitation.

For article RTC1, 2 c.): the services provided by 2 of those Programmer/Analysts (i.e. 50% of the 4 Programmer Analysts), must include tasks that are the same or similar to tasks a, b, c, and g for Programmer/Analyst from Annex A of this bid solicitation.

Question 89:

Questions 62 and 64 in Amendment #12 indicate that bidders cannot use a Contract Authority for RTC2, RTC3, and RTC4. Contracts that have an initial minimum value of \$1M often have multiple Technical/Project Authorities who can only speak to their specific group and bidders are working with the Contract Authority for the tasks associated with their Contract Management Plan, Talent Management Plan, and Risk Mitigation Strategy and who can also speak to the entire contract. Therefore, would the Crown please re-consider and accept a signature from Contract Authorities for RTC2, RTC3, and RTC4?

Answer 89: Please see Clarification 1 and Revision 1 from this solicitation amendment.

Question 90:

Reference 1: Amendment 011, Question & Answer 48:

"Question 48:

MTC1/RTC1 item 2 b) and c):

Please confirm that if the bidders are using a TBIPS contract where they provided resources in the exact same TBIPS resource category as the Crown is requesting in this bid solicitation to demonstrate billable hours in a resource category, the bidder does not need to map tasks to the SOW as per items 2 b) & 2 c), as these resources have already demonstrated alignment to the role. This will save the evaluators time, as it is for this purpose that the TBIPS resource catalogue was created (to create a standard category definition/base SOW).

Answer 48:

Confirmed for MTC1. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 008, Revisions 1, MTC1, 1. e) and f). The requirement remains unchanged for RTC1."

Reference 2: Amendment 012, Question & Answer 65:

"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)."

Based on the response provided in Amendment 011, Question & Answer 48 (see Reference 1 above), we ask why in Amendment 012, Question & Answer 65 (see Reference 2 above) are you now asking for additional effort providing a brief description of tasks under MTC1, 3.h) and the brief description of duties under article MTC2, 2.h)? Please confirm that a TBIPS to TBIPS same resource category does not require mapping to SOW tasks nor a brief description of tasks/duties in MTC1 and MTC2.

Answer 90:

In Question 48, the bidder referenced articles MTC1/RTC1 2b) and c).

Articles 2.b) and 2c) don't exist in MTC1, they only exist in RTC1.

Canada confirmed in its Answer 48 that for MTC1 articles 1.e) and f) that Canada will automatically consider reference resource categories, procured through the TBIPS vehicle, to be 50% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement. Question and answer 48 did not pertain to article MTC1, article 3.h).

Canada also stated in Answer 48 that RTC1 remains unchanged. Since the time that Answer 48 was published, RTC1 article 3.g) was revised. See Revision 7 in Solicitation Amendment 012.

The brief description of tasks required in article MTC1, 1. h) is separate from what is defined in articles MTC1, articles e) and f). A brief description of tasks is required under article MTC1, article 3.h). This is not a new requirement. The Answer 65 remains valid.

The brief description of duties required in article MTC2, 2.h) is separate from what is defined in articles MTC2 1 c). Note: See Solicitation Amendment 012, Revision 7 for minor correction to article MTC2, 3.h).

Question 91:

Amendment # 12 Q&A # 56 a vendor company requested that we be able to use a contracting authority and the response from the Crown states that "Canada requires confirmation from clients on all work performed"

The information being requested in MTC1; RTC1 and RTC5 and through their respective forms (Form M1; R1 and R5) can easily be verified by contracting authorities. Additionally many of the contracts being used to support these requirements are into a single client organization however the services being provided are to multiple Technical Authorities and/ or client contacts making it impossible for an organization to find a single client within the organization willing to confirm all the work that was conducted under the contract. The Contracting Authority would have all records of task authorizations and services call-up through these large contracts. Would the Crown please allow vendors to use the contracting authority as the point of contact for the reference provided against MTC1; RTC1; and RTC5?

Answer 91: Yes, see Clarification 1 from this solicitation amendment.

Question 92:

Transport Canada's response to Question #63 removes the emphasis from "initial minimum value" on a contract and places it on delivery, to a specified level of spend.

If the level of spend/delivery achieved on a contract is to be considered equal to the presence of an initial minimum value on the contract, then will the Crown replace other instances of "initial minimum value" with "total billed value", to recognize those contracts which demonstrate the same volume of delivery with or without an initial value guarantee?

Answer 92: Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 93:

Removing levels from MTC1 materially changes a Bidder's ability to respond. We request a two week extension to allow for Bidders to review the RFP in light of this significant change.

Answer 93:

The bid closing date was extended until May 22, 2019. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 013.

Question 94: Left blank intentionally

Question 95:

By removing the "Levels" requirement in MTC1 in Amendment 12, Transport Canada has significantly impacted many firm's ability to respond to this solicitation. By releasing this amendment on May 1st, two weeks prior to the closing date, firms that now qualify are put at disadvantage. To ensure a fair competitive process for all qualified bidders, we would like to request a two week extension to the current due date of the RFP.

Answer 95: The bid closing date was extended until May 22, 2019. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 013.

Question 96:

As Contracting Authorities are responsible for the overall management of a contract, some Project and Technical Authorities (who may only be able to attest to a specific aspect of a Vendor's performance) are referring Vendors back to the Contracting Authority or client designate to provide contract references.

The requirements listed in RTC2, RTC3 and RTC4 are contractual in nature and in many instances, especially in large Canadian Federal Government contracts/supply arrangements, the Contracting Authority or client designate (with the authority to provide contract references) are well suited to confirm an organizations experience in adhering to these practices.

As a result, we recommend that Contracting Authorities and client designates also be allowed to provide the written statements for RTC2, RTC3 and RTC4.

Answer 96: Please refer to Clarification 1 from this solicitation amendment

Question 97:

Please refer to the revised mandatory technical criteria tables in Amendment 8 which state that "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." The requirement for Bidders to outline experience providing same or similar services is also a part of RTC1. Considering MTC1 and MTC2 were amended to allow use of TBIPS contracts to demonstrate 50% alignment to SOW tasks, and considering that Bidders can use the same contract to support both MTC1 and RTC1, would the Crown please add "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" to RTC1?

Answer 97:

Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 008 is applicable to MTC1 and MTC2. It does not apply to RTC1. For RTC1, Canada will not automatically consider referenced resource categories, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 50% aligned with the SOW tasks of this requirement. Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME