



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

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Special Projects Division (SPD)/Division de Projets
Spéciaux (DPS)

Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floor

Terrasses de la Chaudière 4e étage

10 Wellington Street,

10 Wellington Street,

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet IPRMS Technology Partner Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation U8210-198681/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client U8210-198681	Date 2019-07-26
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XU-002-36647	
File No. - N° de dossier 002xu.U8210-198681	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-09-19	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Kim, Raquel	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 002xu
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 406-0742 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: INNOV, SCI AND ECON DEVT CAN PDP 1, 11 FLOOR 50 VICTORIA ST K1A0C9	

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

THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT NO. 001 IS RAISED TO:

1. Respond to questions received from suppliers; and
2. Amend the RFP.

PART A: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #001

Reference:

General Question

Question #001:

CIPO CDS and IPRMS requirements were tendered in April this year through RFP (No. U8210-197923/A), why is the IPRMS requirement being re-tendered separately under this RFP (No. U8210-198681/A)? What major changes were made to the IPRMS requirement?

Answer #001:

With respect to the IPRMS requirement, no bid was received through the previously issued solicitation U8210-197923/A. As a result, numerous changes were made to reduce barriers preventing industry from bidding. Below is a summary of the major changes:

- Awarding one (1) contract versus awarding up to two (2) contracts;
- In the Statement of Work, removed Strategic Advisory Services requirement;
- In the Statement of Work, reduced the required resource categories and the number of resources while increasing the total working days associated with most resource categories;
- In the evaluation of the corporate experience, reduced the number of the mandatory criteria from six (6) to five (5) and relaxed the requirements related to IT transformation or modernization as well as to the formal practice;
- In the evaluation of the key resources, decreased the number of key resources to be evaluated from seven (7) to four (4); and
- In the technical evaluation, amended most criteria by adjusting parameters such as reducing minimum contract value, reducing minimum duration and increasing the timeframe within which the contract or the project was completed.

Question #002

Reference:

Incumbent

Question #002:

Could Canada please confirm, is there, or has there been, an incumbent performing the duties described in the RFP? If so, who was the company and what was the contract amount?

Answer #002:

Canada confirms that no supplier has provided or is providing, to CIPO, the services described in the IPRMS Technology Partner Services (TPS) RFP.

Question #003

Reference:

Joint Venture

Question #003:

Can joint ventures bid on this RFP?

Answer #003:

Yes, joint ventures can bid on this RFP provided that they comply with Section 1.2.7 of the RFP that states "SA Holders that are invited to compete as a joint venture must submit a bid as that joint venture SA Holder, forming no other joint venture to bid. Any joint venture must be already qualified under the SA #EN578-170432 as that joint venture at the time of bid closing in order to submit a bid."

Question #004

Reference:

Bid Closing Date

Question #004:

For the previous release of this RFP, Canada had eventually allowed seven weeks to respond. The current RFP has changed since the previous release in April, however it still requires a very high level of effort, so that a compliant and qualitative response can be submitted.

Due to the high levels of vacation during this time and the complexity and level of details required, would Canada please consider granting an extension of (1) month to September 19, 2019?

Answer #004:

Canada grants an extension of the bid closing date. The new bid closing date is **September 19, 2019**. Please note, Canada has no intention to further extend the bid closing date.

Question #005

Reference:

Bidder's Conference

Question #005:

Will Canada consider to hold a Bidder's conference or meeting at some point of time during the solicitation to provide Bidder's with an overview of the CIPO's vision and procurement strategy (i.e. Technology Partner Services and Business Partner Services) to provide additional information to support decisions by the vendor community?

Answer #005:

Canada may consider holding a Bidder's conference or Bidder's information session during the solicitation process to provide insights and additional program information as well as to address industry key concerns, provided that such request is received from multiple suppliers.

Question #006

Reference:

Technical Evaluation

Question #006:

In responding to requirements CM-1, CM-2, CPR-1, CPR-2 or CPR-6, if a Bidder has modified, or built, depending on the respective requirement a Case Management Workflow System with an integrated Document/File Management System, is it acceptable for the Bidder to cite one contract to address both part A and part B of these requirements?

Answer #006:

Yes, the Bidder can provide the same reference contract for both Part A and Part B of CM-1, CM-2, CPR-1, CPR-2 or CPR-6 if the reference contract covers all the requirements as described in Part A and Part B, respectively.

Question #007

Reference:

Technical Evaluation

Question #007:

Many large value contracts are omnibus type contracts and not developed specifically for a single project. Therefore, if a Bidder has delivered multiple projects, involving, for example, two (2) Case Management systems under a single large value omnibus contract, is it acceptable for bidders to reference these two (2) projects against the same requirement? For example, CPR-1 requires between 2 and 6 years' experience enhancing or upgrading Case and Workflow Management Systems. If a Bidder has experience on a 36-month project (project A) developing a Case and Workflow Management System and also on a 37-month project (project B) developing a Case and Workflow Management System that were delivered concurrently under the same large value contract, will this Bidder be awarded 60 points?

Answer #007:

As stated in the RFP, Canada considers concurrent years of experience for corporate criteria but would not accept concurrent years of experience for key resources. In the above described scenario, the Bidder would be awarded 60 points.

For greater clarity, to demonstrate the required corporate experience, the Bidder must provide **reference contract(s)**. On the other hand, to demonstrate the required key resource experience, the Bidder must provide **reference project(s)**. In this case, this large value contract will be considered as one (1) reference contract for the

corporate criteria. However it may be used, if applicable and appropriate, as two (2) different reference projects for key resources criteria.

Question #008

Reference:

Statement of Work

Question #008:

Has ISSED/CIPO selected a commercial off the shelf solution(s) to enable this vision? If no, is it CIPO's intention to procure COTS to meet its requirement or leverage existing GC licensing?

Answer #008:

ISSED/CIPO has not yet selected any solution(s). However, CIPO intends to leverage GC licensing of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software(s)/solution(s). Should this not be viable or suitable, CIPO, with support from the Technology Partners and the Business Partner, would explore alternative options and implement the most appropriate solution.

Question #009

Reference:

General Question

Question #009:

Does Canada envision the "Business Partner" referenced in the RFP to provide program management and integration services for the CDS and IPRMS contracts?

Answer #009:

It is anticipated that the Business Partner will work with ISSED/CIPO and the Technology Partners in providing leadership, management and advisory services to support the modernization, harmonization and integration of CDS and IPRMS applications and systems. The work requirements for the Business Partner would include enterprise-wide business service (e.g. business solution and technology solution), enterprise-wide management service (e.g. portfolio management and project management) and procurement support service.

Question #010

Reference:

Statement of Work

Question #010:

Can Canada confirm if the Technology Partner will provide services primarily in support of the current legacy environment or will this Technology Partner contract be leveraged to support the transformation to enable CIPO's vision?

Answer #010:

The IPRMS Technology Partner would be required to primarily support the modernization, harmonization and integration of various CIPO applications and systems. The IPRMS Technology Partner could be also requested to provide some resources to provide in-service support to legacy systems. Please refer to *Annex A - Statement of Work* for more details.

Question #011

Reference:

General Question

Question #011:

RFP Section 2.1.6 states "Subsection 4 of Section 5 of SACC 2003 (2019-03-04) is amended as follows:

Delete: 60 days

Insert: 365 days

Would Canada explain why the bid validity period is increased significantly?

Answer #011:

Canada intends to conclude this procurement early Q4 Fiscal Year 2019-2020. The bid validity period is increased from 60 to 365 days to mitigate potential unforeseen issues in the solicitation which may result in significant delay of contract award.

Question #012

Reference:

General Question

Question #012:

To leverage corporate global qualifications and experiences, would Canada consider to revise the definition of Bidder to include its affiliates, parent and subsidiaries?

Answer #012:

Canada will be reviewing this suggestion with pertinent stakeholders and provide a formal response in the subsequent solicitation amendment.

Question #013

Reference:

Technical Evaluation

Question #013:

Multiple rated requirements award additional points for projects that were delivered for an International Property Office, thereby reducing the maximum possible score for a Bidder who has not worked on Case and/or Document Management projects with CIPO or other international IP offices to a maximum of 91.45%. This requirement therefore favors both incumbent providers and international Bidders, while placing otherwise qualified Bidders with a strong track record of service delivery to the government of Canada at a distinct disadvantage. Therefore we respectfully request that Canada remove all IP specific point allocation.

Answer #013:

To further differentiate Bidders' technical experience and capability, IPO-specific experience will be appreciated with additional points. However, to ensure fairness and avoid bias, the weight of such experience is cautiously limited to 8.55% of the total score.

As we have responded in **Answer #002** to **Question #002**, no supplier has provided or is providing, to CIPO, the services described in the IPRMS Technology Partner Services (TPS) RFP. Furthermore, as per CITT decision, incumbent advantage is acceptable in government procurement to a certain extent.

Nevertheless, Canada will be reviewing this suggestion with pertinent stakeholders and provide a formal response in the subsequent solicitation amendment.

Question #014

Reference:

Bid Closing Date

Question #014:

Given this is the holiday season, obtaining the client references is proving to be somewhat challenging hence we are formally requesting a two (2) week extension?

Answer #014:

See **Answer #004** to **Question #004**.

Question #015

Reference:

Bid Closing Date

Question #015:

Given the scope of the requirement and the timing (peak vacation period), would Canada extend the bid closing date by ten (10) business days?

Answer #015:

See **Answer #004** to **Question #004**.

PART B: RFP REVISIONS

No revision has been made to the RFP as a result of this Solicitation Amendment.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE BID SOLICITATION REMAIN UNCHANGED.