

**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**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Business Management and Consulting Services Division
/ Division des services de gestion des affaires et de
consultation

Terrasses de la Chaudière 5th Floor

Terrasses de la Chaudière 5e étage

10 Wellington Street

10, rue Wellington

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

| | |
|--|---|
| Title - Sujet RFP - New Contract - PM Resources | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 47419-211699/A | Amendment No. - N° modif. 007 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 47419-211699 | Date 2021-06-14 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZG-423-39527 | |
| File No. - N° de dossier 423zg.47419-211699 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT on - le 2021-06-25 Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE | |
| F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Marcotte, Karen | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 423zg |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-8522 () | 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 |

Sollicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
474179-211699/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
47419-211699

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
007
File No. - N° du dossier
423ZG.47419.211699

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
423ZG
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Amendment 007 is raised to:

1. Answer the following questions

1. Questions:

Question 24: Reference: Amendment 004 Question 13

We require further clarification on the response to this question. It is the word "including" in requirement MTC1-B that is the issue.

As an example, let's say Contract A used in MTC1-A has B.1 Business Analysts, B.2 Business Architects, B.3 Business Consultants and B.5 Business Process Re-engineering Consultants. If you total the days for all resource categories on the contract INCLUDING Business Analyst and Business Architect to arrive at a cumulative total for the contract, you are including the Business Consultant and Business Process Re-engineering Consultant days in the total. We are pretty certain this is not the intent.

Please confirm that the word "including" can be deleted and the requirement should read "Using the reference Contract(s) in MTC1-A, the Bidder must demonstrate in its bid that the reference Contract(s) have a cumulative total of at least 2,000 billable days for the resource categories Business Analyst and Business Architect covering a period not more than three years."

The same issue exists with Workstream 2 MTC1-B. Please confirm that the word "including" can be deleted.

Answer 24: Workstream 1 – MTC1-A states the following for the Business Analysis and Business Architect resource categories:

1. Using one reference Contract, the Bidder must demonstrate that it has provided services that are the same or similar to a Business Analyst in which one individual filling the position of a single resource has a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of one year. To demonstrate a similar resource category, the Bidder must map at least 50% of the Business Analyst's SOW tasks and deliverables of this requirement to the tasks and/or deliverables of the resource category identified in the reference contract.
2. Using the same reference Contract from 1. above or a second contract, the Bidder must demonstrate that it has provided services that are the same or similar to an Business Architect in which one individual filling the position of a single resource has a minimum of 120 billable days for a period of one year. To demonstrate a similar resource category, the Bidder must map at least 50% of the Business Architect's SOW tasks and deliverables of this requirement to the tasks and/or deliverables of the resource category identified in the reference contract.

As the Bidder can demonstrate they have provided services that are the same or similar to a Business Analyst or a Business Architect using a similar resource category, the term "including" is applicable to MTC1-B.

Question 25: Reference Amendment 004 Question 14

We require further clarification on the response to this question. Our original reference to a specific page number in the RFP seems to have been deleted.

Our original question referred to the table on page 119 of 120 of the RFP. This table seems to be part of Form R1, but it requires Bidders to demonstrate the opposite of what RTC1 is asking for.

RTC1 asks Bidders to use the contract(s) referenced in MTC1-A and MTC1-B to demonstrate days in excess of the 120 billable day minimum. There can be multiple individuals filling a role for a specific resource category, but

NOT simultaneously. As an example, on Contract A:

Resource A Business Analyst - 01/01/2019 - 30/04/2019

Resource B Business Analyst 01/05/2019 - 31/12/2019 (start date for counting billable days is May 1st so that time is not simultaneous)

Resource C Business Analyst 02/01/2020 - 08/08/2020 (start date for counting billable days is January 2nd so that time is not simultaneous)..

The table on page 119 in the far right column is asking Bidders for the "total number of resources simultaneously managed." This seems to be the direct opposite of what RTC1 is asking, which is NOT simultaneous. Please confirm that the table on page 119 of the RFP can be deleted.

Answer 25 : For the purpose of this RTC1 criterion in which a proposed resource worked at the same time on more than one project, the duration of any overlapping time period will be counted only once toward any requirements that relate to the individual's length of billable days. In the example you provided above, a single resource would be applicable to Resource A - 01/01/2019 - 30/04/2019 where there could be multiple individuals filling this one role – but not simultaneously.

For the purpose of this RTC1 criterion, a single resource is defined as one role for that resource category which multiple individuals may fill, but not simultaneously.

A bidder may manage multiple resources simultaneously.

Question 26: RE: MTC1-B, Workstream 3 (PIA)

Given the rarity of PIA-specific contracts, it is unreasonable to ask that bidders substantiate 2,000 billed days of PIA Specialists in a three year period using only one contract, especially considering that bidders can use two contracts for MTC1-B in both Workstreams 1 and 2. As such, please confirm that bidders can use two contracts to substantiate MTC1-B in Workstream 3, granted that the second contract meets the minimum requirements for MTC1-A.

Answer 26: *Bidders can use one contract to substantiate MTC1-B in Workstream 3.*

Question 27: Currently RTC2 item b) in each Workstream states that the contracts must “have an initial minimum value of \$1,000,000.00 (CAD) excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments”. Given that most Tier 1 contracts, and even some Tier 2 Omnibus-style contracts, are awarded with a value lower than their full potential value, and that an initial contract value is not indicative of services that have been provided by a Bidder, would the Crown please accept contracts that have a total value of \$1,000,000.00 (CAD) excluding applicable taxes, including amendments?

Answer 27: No - Each contract identified must have an initial minimum value of \$1,000,000.00 (CAD) excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments.

Question 28: : Currently RTC2 item c) in each Workstream states that the contracts must “have an initial minimum Contract Period of one year, not including amendments”. Given that most Tier 1 contracts, and even some Tier 2 Omnibus-style style contracts, are awarded with an initial contract period only to the end of a fiscal year and tend to exercise additional option periods to fulfill client needs over a multi-year timeframe, and that an initial contract period is not indicative of services that have been provided, would the Crown please accept total contract periods, including amendments?

Answer 28: No, Each contract identified must have an initial minimum Contract Period of one year, not including amendments

Question 29: Workstream 3, MTC1-B states that the Bidder must demonstrate 2,000 billable days for the PIA Specialist. The 2,000 hours requested for the other two Workstreams can be attained by combining two contract references for two resource categories, whereas in this Workstream, only one contract reference and resource category can contribute to the hours. This seems to have been addressed in the related Rated requirement (RTC1) where there is a requirement for fewer hours for maximum points; however, the hours for the Mandatory remains at the higher number. For consistency, we respectfully request that the Crown reduce the number of hours for the PIA Specialist to 1,000 hours for Workstream 3 MTC1-B in order to address these disparities.

Answer 29: Bidders can use one contract to substantiate MTC1-B in Workstream 3.

Question30 : For Form R1 - Bidder Experience, there appears to be three tables for completion Tables 3 and 4 to demonstrate billable days by resource/contract and then a third table for completion (on page 119) used to assess total number of resources provided and simultaneously managed across multiple contracts. However, RTC1 is asking for Bidders to demonstrate they provided a single resource in a same or similar role for so many billable days, therefore it is unclear what is expected to be completed in the third table on page 119. Can the Crown please clarify if Bidders are expected to complete the table on page 119 for RTC1 and if so, please clarify what the purpose of the table is?

Answer 30: For the purpose of this RTC1 criterion in which a proposed resource worked at the same time on more than one project, the duration of any overlapping time period will be counted only once toward any requirements that relate to the individual's length of billable days. For the purpose of this RTC1 criterion, a single resource is defined as one role for that resource category which multiple individuals may fill, but not simultaneously.

A bidder may manage multiple resources simultaneously.

Question 31: Re: Attachment 4.3 Technical Criteria, Workstream 3 – Cyber Protection Services, Part B: Point Rated Corporate Experience, RTC2 (page 111 and 112):

In the normal course of authoring PIAs, a PIA is not normally performed on user experience or agile software development. Assuming a PIA is being authored on a newly deployed system, the PIA would focus on the deployed system and not how it was developed. To meet TBS PIA requirements, a PIA focuses on the manner in which the system functions for the users; in other words, how the users collect, store, and share data in the system. Not the manner in which it was developed using UX services and agile software/PM methodology. As these requirements are not in scope for a PIA, will the Crown reconsider and remove RTC2 (a) through (c)?

Answer 31: These requirements will not be removed. The Bidder must demonstrate that it has provided services that are the same or similar to a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) Specialist for the following new technologies and new methodologies:

- a) Cloud technologies;
- b) User Experience (UX) Services; and
- c) Agile Software Development.

Question 32: Attachment 4.3 Technical Criteria, Workstream 1 – Business Management Services, Workstream 2 – Project Management Services and Workstream 3 – Cyber Protection Services, Part B: Point Rated Corporate Experience, RTC2:

With regards to RTC2 and the subsection "*each contract identified must:*" bullet point B "*Have an initial minimum value of \$1,000,000.00 (CAD) excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments*". Would the Crown change this criteria to include contracts with amendments so this does not penalise companies who have won multi-year vehicles who have received initial contracts towards the mid to late end of fiscal year whereby the crown has only awarded a smaller initial contract value to allow the work to begin, to then award amendments to gradually increase the value and extend the end date.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
474179-211699/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
47419-211699

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
007
File No. - N° du dossier
423ZG.47419.211699

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
423ZG
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Answer 32: Each contract identified must have an initial minimum value of \$1,000,000.00 (CAD) excluding applicable taxes, not including amendments.

Question 33: On page 119 of the solicitation and immediately following "Form R1" is a table with four columns, which appears to be requesting that each Bidder provides a total number of resources simultaneously managed across three different contracts. In the header of this page is a reference to solicitation 21120-194545/A, which was an entirely different solicitation on behalf of Correctional Services Canada. This table existed in 21120-194545/A so that Bidders could demonstrate that their Account Manager had experience managing multiple contracts, meeting a threshold for resources managed simultaneously. Given that this requirement does not exist in 47419-211699/A, will the Crown please confirm that the form appearing on solicitation page 119 was inserted in error and remove it from the solicitation?

Additionally, because solicitation page 120 with "Form R2" also references 21120-194545/A in the header, will the Crown also please confirm whether this form was intended to appear in 47419-211699/A as is currently presented?

Answer 33: The correct number is 47419-211699/A. Please ignore reference to 21120-195545/A

Question 34: With respect to the subject solicitation, we have the following request for the Crown's consideration.

In the interest of putting forth our highest quality response to the subject RFP, we respectfully request an additional extension of three (3) business days to the current closing date (June 25th 2021) to **Wednesday June 30th, 2021**. These added few days would allow us to craft a truly competitive proposal.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Answer 34: We will not extend the close date past June 25, 2021.

Sollicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
474179-211699/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
47419-211699

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
007
File No. - N° du dossier
423ZG.47419.211699

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
423ZG
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Question 35: Due to the level of effort required to respond to the requirements, especially for those responding to several workstreams, we respectfully request an extension to June 30th to allow for Canada to evaluate the maximum number of bids in a fair, open and transparent process.

Answer 35: We will not extend the close date past June 25, 2021.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged
