



## 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

OR via ePost Connect

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 - EL Division/Services  
professionnels en informatique - division EL  
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floor  
10 Wellington Street  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Professional Services - TBIPS 2	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 08915-170500/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20170500	<b>Date</b> 2019-06-20
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-618-35796	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 618el.08915-170500	<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 2019-07-05</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> Laassouli(EL DIV.), Hicham	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 618el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 858-9817 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

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>

**The Request for Proposal (RFP) Amendment 004 is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and amend the RFP accordingly.**

---

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Question: 26**

Is it acceptable to have a contract that has a reliability SRCL but we have supplied secret level clearance resources to satisfy M4 <sup>PB</sup> # 2 in all workstreams “at least two of the contracts provided must have been for resources at the level of Secret or higher” ?

**Answer: 26**

The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question: 27**

For M4 and R5 (billable days), all workstreams, please confirm the 50% mapping of the associated tasks is in reference to the Category of Personnel and not in reference to Category of Personnel and Level.

**Answer: 27**

The Crown confirms that M4 and R5 (billed days) requires 50% mapping of the associated tasks is in reference to Category of Personnel and Level. Refer to table within M4 – All Workstreams.

**Question: 28**

For M4 and R5 (billable days), all workstreams, in order to demonstrate 50% equivalency of the SOW tasks, can the Crown please confirm vendors are required to map only the tasks associated with the resource category per referenced contract, and not required to map the tasks of each individual resource placed on the referenced contract?

For example; please confirm the following would be compliant - Mapping the contract resource category:

Vendor A provided Project Managers to Client Z using contract 123.

Contract 123 defined Project Manager Tasks as detailed below, and is 50% mapped to the SOW outlined in this RFP;

Task 1...(mapped to SOW)

Task 2...(mapped to SOW)

Etc. (mapped to SOW)

**Answer: 28**

The Crown confirms that for M4 and R5 (billed days) requires mapping of the tasks associated with the resource category per referenced contract. Bidders must use Appendix B to Attachment 2 to submit their response to both M4 and R5 using Appendix B to Attachment 2.

**Question: 29**

With regards to R3 (placement of bilingual resources), for all workstreams, could the crown please advise if the placements can be cumulative across all M1 contracts or must a single contract from those identified at M1 be utilized for this criteria?

**Answer: 29**

The Crown confirms the placements can be cumulative across all contracts under M1. Refer to R3 – All Workstreams.

**Question: 30**

With regards to R4 (resource management process) for all workstreams, could the crown please advise if all or some of the contracts from M1 can be used to address the criteria for additional points or if only a singular contract from M1 can be used for all additional points.

**Answer: 30**

The Crown confirms that only one (1) contract may be referenced from M1. Refer to R4 - All Workstreams.

**Question: 31**

M4 for all Workstreams requires bidders to demonstrate that “the work billed for any given resource category must include at least 50% of the associated tasks listed in Annex A – Statement of Work for the same resource category; and, The Bidder must provide a completed Billed Days Response Template for each Resource Category using Appendix B to Attachment 2.” This is further specified in the Appendix B to Attachment 2.

We believe that demonstrating >50% match to the Statement of Work for resources in the exact same TBIPS category is a redundant exercise because the tasks are inherently the same, such is the purpose of the TBIPS role categories and task catalogue. Requiring bidders to map the exact same TBIPS tasks will also increase the Level of Effort on the Crown to evaluate the additional redundant pages of information in response to this solicitation.

In order to save you time in evaluation and eliminate a redundant requirement, can the Crown please confirm that for resource categories that are in the exact same TBIPS category, Bidders do NOT need to map the tasks to the Annex A – Statement of Work?

**Answer: 31**

The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question: 32**

Please provide clarification for all Workstream Titles.

Workstream titles in Part 1, pages 6 and 7 of the RFP do not correspond with Workstream Titles in Attachment 2 – Bid Evaluation Criteria of the RFP.

**Answer: 32**

Refer to Part 1 - pages 6 and 7 for correct Workstream Titles. See RFP change no.8 below.

## **RFP AMENDMENT**

8. At Attachment 2: BID EVALUATION CRITERIA –Workstreams 1, 2 and 4

**DELETE:** Workstreams' titles

**INSERT:**

**WORKSTREAM 1: APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**WORKSTREAM 2: INFRASTRUCTURE/DBA SERVICES**

**WORKSTREAM 4: BUSINESS SERVICES**

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**