



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 SECURITE

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: 7 Workstreams / 7 Volets	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation T8086-172450/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 015
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-172450	Date 2019-05-09
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-626-34855	
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 checked="" 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. 015

This amendment is raised to answer bidders' questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 98:

In APPENDIX C TO ANNEX A, in all seven (7) streams TC requests candidates validate their level of expertise as follows;

- a) Level 2 Resource: Five years within the past seven years
- b) Level 3 Resource: Ten years within the past twelve years.

In order to give TC access to an effective pool of candidates after contract award, would the Crown consider amending now, all references to Level 2 and Level 3 resources in APPENDIX C TO ANNEX A for all seven (7) streams as follows;

- a) Level 2 Resource: Five years within the past ten years.
- b) Level 3 Resource: Ten years within the past fifteen years.

Answer 98: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 99:

Regarding RTC1 – 1 Workstream 6.

For maximum points the bidder must provide multiple, 3 month periods for four programmer analysts CRM and four business analysts UX. And with RTC 2 c) 50% of the resources identified for section RTC 1.1 must include the specific tasks outlined in the SOW tasks (i.e. a, b, c and h) for Programmer Analysts CRM.

Up until fiscal 2018, the adoption rate of MS Dynamics CRM within the Government Departments has been gradual (department by department) starting with smaller, more exploratory type projects. The resourcing requirements to aid in their solution development have been for smaller teams (with more architectural focus). Would the crown consider reducing the number of required resources for this workstream from four (4) Programmer/Analysts CRM and four (4) Business Analysts UX, to two (2) Programmer/Analysts CRM and two (2) Business Analysts UX?

Also, with the specific SOW tasks for Programmer Analysts CRM (a, b, c and h) the crown is requesting that the programmer analysts named in the response to the RFP have experience in customization and integration with MS Dynamics CRM 2016 or higher. The SCMS version of MS Dynamics CRM used by the Government of Canada has recently been released using version MS Dynamics 2015, making much of the previous experience of the Programmer Analyst CRM resources on existing contracts for RTC 1.2 not usable due to this requirement for MS Dynamics 2016 or higher. For this reason, and for future resourcing requirements, it is requested that the Crown consider reducing the MS Dynamics CRM experience requirements in the SOW tasks for Programmer Analyst CRM to experience with MS Dynamics 2013 or higher.

Answer 99: Your request was considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 100:

Regarding Amendments 11 and 12:

In Amendment 11 question 51, The Crown was asked to confirm the understanding of the bidder about RTC1 regarding points awarded per three month period in which the bidder provided "simultaneously" the required resources for the workstream. In providing the answer to question 51 the Crown introduced the word "consecutive" for the first time, by saying that each 3-month period must be "consecutive". Previous to Amendment 11, question 51, the stated requirement was for identifying 3 month periods in which the bidder provided the required resources "simultaneously".

A 3 month period in which the bidder provided the required multiple resource categories “simultaneously” could be for instance January, April and May. Whereas providing resources for 3 months “consecutive” means the months must follow one after another. This is a different requirement all together.

Amendment 12 (in the past week) there has now been a revision to remove resource category levels in MTC1 for all workstreams.

When a bidder is preparing the response to an RFP with corporate requirements such as this, a large amount of effort is expended conducting analysis of many contracts and their billings to match exactly what is written in the RFP requirements before the response writing can commence. Having the requirements fundamentally change at this late date in the RFP response (as they have in Amendments 11 and 12) means the bidder must re-evaluate their current response and rework or even change some, or all, of the reference contracts for which they’ve already based their response.

Respectfully we ask that the Crown reconsider its response to question 51 to remain fixed to the original requirement to provide resources “simultaneously”. Also, due to the change in removing levels for the resource categories in MTC1, we respectfully ask the Crown to consider extending the response date to June 7th, to allow the bidders to re-analyze and re-write their responses.

Answer 100:

Each 3 month period must be consecutive (one month following another). The overall 24 months does not have to be consecutive. The bid closing date remains May 22, 2019.

Question 101:

Amendment 12, Question 63 regarding MSA contract values.

In Question 63 It was asked if the Crown would accept for a Master Services Agreement (MSA) with no Initial Value the sum of the awarded callups during the initial contract term as equivalent to the

to the Initial Contract Value. The Crown’s answer was a yes, but that it would accept the value of the “first call-up” issued against an MSA.

Respectfully, the “first call-up” against an MSA could be for one resource, and would not represent the value of the initial contract period. Would the Crown please confirm that the value of the total call ups in the initial contract period (excluding amendments and taxes) is acceptable?

Answer 101:

Your request has been considered but the answer to question 63 remains unchanged

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME