



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

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 - ESDC	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation G9292-226504/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client PREQ 100016504	Date 2021-09-08
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-625-39844	
File No. - N° de dossier 625zm.G9292-226504	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 2021-09-21 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: Haroutounian, Rosanna	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 625zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 354-5346 ()	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. 006

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

SOLICITATION REVISIONS:

5. At ATTACHMENT 4.2, RTC5 item 1:

Delete: b) Have an minimum value of \$2,000,000.00 CAD (inclusive of all taxes and amendments);

Insert: b) Have a minimum value of \$2,000,000.00 CAD (amendments and applicable taxes included), or a minimum billed value of \$2,000,000.00 CAD (amendments and applicable taxes included);

6. At ATTACHMENT 4.2, RTC5 item 2:

Delete: f) The total value (including applicable taxes) of the Contract Period;

Insert: f) The total value (amendments and applicable taxes included) of the Contract Period, or the total billed value of the Contract (amendments and applicable taxes included);

7. At ATTACHMENT 4.2, Form R5:

Delete: f) The total initial value (including applicable taxes) of the Contract Period; and

Insert: f) The total value (amendments and applicable taxes included) of the Contract Period, or the total billed value of the Contract (amendments and applicable taxes included); and

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 43: On page 4 of Attachment 4.1 (Mandatory Technical Criteria and Forms), section (g) of question 3 requests that for each individual resource identified, the bidder must provide the title, full name, start date and end date, total number of billed days and demonstrated similar resource categories. We request that the requirements specifically listed in section (g) of question 3 be removed. We believe that the requirements for question 3 can be sufficiently substantiated from all other sections of question 3 (a, b, c, d, e, f, h), excluding the significant amount of effort that would be required to respond to section (g).

Answer 43: Your request was considered but the criterion remains unchanged.

Question 44: Can the Crown please confirm that wherever the RFP G9292-226504/A requests a "*Client signature*" or "*Project Authority or Technical Authority signature*" Bidders can alternatively provide a Contracting Authority signature? The Contracting Authority is better able to confirm Billed Days and Invoice amounts, whereas a Client/Project/Technical Authority is not likely have this level of detailed information.

Answer 44: The Bidder may only provide the signature of the Contracting Authority if this individual is a representative from the client organization that can attest to the services rendered and information provided with respect to the reference contracts.

Question 45: Form R5, item f) requires Bidders to present the “total initial value (including applicable taxes) of the Contract Period.” In cases where Bidders are presenting contracts from the private sector that don’t always have specific contract values, would Canada accept if Bidders present the billed value of the contracts instead?

Answer 45: RTC5 and Form R5 have been revised. Bidders must indicate either the total value (amendments and applicable taxes included) of the Contract Period, or total billed value of the Contract (amendments and applicable taxes included). Please see Solicitation Revisions 5, 6 and 7.

Question 46: RTC5 states that contracts referenced must “*b) Have an minimum value of \$2,000,000.00 CAD (inclusive of all taxes and amendments)*”, which aligns to the other requirements of the RFP. However, Form R5 states that bidder’s must provide “*The total initial value (including applicable taxes) of the Contract Period*”.

Could the Crown please confirm that bidders are to provide the value of the referenced contracts, **inclusive of taxes and amendments**, as is stated in the requirement?

Answer 46: RTC5 and Form R5 have been revised. Bidders must indicate either the total value (amendments and applicable taxes included) of the Contract Period, or total billed value of the Contract (amendments and applicable taxes included). Please see Solicitation Revisions 5, 6 and 7.

Question 47: At present, Criteria MTC2 allows for a maximum of four (4) contracts to be used across the four (4) workstreams and twenty (20) categories. With the unique combination of categories and the limited number of contracts that can be used across the Workstreams, it is almost a matter of luck for potential respondents to have the right mix of contracts to achieve the minimum number of billable days required to pass the mandatory. Given this, would the Crown please modify the criteria to allow Bidders to use up to ten (10) contracts across the twenty (20) categories to achieve the minimum number of billable days required for each category? Making this change to allow additional contracts to be used will very likely enable otherwise qualified bidders to submit a compliant response to this RFP.

Answer 47: Your request was considered but the criterion remains unchanged.

Question 48: At present, in Criteria MTC1 and MTC2 the Crown requires the Bidder to obtain signed letters from clients certifying contract specifics. The process of obtaining letters from clients to certify details seems redundant and excessive given that Bidders already undergo a rigorous process in order to qualify for TBIPS. Obtaining client signatures from organizations is always problematic due to legal liability concerns. Even some government organizations will no longer provide signed letters attesting to the provision of services. Add to this the challenge that COVID-19 poses on the logistics of getting signatures and these requirements present a real logistical risk for any potential respondent, especially because the core of the response must be written first so as to provide a client with the details of what they are being asked to certify. This means that potential respondents could put significant effort into producing a response only to discover that signature logistics prevent them from getting signatures in

time. For these reasons we ask that the requirement for a letter signed by a client be removed from MTC1 and MTC2 and replaced by the more traditional right of the Crown to seek confirmation by means of email/telephone.

Answer 48: Your request was considered but the criteria remain unchanged.

Question 49: At present, in Criteria RTC2, RTC3-B, RTC4-B, and RTC5 the Crown requires the Bidder to obtain signed letters from clients certifying contract specifics. The process of obtaining letters from clients to certify details seems redundant and excessive given that Bidders already undergo a rigorous process in order to qualify for TBIPS. Obtaining client signatures from organizations is always problematic due to legal liability concerns. Even some government organizations will no longer provide signed letters attesting to the provision of services. Add to this the challenge that COVID-19 poses on the logistics of getting signatures and these requirements present a real logistical risk for any potential respondent, especially because the core of the response must be written first so as to provide a client with the details of what they are being asked to certify. This means that potential respondents could put significant effort into producing a response only to discover that signature logistics prevent them from getting signatures in time. For these reasons we ask that the requirement for a letter signed by a client be removed from RTC2, RTC3-B, RTC4-B, and RTC5 and replaced by the more traditional right of the Crown to seek confirmation by means of email/telephone.

Answer 49: Your request was considered but the criteria remain unchanged.

Question 50: Given the complexity of the bid requirements in the subject solicitation, the volume of billable days that bidders are required to prove, the amount of detail required in other mandatory and rated criteria, the volume of other Federal Government solicitations currently undergoing competition, and the upcoming long weekend, we respectfully request a two-week extension to the current closing date of September 21.

Answer 50: The solicitation period will not be extended at this time.

Question 51: With regard to MTC2 and RTC1-B, that request the Bidder to demonstrate billed days for the I.10 Technical Architect and I.11 Technology Architect positions, would ESDC consider lowering the required billable days? Currently the number of billable days requested is equivalent to the number of billable days requested for the Programmer/Software Developer and Programmer/Analyst positions. It is hard to imagine an IT project that contained equal numbers of Developers and Architects, as generally, far more developers are required than technical architects. For this reason, it would also be extremely challenging to meet the required number of Technical and Technology Architect billable days across only 4 contracts. Considering these facts, would ESDC consider lowering the required number of billed days for the Technical/Technology Architect categories to a number that accurately represents the typical ratio of Architects to Developers on an IT project?

Answer 51: Your request was considered but the criteria remain unchanged.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.