



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions - TPSGC

**Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
11 Laurier St.\11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
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

Business Transformation and Systems Integration
Service/Division de transformation des opérations et
d'intégrat
Special Procurement Initiative Dir
Dir. des initiatives spéciales
d'approvisionnement
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floor
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet ISST - TBIPS Professional Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP243-200016/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20200016	Date 2019-11-04
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XE-683-36915	
File No. - N° de dossier 683xe.EP243-200016	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-11-20	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Ouellette, Kristen	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 683xe
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 402-8745 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: See Herein	

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 003

This Amendment services to provide answers to questions 25 through 31, regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) EP243-200016/A.

This Amendment modifies the Bid Closing Date to November 20, 2019.

TRACKING LOG OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PROVIDED TO DATE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	PROVIDED IN DOCUMENT
Questions and Answers 1 to 14	Amendment 001
Questions and Answers 15 to 24	Amendment 002
Questions and Answers 25 to 31	Amendment 003

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
25	The Pricing Schedule in Attachment 3, encourages Bidders to propose low rates in the categories with Higher Estimated Number of Days by evaluating the Total Cost after the Firm Per Diem Rates (column D) are multiplied by the Estimated Number of Days (column C). By including such a large difference in Evaluation Weight between the categories, it encourages vendors to "tank" rates for the categories with higher estimated days in order to keep their Total Bid Price down for financial evaluation. To ensure the winning bid ensures fair market rates are available to contract qualified professionals, would the crown consider changing the Estimated Number of Days to be the same for each category?	All categories identified are required. It is encouraged that all vendors bid at the rate resources can be retained.
26	For each of the resource grids, M3 & M4 ask for a specific amount of experience within the past 60 months. R3 & R4 then request that bidders demonstrate experience beyond the minimum requirements in M3 & M4. Can PSPC please confirm that bidders are restricted to experience within the past 60 months for M3 & M4 only, and that R3 & R4 can demonstrate experience beyond the 60 months?	Correct. The mandatory is the minimum time. Rated rewards those resources beyond the minimum.
27	Reference: RFP Attachment 2 - C.16 PIA Specialist, R1 - RFP, Page 88 of 99, requesting further experience above and beyond the minimum required at M1 which is "A minimum of one hundred twenty (120) + months of experience." Would Canada consider eliminating this Rated requirement? We ask the response to M1 already demonstrates the experience of a senior level resource, and given the nature of PIA work encompassing very short duration projects, it is extremely difficult to find resources that meet	No change to this requirement. If this is an Industry concern, then all vendors will receive the same score. For those companies with resources that have contractors with greater experience, they will be scored accordingly.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EP243-200016/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
EP243-200016

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
003
File No. - N° du dossier
683xe.EP243-200016

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
683xe
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	additional Rated timeframes beyond the 120 months (10 year) timeframe.	
28	Would Canada consider allocating the Stream 6 (IT Security) roles into a separate workstream with corporate requirements to ensure that it is receiving bids from firms who have demonstrated success in undertaking these types of Tier 2 level IT security assignments in the past?	No change to this requirement. Canada does not restrict companies from partnerships to meet this consolidated requirement.
29	In regards to Amendment 1, Question #10, Canada has indicated that client references must be provided for each referenced project. We find this requirement unnecessary as each of the grids is already requesting client reference information in the mandatory criteria. Would Canada accept the three (3) references required in the mandatory criteria as fully compliant with respect to client references, as originally intended?	As long as it meets the requirement, the same references can be used.
30	In our experience, RFPs with 60% technical and 40% price weighting result in bids with unrealistic rate expectations, creating challenges with resource retention. Likewise, this lack of emphasis on technical score also incentivizes rates that do not support top tier resources. Will the Crown consider amending the RFP to an 80% technical and 20% price weighting?	For consistency, this logic is sound.
31	Due to the large number of resources bidders are required to submit and in consideration of outstanding questions which may impact how responses are prepared, we would like to request an extension of two weeks to the solicitation closing date.	Canada has modified the Bid Closing Date to November 20, 2019.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED