



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

This document contains a security requirement.

Ce document contient une exigence de sécurité.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Informatics Professional Services Division / Division
des services professionnels en informatique

Les Terrasses de la Chaudière

10, rue Wellington, 4ième

étage/Floor

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS - Tier 2	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 21120-194545/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 3154545	Date 2020-10-13
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-626-38511	
File No. - N° de dossier 626zm.21120-194545	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-11-05	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
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: Holden, Carole	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 626zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-9217 ()	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

AMENDMENT NO. 005

This amendment is raised to revise the solicitation and to answer bidders' questions.

RFP REVISIONS:

Revision No 6:

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 - Application Services, Part B, RTC5 - BIDDER EXPERIENCE WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW METHODOLOGIES, article 1. d):

Delete:

d) Have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Insert:

d) Have been completed or ongoing for a minimum of 6 months in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Revision No 7:

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Workstream 2 – IM/IT Services, Part B, RTC5 - BIDDER EXPERIENCE WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW METHODOLOGIES, article 1. d):

Delete:

d) Have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Insert:

d) Have been completed or ongoing for a minimum of 6 months in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Revision No 8:

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Workstream 3 – Business Management Services, Part B, RTC5 - BIDDER EXPERIENCE WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW METHODOLOGIES, article 1. d):

Delete:

d) Have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Insert:

d) Have been completed or ongoing for a minimum of 6 months in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Revision No 9:

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Workstream 4 – Project Management Services, Part B, RTC5 - BIDDER EXPERIENCE WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW METHODOLOGIES, article 1. d):

Delete:

d) Have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Insert:

d) Have been completed or ongoing for a minimum of 6 months in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Revision No 10:

At Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria, Workstream 5 – Cyber Protection Services, Part B, RTC5 - BIDDER EXPERIENCE WITH NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND NEW METHODOLOGIES, article 1. d):

Delete:

d) Have been completed or ongoing in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

Insert:

d) Have been completed or ongoing for a minimum of 6 months in the last seven years as of the initial publication date of this solicitation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 14:

Page 133 - Workstream 1: Application Services, MTC1-A, item 2. Programmer/Analyst states: "For the same resource category, Canada will automatically consider the referenced resource category, procured through the TBIPS contracting vehicle, to be 50% aligned with the SOW tasks and deliverables of this requirement."

In regards to a TBIPS resource category automatically aligning with 50% of the SOW tasks and deliverables, does CSC also consider TBIPS contracts for ERP Programmer Analysts as automatically aligned with 50% of the SOW tasks and deliverables of this requirement?

Answer 14: Canada will not consider TBIPS contracts for ERP Programmer Analysts as automatically aligned with 50% of the SOW tasks and deliverables for Programmer Analyst of this requirement

Question 15:

In order for contract(s) to gain full points on RTC1 of Workstreams 1 to 4, the contract(s) would have to be running for almost the full five years of the last five years for a single placed resource to have more than 960 days on the contract. This does not allow for otherwise compliant contracts that have started in the last 1 to 2 years to be used in the same way that it also prevents the use of contracts that might have ended a year or two ago as they would only have a limited timeframe within the contract window. It also negates suppliers that might have been servicing a client in relevant roles where the billable days span multiple iterations of what are effectively continuations of the same statement of work over multiple iterations of a contract. A service supplier who has provided valued contract services of the size and scope relevant to this requirement to a client/partner over a period that exceeds the requirements in the RFP, should not be penalized, or have that experience deemed non-compliant due to the fact that the timelines don't align perfectly with the release date of this RFP.

Also, having one resource in the same role for almost five years does not necessarily demonstrate the ability of the service supplier to meet a variety of needs as would be associated with a contract of this scope, and in some clients is also no longer allowed (contracts are restricted to a maximum of 2 years, and the vendor is then required to provide a replacement resource due to deemed employer/employee perception risks). Rather than demonstrating a Bidder's capability in delivering a high volume of resources across varying resource categories, the criteria as written favours Bidders who have contracts that must coincide exactly with the 5-year window and who have placed only two specific resources for a long period of time. This is not demonstrative of a Bidder's capability and does not allow Bidders who have experience providing large volumes of stable resources on a contract to score full points.

Given this, would the Crown consider one or more of the following requests for amendment:

1. Allow a respondent to use the billable days of multiple resources from a contract conducted in the last seven (7) years in the relevant resource categories for each Workstream to comprise the 960+ days, so long as each resource used from the contract has billed for a minimum of 120 sequential days?
2. Allow the use of up to three (3) contracts (one of which has to meet the criteria of MTC1-A) from within the last seven (7) years to comprise the 960+ billed days required to score full points so long as the resources on each of the three (3) contracts has billed a minimum of 120 sequential days?

Answer 15: The billable days in excess of the 120 for each resource category specified in the criterion for each workstream may be demonstrated by multiple individuals, but must not have been acquired concurrently. For example, in Workstream 1, where a Bidder cites the billable days of two

Application/Software Architects working on the same contract simultaneously, only the experience of a single Application/Software Architect will be counted. As indicated in the criterion, in situations where a resource was replaced, the Bidder must include the names of the replacement resources, the start and end dates of each resource, and the respective billable days.

Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged. The intent of the criterion is to evaluate Bidders' capacity to provide resources in the specified resource categories who worked during a period of time that is in excess of the minimum 120 billable days, and not to evaluate Bidders' capacity to provide resources who worked cumulatively in those resource categories during the same period of time.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME