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 speciales d'approvisionnement
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floo
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau
Québec
KIA 0S5

Title - Sujet ISST - TBIPS Professional Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP243-200016/A	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20200016	**Date** 2019-11-08
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**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☐ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
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 004

This Amendment serves to provide answers to questions 32 through 43, regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) EP243-200016/A.

This Amendment also serves to amend question 30 in Amendment 003 as another question was inserted in error.

DELETE:

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
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.

INSERT:

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
30	"In regards to the response to Amendment 1, Question #11, ""Canada makes a distinction between completed initiatives pertaining to the contracted role and contract end."" We would like to confirm that this answer pertains to every instance of the request for ""completed projects"", ""completed initiatives"" and ""completed activities.""""	For consistency, this logic is sound.

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
Questions and Answers 32 to 43 and Amendment to Q30	Amendment 004

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
32	The answer to question 10 in amendment 001 is unclear. Please confirm that the only client reference names required for the resources are those that are specifically requested in mandatory requirements, namely:	This is a correct interpretation.

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	• M5 for the A.1 Application/Software Architect (page 66 of 99) • M5 for the A.11 Tester (page 67 of 99) • M5 for the B.5 Business Process Re-engineering Consultant (page 69 of 99) • M5 for the B.6 Business System Analyst (page 70 of 99) • M5 for the I.1 Data Conversion Specialist (page 72 of 99) • M5 for the I.4 Database Modeller/IM Modeller (page 74 of 99) • M5 for the P.1 Change Management Consultant (page 76 of 99) • M5 for the P.2 Enterprise Architect (page 77 of 99) • M5 for the P.10 Project scheduler (page 81 of 99) • M5 for the P.12 Risk Management Specialist (page 83 of 99) • M5 for the P.13 Independent IT Project Review Team Lead (page 85 of 99) • M5 for the P.14 Independent IT Project Reviewer (page 86 of 99) • M4 for the TRA specialist (page 89 of 99)	
33	Please confirm that no client reference names are required for the resources presented for the following categories: • Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) Specialist • Project Manager	This is a correct interpretation. However, Canada reserves the right to request references at any time during the evaluation period.
34	As written, rated criteria R1 – R4 for the Project Manager category (pgs. 79 – 80), as well as rated criteria R1, R2, and R4 for the TRA Specialist (pgs. 90 – 91) require the provision “referenced projects” to score points. We assume that this simply means that projects must be clearly cross-referenced in the resume, not that client reference names must be provided for all projects. Please confirm that this interpretation is correct.	For Attachment 2, the projects need to be cross-referenced. The exception is for any criteria that requests the Bidder provide client references to support their proposed resource’s demonstrated experience.
35	The answer to question 9 in amendment 001 is unclear. Usually GoC RFPs that have rated criteria that provide points for experience (either # of years or # of projects) beyond that required at the mandatory criteria, time restrictions demanded in the mandatory criteria are removed for the rated criteria (For example, if M1 requires the experience presented to be within the last 10 years, the corresponding R1 requirement would have no 10 year limitation). This is due to the fact that the rated criteria often require so many more years/projects than the limitation demanded in the mandatory criteria becomes an unreasonable requirement. Given this, please confirm that for all rated criteria that require experience (years or projects) beyond a corresponding experience required in a mandatory criteria there is no time limit window within which the	The interpretation provided is correct. It is unrealistic to presume a resource has completed 10+ projects in 60 months (example given). It is realistic to presume that a resource has completed 10+ projects in (once again, the example) 15 yrs. Full marks, in this case would be provided for valid and complete examples.

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	rated experience must be attained. So, just as an example, for R3 for the database modeller/IM modeller, a resource could present 10 projects going back 15 years and score the full 20 points (even though the time limit window was 60 months at M3).	
36	Please confirm that for any given rated criteria that requires experience over and above a mandatory criteria, project experience can be presented cumulatively. That is, project experience presented for the mandatory criteria can also be presented and counted for the corresponding rated criteria. For example, for the database modeller/IM modeller, if projects #1, 2, 3, and 4 are presented for M3, then projects #1, 2, 3, and 4 can also be presented and counted towards R3.	Examples used in mandatory can be used for the rated criteria, if deemed applicable.
37	On page 10 under Bid Preparation Instructions, section b, Canada is requesting bidders to submit hard copies and a soft copy on CD for the Technical and Financial sections. Would Canada accept hard copies and a soft on copy on USB, in lieu of a CD?	Canada cannot accept soft copies on a USB. If Bidders would like to submit their bid electronically, they can submit their bids through epost Connect.
38	"**Reference**: RFP Attachment 2 – Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Resource Grids – in the Point Scales for Rated requirements: for example at: "10.2 Rated Evaluation Criteria for B.5. Business Process Re-Engineering Consultant, Level 3: R3 – The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has above and beyond the minimum number of projects completed required at M3. Point Scale: 3 projects (or less) = 0 points, 4 to 5 projects = 5 points, 6 to 7 projects = 10 points, 8 to 9 projects = 15 points, 10+ projects = 20 points. Maximum of 20 points." **Question:** Please confirm that a resource's experience would score full points (20 points in the example above for B.5.) by providing the required 3 projects in answer to M3 plus an additional 7 projects for R3 (for a total of 10 projects). "	Mandatory is the baseline. Rated rewards those with a broader depth of experience. The example (assuming applicable) provided could yield full points.
39	**Reference:** Current Submission Date of November 13, 2019 **Question:** In light of concerns that we have not received answers to outstanding questions and the likelihood of considerable rework that may be required for resource grids, we respectfully request an additional extension to the current submission date of two (2) weeks to November 27, 2019.	The revised closing date is November 20th, 2019.
40	With respect to rated criteria R1 through R4, pages 79-80, for the Project Manager, Level 3, the Crown has indicated that resources should demonstrate 6+ projects for full points within the last 60 months. This stipulation is quite restrictive as Project Managers	Agreed. The last 120 months is ample time to demonstrate six projects.

Q#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	are typically engaged on longer-term contracts, making it difficult to demonstrate 6 or more projects within the last 5 years. As the Crown has allowed resources to demonstrate experience beyond the 5 years for all other resource categories, we respectfully request that the Crown provide the same latitude for this role by removing the 5-year limitation for all rated criteria.	
41	We would like to request that the Crown accept project equivalencies of 12 month periods, specifically for rated requirement R3 for all resources.	The Crown has requested individual contracts to demonstrate breadth and depth. The 12-month equivalencies will not be considered.
42	We request an extension to the closing date of 2-weeks (to Nov. 27th) to allow time to adequately adjust our proposal once the answers to the next round of questions are received. If 2 weeks is too long, please consider an extension of at least 1-week (to Nov. 20th).	The revised closing date is November 20th, 2019.
43	Questions in amendment #2 referred to this RFP as requiring 16 resources. We believe that this was in error at the time it was asked. Please confirm that, with the two reviewer resources that were removed from the RFP in amendment #2, the total number of resources to be submitted is 13.	The total number of resources to be submitted is now 13. Canada has removed the Independent Project Team Lead and Reviewer resources to ensure transparency.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED