



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

Title - Sujet Professional Services - TBIPS 2	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 08915-170500/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 009
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20170500	Date 2019-07-05
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-618-35796	
File No. - N° de dossier 634el.08915-170500	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-07-19	
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: Durigan, Angela	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 634el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 859-0753 ()	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

The Request for Proposal (RFP) Amendment 009 is raised to answer questions received from Bidders.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: 75

Regarding M1 and R1 for all workstreams: The Crown is asking for the Bidder to demonstrate experience on 3 customer reference contracts for M1 and then asking for the Bidder to demonstrate experience for R1 over and beyond M1. Would the Crown please confirm that the additional 3 contracts referenced in R1 cannot be the same 3 contracts referenced in M1 and that the 3 contracts referenced for R1 need to have a cumulative billed value of >\$20M to score full points?

Answer: 75

See Question and Answer 60.

Question: 76

Regarding M2 for all workstreams: Would the Crown please confirm that the Bidder has to demonstrate that the same 15 resources worked for the same 6 month period?

Answer: 76

Confirmed.

Question: 77

In all Work streams R2 ISO Quality Management Certification is weighted more heavily than R3 for Bilingual Resources and scores nearly as much as R1 for Reference Contracts. Given the importance of substantiating the contracts used in M1, M2, R1, and R3 and the high level of importance of having capable bilingual resources available to work in the Global Affairs environment the weighting the R2 appears to be very heavy. In order to ensure a resulting contract focused on the highest priorities of the solicitation process, we would like to request that the Crown reduce the total number of points allocated in R2 to a maximum of 15 points.

According to current TBIPS spend on testers, the government of Canada issued \$8.6 million in testing services for all federal departments during the 2018-2019 fiscal year. According to the bench strength requirements for Stream 3, Global Affairs Canada is requiring vendors to demonstrate a total of 19,000 billed days between testers and test coordinators. This is equivalent to 86 full time resources at 220 billed days per year across four contracts for the five year duration. This number of resources, if assessed at market value for senior resources would equate to at least \$11.2 million dollars being spent by GAC for testing services over the next 5 years, equivalent to \$2.2 million per year and fully equivalent to a quarter of the total government spend. Is the Crown suggesting that GAC is absorbing 25% of the overall spend by the government of Canada?

In responding to R4 the Crown is asking bidders to supply extensive and comprehensive information about their operating procedures and quality management processes and to include client references to validate that vendors have successfully applied and adhered to these quality management processes on large contracts delivered over a long period of time. Given this very thorough demonstration of bidders capabilities and quality control processes, signed off on by independent client references, we fail to see how holding an ISO certification will demonstrate any additional value to the Crown. Not only are bidders already demonstrating their internal quality control processes in depth but in responding to this solicitation must demonstrate millions of dollars, and tens of thousands of billed days in completed business this equates to hundreds of candidates being placed and no staffing firm would be able to accomplish this without having consistent and robust internal processes and quality controls making the ISO certificate, redundant as it fails to demonstrate or prove any capability or standards that are not already conclusively demonstrated by any company that succeeds in passing the mandatory criteria within this solicitation. Furthermore the number of

staffing firms otherwise qualified to respond to this solicitation who hold an ISO certification is extremely limited, representing an exceedingly small portion of qualified TBIPS vendors. Overall the requirement for bidders to have an ISO certification creates no value for the Crown but does needlessly skew the evaluation, favoring a small subset of otherwise well qualified and capable vendors who, by responding to this solicitation, are demonstrating an equivalent level of quality management. We strongly urge the Crown to remove Rated Requirement R2 in order to ensure a competitive solicitation process that will create the greatest value.

Answer: 77

The request has been reviewed, the requirement remains unchanged.

Question: 78

In reference to Question/Answer 27, where the Crown confirms that M4 and R5 requires 50% mapping to Category and Level:

In instances where a Bidder is using contract references outside of the Federal Government or non TBIPS where levels are not defined using the TBIPS methodology for assigning levels to resource categories OR contract references where resources were placed under a level 2 and in both instances the contract category of personnel performed 50% or more of the associated tasks under the same/similar role, level should be inconsequential. As such, we request that M4 and R5 be based on billable days for each category and demonstrating same or similar services regardless of the level as performing equivalent resource category tasks should be sufficient to assure the Crown of relevant experience, without the number of years/levels constraint.

Answer: 78

DFATD confirms that the actual TBIPS category levels are not required to be referenced, however bidders must still demonstrate that the years of experience are a minimum of ten (10) years as per the definition of the TBIPS level 3 category (10 years).

Reference question 79 for additional information.

Question: 79

The Crown has asked for pricing for level 1, level 2 and level 3 resources but have not differentiated in the SOW between the category tasks and the levels of experience. In other words, regardless of the level, the set of tasks are the SAME for that category. As such, we request that M4 and R5 be based on category and demonstrating same or similar services regardless of the level as performing equivalent resource category tasks should be sufficient to assure the Crown of relevant experience, without the number of years/levels constraint.

Answer: 79

DFATD confirms the intent of the solicitation is to access Level 3 resources because of the complexity of the project (EICS II). All resources will be evaluated at the Level 3 category. Although Level 1 and Level 2 resources will not be evaluated at the RFP stage, the Department reserves the right to do so during the contract.

Reference question 78 for additional information.

Question: 80

All streams - R4.3 (Training and Ongoing development of Resources) & R4.4 (Retention of Resources) have the same item a) Is this an error? Amendment #1 corrected the error on item i) but a) is also duplicated please confirm if it remains the same for both is this an error? R4.2 & R4.4 - a)The Bidder's response will be evaluated based on the extent to which the description of the proposed approach and process should result in the provision of contract resources that are competent and knowledgeable of the client's IT environment and the support tools they utilize as demonstrated through the following elements.

Answer: 80

See answer 66.

Question: 81

All streams M4/R5 the requirement is to map to 50% of the associated tasks, some of the tasks listed are specific to DFATD- for example in Workstream 1- Data Conversion Specialist there are 18 bullets we are required to map to 9, 10 of the 18 bullets reference DFATD and/or EICS II (a DFATD system) which equates to only DFATD contracts can be used to meet that requirement. Please confirm that in instances where DFATD is named or a specific application or program is listed it can be met by demonstrating the experience with any department or company and by demonstrating the experience on any system or application.

Answer: 81

Refer to Answer 44 and RFP amendment 10 in solicitation amendment 005.

Question: 82

All streams - Amendment #2 - Question 13 validates the rigorous mandatory components that are required to have and maintain ISO certification, given the audit and surveillance audit (yearly) requirement in order to maintain your ISO certification the current requirement current still allows bidders who have not yet obtained or maintained to pass, would the crown amend R2 further stating that certification must be in place and in good standing before contract award.

Answer: 82

The requirement will not be amended as requested. Please refer to RFP amendment 17 in solicitation amendment 006.

Question: 83

We respectfully request a 3 week extension to the current TBIPS Tier 2 solicitation close date of 05 July, as the corporate requirement for bidders to substantiate and verifying billable days with client references and the corporate mandatory requirements for client attestations requiring signed client letters, can only be secured after the bidder has amassed an enormous amount of documentation at a corporate level for compliancy/substantiation purposes. We note that Amendment 002 released 18 June introduced additional requirements for client contact references for all billable days and associated contracts.

To grant an extension allowing Bidders enough time to amass this information prior to contacting and securing appropriate high-level signatories and client references for any claimed contract experience during the peak summer holiday season (compounded by a lack of client availability which is beyond the bidder's control) would seem reasonable given the significant time and effort bidders will have invested by way of response to this multi workstream Tier 2 solicitation.

Answer: 83

The solicitation closing date has been extended to July 19th, 2019. Please see solicitation amendment 007.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED