



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions
→ TPSGC

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

11 Laurier St.\11, rue Laurier

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

Technology-Enabled Business Transformation Team
7→XY/Transformation des activités sur la technologie /
7→ XY

Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floo

10 Wellington Street

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet DPM Service Delivery - PSAB Services de transformation et de prestation numérique	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation B9220-220011/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B9220-220011	Date 2021-08-31
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XY-001-39834	
File No. - N° de dossier 001xy.B9220-220011	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 2021-09-23 Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
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: Cardinal, France	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 001xy
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 218-9269 ()	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

This amendment is issued to publish questions and answers and make modifications to the Bid Solicitation.

1. Questions and Answers

Question 1

Regarding Amendment #1, Q&A#5 which amended the definition of a Single Client to be "an individual department, agency or Crown Corporation at the Federal level". There are many other Canadian public sector organizations that have deployed cloud technology solutions where bidders may have the exact experience IRCC is intending to evaluate, but this modification excludes this relevant experience from being cited. The GoC Cloud Adoption Strategy was only published in 2016 and it wasn't until late 2017 that the first SSC contracts were awarded to cloud service providers for storage and processing of unclassified data; requiring all reference contracts to be at the federal level of government unnecessarily limits competition in favor of these large technology partners/cloud service providers already working within the GoC to support the early stages of the cloud strategy implementation.

a) Please confirm that IRCC will accept Public Sector client references in WS1M-1 and WS1R-4 as per the definition provided in the RFP.

b) We respectfully request that the definition of a Single Client be reverted back to its original form: "an individual department, agency or Crown Corporation."

Answer 1

a) Canada will not accept Public Sector Client references in WS1M-1 and WS1R-4 as per the definition provided in the originally released RFP "an individual department, agency or Crown Corporation."

b) Canada confirms that the amended definition of Single Client published in Amendment #1, Q&A#5, "an individual department, agency or Crown Corporation at the Federal level" will not be reverted back to its original form as published in the originally released RFP.

Question 2

Regarding WS1M-2 and WS1R-1, please confirm that IRCC will accept similar/equivalent categories as long as bidders demonstrate that the reference contract Statement of Work maps to at least 50% of the tasks for the specific resource category in the RFP Statement of Work at Annex A.

Answer 2

For WS1M-2 and WS1R-1 the request has been reviewed and Canada will not permit similar or equivalent resource categories.

Question 3

Reference WS1M-2 (pg. 106) and WS1R-2 (pg. 108) and WS2M-2 (pg. 112) and WS2R-2 (pg. 114)

- Given that M-1 for both Workstreams 1 and 2 allows for substantiation of alternate categories that are 'same or similar' to the required categories, please confirm that substantiation of 'same or similar' categories also applies to M-2 and R1 for each Workstream. If not, allowing only five contract references to support the high number of required billable days using the exact/same listed categories is highly restrictive, especially since the GOC is procuring the services under the Set-Aside Program for Aboriginal

Business (SPAB), that is geared to promote participation of Indigenous companies (diversified/underrepresented group). For such companies, it is difficult to support the required billable days over only five contracts, and over a wide array of categories (i.e., WS2 has eight categories). Again, using WS2M-2/R-1, the required categories are not typically procured under a single contract. For example, it is rare to see Architects and Developers on the same contract as a Human Resource Consultant and/or an IT Security Design Specialist – these categories are highly specialized and are generally procured through separate contracts that are in alignment with the category of services. As an additional example, Programmer/Analysts and Programmer/Software Developers map more than 50% for each respective category and 'same or similar' tasks are clearly evident. If the GOC will not allow inclusion for mapping of 'same or similar' resource categories, we request that five reference contracts may be used to support each, specific category. With the above suggested concessions, the procurement will be more inclusive, transparent and allow for a healthy competition amongst Aboriginal businesses, and is in line with the GOC's strategy to promote under-represented groups. Please advise.

Answer 3

For WS1M-2 and WS1R-1 and WS2M-2 and WS2R-1 the request has been reviewed and Canada will not permit similar or equivalent resource categories.

2. Correction to Bid Solicitation Amendment 003 (identified in yellow)

Under Amendment 003, section 1 Questions and Answers:

DELETE: question and answer 7 in its entirety;

INSERT: question and answer 7 in its entirety as follows:

Question 7

Refer to Workstream 1, WS1M-2 and WS1R-1, as well as Workstream 2, WS2M-2 and WS2R-1. Please confirm that if a resource category in the referenced contract is not for the identical resource categories in M-2 and R-1, Bidder's are required to map a minimum of 50% of the associated tasks listed in Annex A – Statement of Work for the same resource category to demonstrate that the work performed was the same or similar to the resource categories in M-2 and R-1 of both Workstreams 1 and 2. In addition, if this assumption is correct, please confirm that bidder's can modify Form M2 to include the mapping of the tasks, similar to Form M1.

However, please also confirm that if the resource category in the referenced contract is the same or identical resource category in M-2 and R-1, that mapping is not required.

Answer 7

Canada confirms that WS1M-1 and WS2M-1 allows for same or similar resource categories.

For WS1M-2, WS2M-2, WS1R-1, and WS2R-1 the request has been reviewed and Canada will not permit similar or equivalent resource categories.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE BID SOLICITATION REMAIN UNCHANGED