



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. 014 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 3154545 | Date 2020-11-04 |
| 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 Eastern Standard Time EST on - le 2020-11-17 Heure Normale de l'Est HNE | |
| 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. 014

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

RFP REVISIONS:

Revision No. 22

At Page 1 of the RFP, Solicitation Closes:

Delete: 2020-11-12
Insert: 2020-11-17

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 49:

Given the amount of effort and information required from Bidders in order to respond to the RFP, the number of changes and clarifications made to the RFP in Amendments 1 to 12, the challenges (due to COVID-19 restrictions) in reaching and accessing clients to obtain signatures for the Rated criteria, and the number of large RFPs currently due in the same timeframe, Bidders aiming to respond to all 5 Workstreams will need additional time to react, re-assess and clarify bid content to ensure the Crown receives a compliant response. In light of this, would the Crown please provide a two-week extension of the current deadline for this RFP in order to provide Bidders with this necessary additional time?

Answer 49: Please refer to Revision no. 22 from Solicitation Amendment 014.

Question 50:

Attachment 4.1, Workstream 1 - Application Services: RTC3 & RTC4:

Both criteria are awarding points for signed statements from our clients. There are some clients working from home due to COVID 19 who do not have access to the technology to be able to sign back documents. Would the Crown accept an email from the client confirming the Risk Mitigation Strategy and Contract Management Strategy were implemented as part of the contract?

Answer 50: Canada confirms that email confirmations and electronic signatures are acceptable for both RTC3 item 2 and RTC4 item 2, in all workstreams. Note: a copy of the email must be submitted with the bid.

Question 51:

Attachment 4.1, Workstream 1 - Application Services: MTC1-A, MTC1-B & RTC1:

All three criteria require Bidders to provide billable day information as part of the response. When providing client contact information, please confirm it is acceptable for Bidders to use a Contracting Authority who can attest to the billable day information as the client reference?

Answer 51: It is not acceptable to use the Contracting Authority as the client reference for MTC1-A, MTC1-B, and RTC1. The criteria do not specify that the client reference is only to confirm the billable day information. The client reference could be asked to confirm any of the information required to meet the criterion.

Question 52:

Regarding Amendment 011:

Question 37:

Regarding RTC2 for all Workstreams, in order to meet item #2 (The number of years experience serving as a Client Manager). As per MTC2, bidders are required to provide a copy of the Client Manager's resume which will demonstrate years of experience. Is there anything else required to substantiate this item?

Answer 37: To meet RTC2, 2; provide the number of years the individual named in RTC2, 1. has served as a Client Manager. Please refer to Form R2, b).

Form R2, line item b) simply asks for years of experience, whereas the requirement at RCT2 asks that bidders use “one or more reference contract(s)” to demonstrate experience. Is there a specific format / Form to ensure that bidders provide the same detail for the contracts used to demonstrate Form R2, line item b)?

Answer 52: To demonstrate RTC2, article 2., provide the number of years the individual named in RTC2, 1. has served as a Client Manager (refer to Form R2, b). There is no specific format required to present the Client Manager’s years of experience in response to RTC2. The purpose of the forms and tables is to assist bidders in preparing their responses. It is the responsibility of the Bidder to clearly demonstrate in its bid how it meets the requirements of each criterion as it is described at Attachment 4.1 Technical Criteria and in the solicitation amendments for the workstream(s) for which the Bidder is providing a bid.

Question 53:

Regarding the post contract award Resource Assessment Criteria and Response Tables:

Many of the resource categories include a mandatory resource requirement that indicates resources must “demonstrate experience in each of the technologies, software, tools and techniques identified in the Task Authorization as essential within the last seven years, as follows:

X projects each with a minimum duration of six months. If the project involved “new technologies” as indicated on the TA, then one project with a minimum duration of four months is acceptable.”

However, Appendix B to Annex A Task Authorization Form template only lists “Resource Essential Technology Requirements” rather than “technologies, software, tools and techniques” as listed in the response table(s).

- a) By techniques, does CSC intend for end clients to also be able to include additional task experience here? If so, please update the Task Authorization Form template to include “Resource Essential Technology, Software, Tools or Techniques Requirements”
 - b) While common to evaluate responsibilities by project, it is highly unusual for experience with technology to be evaluated by number of projects. For example, resources may stay on larger projects for extensive periods of time but have in-depth knowledge of specific technologies.
 - a. Will CSC consider altering these requirements to evaluate durations rather than number of projects? For example, rather than 3 projects of 6 months each to pass, request 18 months of experience?
- OR
- b. Will CSC consider altering these requirements to also accept “project equivalencies” where significantly longer duration projects are evaluated as equivalent to multiple separate 6 month projects at different clients? For example, will CSC accept a 13 month project as equivalent to 2 projects of 6 months?

Answer 53 a): As stated in the Statement of Work, CSC IM/IT Infrastructure will change with time. The details specified in a Task Authorization will include the list of tasks and the list of essential technologies required for the respective TA. Your request has been considered but the requirement remains unchanged.

Answer 53 b): Canada will not consider altering the requirements.

Question 54:

Due to the length and complexity of the requirements for bidders responding to all five (5) Workstreams, including coordinating the provision of signed client reference statements/letters to score full points, would CSC please grant a one-week extension to allow bidders to produce a quality response?

Answer 54: Please refer to Revision no. 22 from Solicitation Amendment 014.

Question 55:

We are working diligently to provide Correctional Service of Canada the best response at the best value. However, in order to provide a more thorough response, we cordially request that the closing date be extended in order to efficiently review and implement all thirteen (13) amendments, to date, in our response.

Answer 55: Please refer to Revision no. 22 from Solicitation Amendment 014.

Question 56:

Regarding Amendment #11, Question #36

Please note that in Amendment #11, Question #36, the question erroneously refers to minimum contract values of \$2 Million for Workstreams 1 through 4. Although no changes were made to the RFP as a result of this question, we would like to mention this in case it changes other bidder's assumptions.

Answer 56: The required minimum contract value for the reference contracts have not been revised for any of the technical criteria.

Question 57:

With regards to Workstream 1: Application Services, A.9 System Auditor; would the Crown be able to provide any further details to better define the expected role? The contract category has historically not often been used in Government of Canada Tier 2 RFP's.

Specifically, does the Crown anticipate that the position would require experience relative to auditing specific IM/IT systems such as:

- ERP systems
- departmental web applications
- departmental servers
- network security/cyber security

Answer 57: The specific systems to be audited will be detailed in the task authorizations as required.

Question 58:

Do we need to be qualified for every workstream in order to bid? For example: If we are qualified for every workstream from 1 to 4 but not for workstream 5, can we still bid?

Answer 58: If you wish to bid on Workstreams 1, 2, 3 and 4; and you are a TBIPS SA Holder holding a TBIPS SA for Tier 2 at the time of bid closing, in all required resource categories of Workstreams 1, 2, 3, and 4 in this solicitation and in the National Capital Region under the EN578-170432 series of SAs, then you are eligible to bid for Workstream 1, and/or Workstream 2, and/or Workstream 3, and/or Workstream 4.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME