



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. 019
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8086-172450	Date 2019-05-14
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 2019-05-23	
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. 019

This amendment is raised to answer bidders' questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 106:

Reference – Appendix C to Annex A: Level 2 resources – all workstreams MTC1 - resource assessment for TA callups

In the case of all resource assessment criteria that will be used to conduct resource assessment of task authorizations, where Level 2 resources are required they must display “five years within the past seven years” of skills relevant to the role. This does not provide much leeway for someone that is otherwise suitably qualified to have done something that is not related to the role. Even a consultant that might have taken parental leave would be constrained by this requirement. We request that the window of time be increased to require “five years in the past nine years”.

Answer 106: See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 017.

Question 107:

Reference – Appendix C to Annex A: Level 3 resources – all workstreams MTC1 - resource assessment for TA callups

In the case of all resource assessment criteria that will be used to conduct resource assessment of task authorizations, where Level 3 resources are required they must display “ten years within the past twelve years” of skills relevant to the role. This does not provide much leeway for someone that is otherwise suitably qualified to have done something that is not related to the role. Even a consultant that might have taken parental leave would be constrained by this requirement. We request that the window of time be increased to require “ten years in the past fifteen years”.

Answer 107 : See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 017.

Question 108:

Reference – Appendix C to Annex A: all workstreams MTC2 – resource assessment for TA callups

In cases where Level 3 resources are required, MTC2 requires that a minimum of five projects of six months duration be used to substantiate experience. The allowable window of time that can be used is “within the last five years:.. This is a relatively small window of time in which at least five projects of six months each must be demonstrated (three years in the last five). It means that someone that might have been working on short-term projects less than six months in duration but representing more than two years in the last five years would not qualify, even though they may be more than qualified to perform the role. We request that the window of time be increased to “within the last seven years”. This would provide some leeway for resources that work on shorter-term projects from time to time without negatively affecting their eligibility for consideration.

Answer 108: See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 017.

Question 109:

Workstream 3 – Appendix C to Annex A: C.3 – IT Security TRA and C&A Analyst - MTC2

- a. Security/cyber resources tend to work on initiatives that are relatively short in duration. That might make it very hard to find resources that are otherwise qualified but that have at least five projects with minimum durations of six months in the last five years (meaning at three years in the last five). We request that the project duration be reduced so that five projects only need to be three months in duration to be acceptable.
- b. Security/cyber resources tend to work on initiatives that are relatively short in duration. That might make it very hard to find resources with experience in “new technologies” that are otherwise qualified but that have at least one project with minimum durations of four months. We request that the project duration be reduced so that projects only need to be two months in duration to be acceptable.

Answer 109: See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 017.

Question 110:

Workstream 3 – Appendix C to Annex A: C.7 – IT Security Design Specialist - MTC2

- a. Security/cyber resources tend to work on initiatives that are relatively short in duration. That might make it very hard to find resources that are otherwise qualified but that have at least five projects with minimum durations of six months in the last five years (meaning at three years in the last five). We request that the project duration be reduced so that projects only need to be three months in duration to be acceptable.
- b. Security/cyber resources tend to work on initiatives that are relatively short in duration. That might make it very hard to find resources with experience in “new technologies” that are otherwise qualified but that have at least one project with a minimum duration of four months. We request that the project duration be reduced so that projects only need to be two months in duration to be acceptable.

Answer 110: See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 017.

Question 111:

Workstream 4 – Appendix C to Annex A: I.11 Technology Architect – MTC1

MTC1 indicates that resources must demonstrate ten years of experience that are “same or similar to tasks a., b., c. and g.” Sub-item (c) includes “Develop IaaS and PaaS solution architectures on cloud platforms such as MS Azure, Amazon, SAP or others...” Concepts such as IaaS and PaaS have been around for a while, but use of “MS Azure, Amazon, SAP and others” has only started to be seen used in government in the last few years. Some of these environments have only recently been certified for government of Canada use at this point in time. That would make it very hard to demonstrate 10 years of “same or similar” experience specific to sub-item (c). We request that sub-item (c) either be removed from this list of required items, or that in the case of sub-item (c) only two (2) years of “same or similar” experience needs to be demonstrated.

Answer 111: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 112:

Workstream 6 – Appendix C to Annex A: A.7 Programmer/Analyst (CRM) – MTC1

MTC1 indicates that resources must demonstrate ten years of experience that are “same or similar to tasks a., b., c. and h.” Sub-items a, b and h all specify experience is required with CRM 2016 or higher. MS Dynamics CRM 2016 was officially release November 30, 2015 so as of the current due date of the RFP, it would only be possible to have accumulated three and one-half years of experience. MTC1 requires ten years of experience specific to CRM 2016 or higher. We request that sub-items a, b and h all be changed to reflect “any version of MS Dynamics CRM”.

Answer 112: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Question 113:

Given that the Crown continues to provide clarifications and revisions to language (e.g., Amd. 16) that change requirements substantially, demanding that bidders revisit eligible contracts and revise/entirely redo work toward the submission that was already completed, we respectfully request an additional two-week extension.

Answer 113: Solicitation Amendment 016 was issued to correct a typo in Answer 78. It did not change the requirement. Your request was considered but the bid closing date is not being extended.

Question 114:

In regards to Q&A98, will the Crown reconsider their answer? The purpose of this contract is to add value to Transport Canada through access to the best IT talent available as it relates to each Stream. Limiting TC's access to top talent by setting specific timelines on a resource's past experience will directly limit Transport Canada's access to quality and top talent IT consultants.

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 114: See Revision 1 from Solicitation Amendment 017.

Question 115:

Given the number of amendments issues against this solicitations and the volume and complexity of this response we are respectfully requesting that the Crown grant an additional one week extension to the solicitation closing date?

Answer 115: The bid closing date was extended. See Solicitation Amendment 018.

Question 116:

We would like to pose the following question to the **Transport Canada Technical Authority** for Solicitation T8086-172450/A:

All Streams, RTC1: Q&A 79

Canada has previously confirmed very clearly in AMD 11 Q&A 51 that the 3-month periods used to achieve points on RTC1 need to be consecutive, and therefore full points would **require 8 consecutive 3-month periods (24 months)**. AMD 14, Q&A 79 fully contradicts this direction, now allowing 3-month periods that are not consecutive within a fixed 24 month period.

As bidders have already invested significant time and money into their response to this RFP, a change such as this significantly impacts the references chosen to demonstrate compliance with this requirement. This is not the first time an amendment for this solicitation has contradicted previous clarification resulting in significant impact to industry as a result.

Please confirm that the direction provided in AMD 11 Q&A 51 stands, and that in order to achieve full points the bidder must identify 8 consecutive 3-month periods (therefore resulting in 24 consecutive months) where the requested resources were provided, using multiple contracts if required.

Answer 116: Each 3 month period must be consecutive (one month following another). The overall 24 months does not have to be consecutive.

Question 117:

Can the Crown please confirm that for requirement RTC1, 3) g. The description of the services provided (2-3 sentences) including the first and last name of each resource, and the specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified task. (amendment #12) Bidder's are only required to provide 2-3 sentences for the overall experience that is being requested in #RTC1, 1).

For example: WS1 RTC1 3)g. would include 2-3 sentences to describe in aggregate the work that the ten named Programmer/ Analysts and 2-3 sentences to describe in aggregate the work that the two named Testers performed (as identified in RTC1 1). Bidders are not required to provide 2-3 lines per each of the 12 named resources (ten named Programmer / Analyst and two named Testers) and no names / descriptions are required for any resources that were provided on the reference contract that do not correspond to the work stream category.

If this is not the case, could the Crown please indicate what a response to this section should include in order to gain full points.

Answer 117:

Revision 2 of Solicitation Amendment 012, states "*RTC1, 3.g) The description of the services provided (2-3 sentences) including the first and last name of each resource, and the specific timelines by the resource to demonstrate compliance with the identified tasks.*"

For each Contract identified; the RTC1, 3.g) description must demonstrate that 50% of the resources identified in RTC1,1. provided services the "same or similar" to the tasks identified in RTC1, 2.c); and that the remaining identified resources provided services that are the same or similar to at least four of the tasks identified for the specific resource and category in Annex A of this Bid Solicitation. It is the Bidder's responsibility to decide how long their descriptions need to be. If the Bidder can provide a description in 2-3 sentences, then that is acceptable. If the Bidder's descriptions need to be longer than 2-3 sentences, then that is acceptable as well.

Question 118:

With respect to this RFP's many amendments (17), clarifying Questions/Answers (103), and Requirement revisions; in order for Bidders to have any hope of providing a compliant response, we request an extension to the due date of at least one week. Bidders will require a traceability matrix to ensure they are using the correct version of the requirements and a thorough assessment of all the clarifying Q&As in context of the revised requirements and then may need to adjust already prepared work. If Bidders could receive an updated RFP, that may help matters. The confusion around this RFP's requirements is considerable and puts Bidders at great risk of non-compliance.

Answer 118:

Canada extended the bid closing date. See Solicitation Amendment 018. No further extensions are being considered due to operational needs. Canada will not post an updated RFP. However, Word versions of all solicitation amendments are available upon request to carole.holden@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that any revisions made through any solicitation amendment issued through Buy and Sell are taken into account.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME