



RETURN BIDS TO:

**Canada Revenue Agency
Bid Receiving Unit**
Ottawa Technology Centre
Receiving Dock
875 Heron Road, Room D-95
Ottawa, ON K1A 1A2

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSION À:

**Agence du revenu du Canada
Réception de soumission**
Centre de technologie d'Ottawa
Quai de réception
875, chemin Heron, Salle D-95
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 1A2

Proposal to: Canada Revenue Agency

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein and/or attached hereto, the goods and/or services listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefor.

Proposition à : l'Agence du revenu du Canada

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté la Reine du Chef du Canada, en conformité avec les conditions énoncées dans la présente incluses par référence dans la présente et/ou incluses par référence aux annexes jointes à la présente les biens et/ou services énumérés ici sur toute feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

Bidder's Legal Name and Address (ensure the Bidder's complete legal name is properly set out)

Raison sociale et adresse du Soumissionnaire (s'assurer que le nom légal au complet du soumissionnaire est correctement indiqué)

**AMENDMENT TO REQUEST FOR
PROPOSAL / MODIFICATION DE
DEMANDE DE PROPOSITION**

Title – Sujet Microsoft Dynamics Professional Services	
Solicitation No. – No de l'invitation 1000347994	Date 2019-11-15
Amendment No. - N° modif. 001	
Solicitation closes – L'invitation prend fin on – le 2019-12-18 at – à 2:00 P.M. / 14 h	Time zone – Fuseau horaire EST/HNE Eastern Standard Time/ Heure normale de l'Est
Contracting Authority – Autorité contractante Name – Nom: Laurence Nyirabigirimana Adresse: 250 Albert Street, Ottawa, ON, K1A 0L5 E-mail address – Adresse de courriel laurence.nyirabigirimana@cra-arc.gc.ca	
Telephone No. – No de téléphone (613) 957-9266	
Fax No. – No de télécopieur (613) 957-6655	
Destination - Destination See herein / Voir dans ce document	
Bidder: Identify the name and title of the individual authorized to sign on behalf of the Bidder – Soumissionnaire: identifier ci-bas le nom et le titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du soumissionnaire :	
Name /Nom _____	
Title/Titre _____	
Signature _____	
Date (yyyy-mm-dd)/(aaaa-mm-jj) (____)_____	
Telephone No. – No de téléphone (____)_____	
E-mail address – Adresse de courriel _____	

**THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY REQUIREMENT.
LE PRÉSENT DOCUMENT COMPORTE UNE EXIGENCE EN MATIÈRE DE SÉCURITÉ.**



SOLICITATION AMENDMENT # 001

This solicitation amendment is raised to address the following questions submitted during the solicitation period as per RFP.

1. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q1.** Is there someone currently, or has there been someone in the past providing similar or relevant services? If yes, who has been providing these services, what is (or was) the contract value and what is (or was) the duration of the contract (including any extensions), and are the allowed to bid on this opportunity?
- A1.** This is a new requirement. There is no incumbent. The Request for Proposal (RFP) is subject to Open Bidding and contains all of the information required to submit a bid. The requested information is not relevant to this solicitation.
- Q2.** Could the client confirm if any firm/individual is currently performing this or similar work or has done so in the last 12 months. If yes, have they been invited? If there is an incumbent, would you please provide the name of the supplier(s), contract(s) date and total amount paid for the services?
- A2.** Please see answer to Q1.
- Q3.** Basis of Selection (Part 4, Section 4.2, Step 4 on pg. 14)
Please amend to read "Technical merit will be given a weighting value of 70% and bid price score a weighting value of 30%".
- A3.** Accepted. Please see Amendment to Basis of Selection below "Contract Amendment #001" below.
- Q4.** Evaluation of Financial Proposals (Part 4, Section 4.2, Step 3 on pg. 14)
Please amend to a 'Median Band' evaluation method, where the median band is set at -10%, +30%.
- A4.** CRA will not make the change.
- Q5.** It is indicated under Section 3.1 (page 12) that bidders are required to submit a fourth volume titled "Additional Information". However, no instructions are provided regarding the information that needs to be included in this volume.
Will the Crown please either confirm that bidders are not required to submit Section IV – Additional Information or indicate what information needs to be included in this volume?
- A5.** Bidders must provide the additional information required under Part 5 prior to contract award.
- Q6.** Rated requirement R5 is requesting up to 5 project references where work was delivered to a public sector client. While we understand R5 is a rated requirement and therefore should not result in eliminating any proponent from submitting a proposal, the reality is that any proponent who has a single public sector project would lose all 25 points for this rated requirement which results in the loss of one fifth the total rated points therefore severely limiting the proponents ability to present a competitive response to this



solicitation. A zero score in R5 when coupled with the possibility of not achieving maximum points on any other rated requirements will prevent proponents from meeting the minimum points threshold and therefore their proposal will be deemed non-compliant. This possible scenario ultimately places the CRA at risk of receiving very few competitive responses to this solicitation. In order to foster a healthy competition for this procurement, will the CRA please consider amending R5 to one of the following:

1. Allow non-Dynamic related public sector reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity or,
2. Allow MS Dynamics reference projects where work was performed in para public or highly regulated organizations such as Health Care, Education, Banking / Financials, and Insurance or
3. Remove R5 in its entirety.

- A6.** CRA will not make any changes to R5. The CRA will accept Canadian based or USA based government entities.
- Q7.** M7 states that “One of the projects provided for M2 above must be for a federal, provincial or municipal government entity”. Since the criteria does not state that the government entity needs to be Canadian, we assume that bidders can use project references from government entities (Federal, Provincial or municipal) from countries other than Canada to meet this mandatory criteria. Please confirm if this assumption is correct.
- A7.** Yes, this assumption is correct.
- Q8. Number of resulting contracts** - Can CRA please advise the number of resulting contracts they intend to award in response to this Solicitation?
- A8.** The CRA intends to award one contract.
- Q9. Basis of Selection** - This solicitation evaluation criteria is 60/40 (technical score/financial score) and is heavily weighted for staffing companies/agencies. This will result in lowest possible rates vs best value and will not allow CRA to attract and retain quality CRM resources. Currently, CRA will be competing with more than seven other GoC departments for quality CRM resources. All of the other GoC departments issued solicitations using a financial evaluation of -10 % below the median and plus 30% above the median. Would CRA consider levelling itself with other GoC departments and include a lower/upper median bands of -10% / +30% and award 0 points for all firms with bidding rates outside the median bands? This will prevent bidders from presenting unreasonably low prices and the possible switching out of resources once the contract is awarded, and ensures fair market value. Please advise.
- A9.** Please see section 2 of RFP Amendment #001. No other changes will be made.
- Q10. Reference – Appendix 3: Financial Proposal** - CRA has assigned variable point weighting for each resource category. We suggest allocating a standard weighting to all of the resource categories. We would like to request that, for the financial evaluation, to set the point allocations so that all resource categories are weighted equally, eg. 500 points for the initial contract term and each option period thereafter. This avoids scenarios where, because of high point allocations, rates have to be “tanked” simply for vendors to stay competitive on score. Please advise.
- A10.** The CRA will not make any changes to Appendix 3 – Financial Proposal.



- Q11.** With regards to the Mandatory and Rated requirements, for joint venture Bidders, would the Crown please confirm that there no restrictions on how a joint venture Bidder can combine experience that meets the mandatory and rated criteria in this solicitation? For example, please confirm that Bidders who are part of a Joint Venture may use a combination of contracts and references from each company that is a member of the JV to provide compliance against the evaluation criteria.
- A11.** For Joint Venture Bidders, at least one member of the Joint Venture must have the required experience to meet the mandatory and rated criteria.
- Q12.** We respectfully request that the Crown amend RFP Section 4.2 (RFP pages 13/14) to evaluate bids based on a total combined rating of technical merit (80%) and price (20%).
- The Crown has not included a median band pricing approach in the Basis of Selection, giving bidders further incentive to submit low rates that are not in alignment with current market rates. This typically exacerbates the issue described above, resulting in contracts being awarded to suppliers that cannot deliver or retain resources as a direct consequence of low rates.
- A12.** Please see answer to Q3 and Q4.
- Q13.** We respectfully request that the Crown extend the solicitation closing date by one and a half weeks to December 18th. The scope of this solicitation requires a high level of effort to gather contract information and obtain sign-off from clients on project references (as per Attachment A – Project Reference Template). This extension will provide bidders with sufficient time to develop thorough and complete proposal responses to this solicitation.
- A13.** Accepted. See Section 1 of RFP Amendment #001.
- Q14.** While the Crown has indicated under section 3.1 that bidders must submit Section IV – Additional Information, no instructions are provided regarding the information that needs to be provided under this volume. Will the Crown please either indicate what information needs to be provided under this volume or confirm that bidders do not need to submit it?
- A14.** Please see answer to Q5.
- Q15.** This RFP was posted on Buy&Sell on November 1st, 2019. Our company (and likely a number of others) asked a question on November 1st that will significantly impact our bid response. Since we have not received a response for 13 days (which drastically cuts into our bid response time) we respectfully ask for a one-week extension to December 18th, 2019.
- A15.** Please see answer to Q13.
-

**2. AMENDMENTS TO THE RFP**

1. At page 1 of the RFP:

At Solicitation Closes;

DELETE: 2019-12-11

INSERT: **2019-12-18**

2. At page 14 of the RFP:

DELETE: Step 4 – Basis of Selection in its entirety

INSERT:

Step 4 – Basis of Selection

Basis of Selection – Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price.

CRA will use a combined rating of technical merit score and bid price score to determine an overall, combined ranking for each bid. Technical merit will be given a weighting value of **70%** and bid price score a weighting value of **30%**. CRA will then combine the two values to derive a total combined ranking. CRA will derive the technical merit score by prorating the technical score on the point-rated criteria against the stipulated total available points. CRA will derive the scoring of price by giving full marks to the lowest priced compliant Bid and prorating all other compliant bids against the lowest priced Bid. See Table 1 for an example illustrating how the total combined ranking is determined using a ratio of 70% for technical points and 30% for bid price score.

Table 1: Example Calculation of Total Combined Rating Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)

		Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Overall Technical Score		620/1000	650/1000	760/1000
Bid Evaluated Price		\$600,000	\$620,000	\$660,000
Calculations	Technical Merit Score	$620/1000 \times 70 = 43.40$	$650/1000 \times 70 = 45.50$	$760/1000 \times 70 = 53.20$
	Pricing Score	$\$600,000/\$600,000 \times 30 = 30.00$	$\$600,000/\$620,000 \times 30 = 29.03$	$\$600,000/\$660,000 \times 30 = 27.27$
Combined Rating		73.40	74.53	80.47
Overall Rating		3rd	2nd	1st

CRA will rank bids meeting all the mandatory requirements and having obtained or exceeded the minimum pass mark within the point-rated criteria based on the highest total combined rating of technical merit and bid price score. The highest ranked Bidder, having passed the requirements for this step, will proceed to Step 5.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED