



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. 008
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 3154545	Date 2020-10-16
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. 008

This amendment is raised to answer bidders' questions.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 24:

Regarding the requirements in RTC3 and RTC4, which require "a description of how the Risk Mitigation/Contract Management Strategy as outlined in (the respective mandatory criteria) was implemented":

In both cases, what type and volume of detail is required to satisfy this element of the rated criteria?

Answer 24:

For RTC3, 1 f): the Bidder must ensure that the description it provides clearly explains how the Risk Mitigation Strategy as outlined in MTC3 a) to c) was implemented. Canada has not set parameters on the volume of details required. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that the description includes sufficient details that clearly demonstrate how the strategy was implemented.

For RTC4, 1 f): the Bidder must ensure that the description it provides clearly explains how the Contract Management Strategy as outlined in MTC4 a) to e) was implemented. Canada has not set parameters on the volume of details required. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that the description includes sufficient details that clearly demonstrate how the strategy was implemented.

Question 25:

Reference: Amendment 004, dated October 13, 2020 - Q&A #11, RTC1 Example for Programmer/Analyst (Workstream 1):

"In Contract 1 (January 1, 2016 to August 31, 2020) for the resource category Programmer/Analyst: John worked for 120 billable days for a period of one year (used to demonstrate MTC1-A). John continued to work in this role for an additional 400 billable days, then he was replaced by Henry who worked under the same role for 300 billable days. The bidder can use the 700 billable days from Contract 1 towards RTC1 (400 from John + 300 from Henry = 700 billable days)."

Question: After reviewing Q&A #11, we have the following concern.

Based on the points associated with RTC1:

- ? 121 days to 239 days = 2 points
- ? 240 days to 479 days = 4 points
- ? 480 days to 719 days = 6 points
- ? 720 days to 959 days = 8 points
- ? 960 days or more = 10 points

We agree that a Bidder would receive zero points for having no billable days in excess of the 120 days from MTC1-A, however, if the Bidder uses a resource who has worked the 120 billable days from MTC1-A, and has continued to work in this role for an additional 850 billable days, for a total of 970 billable days (120 + 850 = 970), then the Bidder should receive full points. If this is not the case, then in order to score full points, the resource must have worked for a total of 1,080 days, and not 960 days (120 + 960 = 1,080).

Can the Crown please confirm that Bidders are permitted to use the 120 billable days from MTC1-A towards the billable days in excess for RTC1, for a total of 960 billable days?

Answer 25: Bidders are permitted to use the 120 billable days from MTC1-A towards the total billable days for RTC1. Answer No. 11 was revised. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment 006, Revision No. 11.

Question 26:

RE: Quality Assurance Practices

CSC is clearly concerned about Bidders' ability to manage contract risk and resources. Recently, other government departments have recognized the value in requesting an ISO 9001:2015 (Quality Management System) certification from Bidders to address such concerns. As written, the RFP asks Bidders to demonstrate only past capability to deliver on contracts using the Plans provided in MTC3 and MTC4. Asking Bidders to provide a relevant ISO certification would, in addition, give CSC proof of the Bidder's future capacity to deliver. An ISO 9001:2015 certification is of additional value to the Crown given that maintaining this certification requires Bidders not only to have a documented QMS but also to have this system evaluated on an annual basis by a neutral third-party auditor.

We believe that amending the RFP to introduce a rated corporate requirement for a relevant ISO certification, such as one from the 9000 family of quality management systems, would ensure best value to the Crown. Would the Crown please consider amending the RFP to add the following rated requirement:

"The Bidder should demonstrate that they hold an active ISO certification from the ISO 9000 family, relevant to risk management, contract management, or another aspect of the delivery of contractor resources, by providing a copy of the certification.

Score: 10 points"

Answer 26: Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged

Question 27:

Given the highly specialized technical roles required for this solicitation and a continuing high demand of resources in this space, we believe that amending the Corporate rated requirements of the RFP to allow firms to demonstrate experience with only GoC contracts would provide best value to the Crown. This change would reduce risk to the Crown by ensuring that firms have experience with the Government of Canada TA process and demonstrated experience fulfilling TAs within 5 days. In addition, because the current COVID-19 health emergency is severely affecting the traditional security clearance processing time, CISC is backlogged and we are seeing significant delays with obtaining a security clearance. This could result in firms without Government of Canada experience or benches qualifying but then unable to deliver resources with clearances in time.

To reduce risk and ensure that this procurement process will provide the best value, would the Crown consider amending all Corporate rated requirements to only allow the use of GoC contracts for demonstrated experience?

Answer 27: Your request has been denied.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME