



**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> 006
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20170500	<b>Date</b> 2019-06-28
<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> Fuseau horaire 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 006 is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and amend the RFP accordingly.**

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### Question: 53

Regarding Section 4.4 Basis of Selection, item (b) Contract Funding Allocation:

(ii) “where two contracts are awarded, the amount of the Limitation of Expenditure of each contract will be determined in accordance with the following:

- A. the Bidder with the highest Total Bidder Score will receive 90% of the funding initially allocated for that Workstream; and
- B. the Bidder with the next highest Total Bidder Score will receive 10% of the funding initially allocated for that Workstream.”

With the way the evaluation is set up the probable difference between Total Bidder Score of the top 2 bidders will be less than 5%, a 90%/10% contract allocation does not seem fair and reasonable where fairness and reasonableness are two of the guiding principles of PSPC/PWGSC. Awarding a contract with a 90%/10% contract allocation can decrease the Number #1 ranked bidder's competitive spirit and their desire to perform their best as they are already guaranteed the vast majority of the work with little or no competition. Awarding a contract with a 90%/10% contract allocation can also lessen the desire of the Number #2 ranked bidder's competitive spirit and their desire to recruit and provide the best resources as there is little or no incentive to do so. Would PSPC please change the contract allocation to be in line with the actual Total Bidder Scores achieved and in line with stated PSPC principles of fairness and equality?

### Answer: 53

The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

### Question: 54

Canada has introduced a new requirement for bidders to provide Client Reference Letters for requirements R4.1-R4.4 for all 5 streams. This could potentially result in bidders providing up to twenty (20) letters (four letters per stream x five streams). This is a very high level of effort requirement, and introducing this new requirement so late in a solicitation with an already restrictive timeline is unreasonable.

Furthermore, given that we are in the peak vacation season of the year, obtaining review and approval of 20 Client Reference Letters for R4.1-R4.4 will be very difficult as many GoC employees are on vacation. This new requirement could prevent bidders from responding to this RFP. Bidders are already providing client contact information so that the Crown may confirm responses to R4.1-R.4 so these letters are unnecessarily redundant.

Please either provide bidders with a minimum two week extension to facilitate the collection of up to 20 Client Reference Letters, or remove this unfairly restrictive additional requirement for letters as it is redundant.

### Answer: 54

The Bidder must provide Client Reference letters for R4.1, R4.2, R4.3 and R4.4 (all Workstreams). See amendment to RFP below.

### Question: 55

Regarding M4 bullet #6 across all Workstreams – states “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.” The tasks in Annex A for multiple resource categories ask for specific products, tools, and processes related to DFATD's environment. Additionally, the tasks also refer to the EICS project specifically which is

restrictive to none incumbent respondents. We respectfully ask that any task referencing the DFATD environment (referring to products, tools, processes) or the EICS project specifically be removed from the task list. As an alternative, respondents should have the option to comply with 50% of associated tasks for a given category as defined by that Workstream under the TBIPS Supply Arrangement. (<https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/sptb-tbps/categories-eng.html>)

**Answer: 55**

Refer to Answer 44 under RFP Amendment 005.

**Question: 56**

Regarding R5 for all Workstreams. Column 'B' and 'C' in the evaluation table refer to SM1, please confirm this should read SM4. Also, under the Demonstrated Experience (Bidder's Response), it refers to Total Billed Days provided in response to M1, please confirm this should also read M4. In the end, only contracts from M4 can be used for R5, please confirm.

**Answer: 56**

Confirmed.

**Question: 57**

Given the number of the contract references required, the volume of billable days that need to be tabulated, the time of year with resources away on vacation, and the number of TBIPS requirements in the market today. In order for the Crown to receive competitive and compliant bids from the greatest amount of qualified suppliers in support of this mandate, we respectfully request a (2) week extension to July 19, 2019.

**Answer: 57**

Refer to Answer 6 under RFP Amendment 001.

**Question: 58**

In Reference to All Workstreams M4 and R5, We would request that the Crown remove the Billable Days requirement for matching resource category levels. Describing equivalent resource category tasks should be sufficient to assure the Crown of resources' relevant experience, without the number of years/levels constraint.

**Answer: 58**

The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

**Question: 59**

Regarding Criterion 6 of requirement M4 and related R5 requirement in all workstreams: since standard TBIPS tasks were created in order to establish a common set of experience for specific resource categories/levels, could the Crown please confirm that no mapping is required for given resources with the same category and level as listed in the subject requirement, and that 50% mapping is only required to demonstrate the relevance of similar, but not same, categories?

**Answer: 59**

Refer to Answer 47 under RFP Amendment 005.

**Question: 60**

Please confirm that bidders are expected to use the same three contracts to meet both M1 and R1 requirements, in all workstreams.

**Answer: 60**

Confirmed.

**Question: 61**

Please confirm that the numbering for criterion a) of requirement R4.4 in Workstream 1 should be i to v and not vi to x.

**Answer: 61**

Confirmed.

**Question: 62**

For all Workstreams - Please confirm that requirement R5 should refer back to M4 in the example scenario grid (which currently refers to "SM1" in columns B and C), and the evaluation criteria column (which currently refers to "M1" for the scoring).

**Answer: 62**

Refer to Answer 56 above.

**Question: 63**

In section 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions, submission is requested as soft copy on USB key. Would The Crown accept a soft copy on CD in lieu of the USB key?

**Answer: 63**

The Crown will not accept soft copy submission on CD- Refer to section 2.1.g under Part 2. The Crown encourages all Bidders to use the epost Connect service to submit electronically their Bids to help support PWGSC Policy on Green Procurement – refer to section 3.1.b under Part 3.

**RFP AMENDMENT**

13. At 4.2 Technical Evaluation under Part 4

**DELETE:** 4.2.a.iii

**INSERT**

(iii) If the Phased Bid Compliance Process applies, it will apply only to mandatory technical criteria identified by the superscript (PB) **and the submission of Client Reference Letters requested under rated technical criteria R4.1 to R4.4 (under all Workstreams)**. Mandatory technical criteria **or rated technical criteria** not identified by the superscript (PB) will not be subject to the Phased Bid Compliance Process.

14. At ATTACHMENT 2 BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, Corporate Rated Evaluation Criteria – **R4.2** and **R4.3** All Workstreams:

**ADD:** **“The Bidder should provide a letter from its client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique identifier) that confirms the services provided by the Bidder.”**

15. At ATTACHMENT 2 - BID EVALUATION CRITERIA, Corporate Rated Evaluation Criteria (All Workstreams)

**ADD:** the superscript (<sup>PB</sup>) to the following wording under R4.1 , R.4.2, R4.3 and R4.4

The Bidder should provide a letter from its client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique identifier) that confirms the services provided by the Bidder <sup>PB</sup>.

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