Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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.** 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B9220-220011	**Date** 2021-09-09
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: ☐ **Destination:** ☑ **Other-Autre:** ☐

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**

Canada

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

1. Questions and Answers

Question 1

As per the Summary (Section 1.2, item n), Statement of Work (Annex A, 7.1.1), and Basis of Payment (Annex B, Workstream 1), Workstream 1 only includes three A.1 Application Software Architect categories (2 Core and 1 Additional) with varying cloud specialities. Please confirm that all references to "P.2 Enterprise Architect" in WS1M-1, WS1M-2, and WS1R-1 should read "A.1 Application Software Architect".

Answer 1

Canada confirms that all references to “P.2 Enterprise Architect” in WS1M-1, WS1M-2, and WS1R-1 should be replaced by A.1 Application/Software Architect – Lead Cloud Architect.

A correction will be issued to reflect the change. See section 3 below.

Question 2

Regarding Amendment #3, Q&A#7, and Amendment #4, Q&A#3, which state that, "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."

Competition on this PSAB RFP is already limited to the small number of Aboriginal TBIPS SA holders that can demonstrate the WS1M-1 large contract requirements. By not allowing the use of similar or equivalent categories in WS1M-2/WS1R-1, competition will be further limited to bidders who have multi-year or large TBIPS contracts with identical categories, even though there are many bidders with significant proven experience providing similar services through other types of contracting vehicles such as TSPS and bespoke RFPs for major Crown Projects. In addition, the current RFP allows this practice for one requirement (WS1M-1) and not two others (WS1M-2 and WS1R-2) which introduces inconsistencies in how bidders can demonstrate relevant experience.

Given that there is significant precedent for this practice on similar TBIPS procurements, including the currently active non-PSAB RFP for DPM Service Delivery, Sol#B9220-220010/A in addition to other IRCC procurements in the last 24 months, we respectfully request that IRCC reconsider and allow bidders to cite similar or equivalent non-TBIPS categories (for WS1M-2 and WS1R-1) if they are able to demonstrate that the reference contract Statement of Work maps to at least 75% of the tasks for the resource categories identified under TBIPS.

Answer 2

The request has been reviewed and the requirement will remain unchanged. Please refer to justification provided below in section 2.

Question 3

Can the Crown confirm if there are currently incumbents providing the same or similar services under WS1 and WS2 in the past three years to the IRCC under TBIPS vehicles? If so, which companies?

Answer 3

Please refer to question and answer 8 of Bid solicitation Amendment 001.

Question 4

Regarding Form R4, which requests copies of course outlines, policies, and/or commitment documents; would the Crown please consider amending this requirement to allow submission of these documents "if requested, prior to contract award".

Answer 4

The request has been reviewed and the requirement will remain unchanged.

Question 5

Regarding Form R4, where copies of policies or commitment documents are requested: please confirm it is acceptable to include these documents in an Appendix.

Answer 5

Canada confirms acceptance where copies of policies or commitment documents are requested in Form R4 to be provided in an Appendix in their bid submission.

Question 6

Regarding Form R4, items a, b, c, and e, which request "copies of policy or commitment documents including effective dates", can the Crown please clarify what is meant by 'effective date'.

Answer 6

Canada confirms that “effective date” relates to the date the policy or commitment was implemented.

Question 7

With respect to the Conflict of Interest Requirements in 7.2 - will these be applied to other related contracts that have been in place over the last 18 months that provided the IRCC support related to technical debt or planning for the future Digital Platform Modernization initiatives (e.g. planning, business case, TB submissions, etc.)

Answer 7

Please refer to question and answer 1 of Bid solicitation Amendment 003.

Question 8

As per the Government of Canada website, it is our understanding that the Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business (PSAB) is in place to support underrepresented Indigenous businesses with procurement opportunities by advocating for their inclusion in federal government contract competitions and participation on major Crown projects.
There is already a limited number of qualified PSAB suppliers that can surpass the minimum $15Million contract value in WS1M-1, so by not allowing non federal level contracts and not allowing similar or equivalent categories the Crown is at risk of eliminating some of the Aboriginal firms who have been invited to bid.This goes against the Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business (PSAB).
We respectfully request that IRCC reconsider and allow Public Sector contracts to be used in WS1M-1 and WS1R-4.

Answer 8

Please refer to question and answer 1 of Bid solicitation Amendment 004.

Question 9

There have been Q&A's asked regarding using the same or similar categories for WS2M-2 for billed resource categories and the Crown keeps saying no. We are feeling this is unjustified, as we have worked on several large TBIPS omnibus/Tier 2 IM/IT Supply Arrangements and the Crown has always allowed this.

Our concern is the HR Consultant category that we have to identify 600 billable days with that exact category to score 100% and not allowing suppliers to use the same or similar categories, eliminates many to all Indigenous Suppliers to submit a bid. The HR Consultant category is a low weight category of 2% for billable days. Why wouldn't the crown consider the following that have higher % of billable days as a core resource instead of the HR Consultant. Such as A.1- Application Software Architect (19%), B.5 - Business Process Reengineering Consultant (17%) or P.2 Enterprise Architect (22%), as these are more heavily weighted categories.

Also, in reviewing the HR Consultant resource rated criteria; we don't believe R1 and R3 are applicable or relevant to CIC Transformation and Digital Delivery Services.

R1 - "The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience providing Human Resources advice and guidance for Public Sector Senior Executive Management, including job classifications and justification statements within the past 5 years of the RFP issuance date."

R3 - "The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience delivering HR staffing services within Public Sector under 16 weeks including conducting all phases of the staffing process from initial poster design, to the completion of reference checks within the past 5 years from the RFP issuance date where the proposed resource managed the process from start to finish and was the process authority or the lead."

For this particular Professional Service contact, requesting a HR Consultant to perform such tasks as shown above, job classifications and/or conducting all phases of the staffing process for the CIC's Transformation and Digital Delivery Service would result in a conflict of interest if the HR Consultant is providing specific job classifications and justification statements. TA's are defined by the Project Team

Lead or Project Authority. The HR Consultant would not necessarily be involved in the process since a Project Manager is usually responsible for resources to be made available and the project is developed and is operational. Also, requesting a HR consultant on this Transformation and Digital Delivery Service would result in a conflict of interest between the hired HR Consultant (of the consulting company) and the client, such as losing revenue and/or miss opportunities supplying professional service consultants for this Project.

Answer 9

The request has been reviewed and the requirement will remain unchanged. Please refer to justification provided below in section 2.

Question 10

Given the delay in receiving answers (Amendments), the Amendment alluded to in Amendment 005 that will be issued next week and the upcoming Sept. 6 holiday, we request an extension of the closing date to October 7th, 2021. Please advise.

Answer 10

Canada will not extend the solicitation closing date further.

2. Justification

For WORKSTREAM 1 AND WORKSTREAM 2:

Cloud Delivery Support Services – The GoC's approach to Cloud Conversion requires specific expertise as defined in the categories identified in the RFP. Corporate and resource experience must have been for a Single Client. Single Client cloud requirements differ significantly from the provincial and municipal levels of government due to GoC specific Cloud standards for development, IT security, implementation, and data management.

Canada has identified a risk with allowing Bidders to cite 'same or similar' categories as equivalencies for M-2 and R-1. As an example, Bidder 'X' maps 80% of a Programmer/Analyst level of effort to meet the Programmer/Software Developer category. During evaluations, the evaluators could map to the Statement of Work, however; would be unable to verify the percentage of the overall level of effort performed by the resource to demonstrate the Programmer/Software category experience (e.g. resource only performed 80% of the tasks 20% of the time). As a result, there is a risk that the resulting Contractor would be unable to provide the number of resources in the identified categories required to meet the overall contractual level of effort. Additionally, a risk may exist relating to proposed resources to undertake required work who may not have the required experience in the GoC specific standards mentioned above for Cloud to successfully deliver on IRCC requirements.

3. Modifications to the Bid Solicitation

At Attachment 4.1 Corporate Technical Criteria, 2.0 WORKSTREAM 1:

DELETE: WS1M-1, WS1M-2, and WS1R-1 in their entirety;

INSERT: WS1M-1, WS1M-2, and WS1R-1 below:

WS1M-1 PB	**Corporate Capacity:** 1. Using only 1 Reference Contract provided, the Bidder must demonstrate its experience providing Application Software Architecture services related to Cloud Technologies for a Government of Canada Client. The Reference Contract identified must: a) have been with a Single Client; b) have a minimum value of $15,000,000 (CAD) including applicable taxes and including amendments; c) have an initial minimum contract period of 1 year; d) have been completed in the last 5 years of the RFP issuance date or has been ongoing for a minimum of 6 months of the RFP issuance date; and e) have included the provision of the services of at least 1 of the following same or similar resource categories listed below (i. to iii.) in accordance with Section 7 of the Statement of Work of this bid solicitation: i. A.1. Application Software Architect – Cloud Solutions Architect; ii. A.1 Application Software Architect – Cloud Implementation Specialist; or, iii. A.1 Application/Software Architect – Lead Cloud Architect For the 1 Reference Contract provided, the Bidder must complete and submit Form M1 – Corporate Capacity. For the purpose of this criterion, the term 'task' includes the tasks identified in the Statement of Work at Annex A of this bid solicitation for the resource category. For the tasks to be considered the same or similar, the Bidder must demonstrate at least 50% of the tasks for that resource category in Section 8 of the Statement of Work at Annex A of this bid solicitation. For example, if the SOW for a resource category identifies 15 tasks, the Bidder must use any 7 of the resource category's SOW tasks to meet this requirement (50% of 15 = 7). The Bidder must have been contracted as the prime contractor for the Reference Contract provided in response to this criterion.

WS1M-2 PB	**Billed Days:** The Bidder must demonstrate contract experience in delivering informatics professional services supplying all resource categories listed in the table below for the required minimum billed days per resource category. Billed days are defined as days worked and billed to clients, calculated at 7.5 hours or more per day. **TBIPS Resource Category** / **Minimum Billed Days** A.1. Application Software Architect- Cloud: 1500 A.1. Application Software Architect – Cloud Implementation: 2000 A.1 Application/Software Architect – Lead Cloud Architect: 2000 To demonstrate such experience, the Bidder must complete and submit Form M2 –Billed Days. The Bidder must demonstrate the following for each resource category:

	1. The services demonstrated were provided under a maximum of 5 contracts; if more than 5 contracts are provided, only the first 5 will be considered; and 2. Each of the identified contracts must have been active within the last 10 years of the RFP issuance date; the demonstrated billed days experience must fall within the 10 years of the RFP issuance date.

WS1R-1

Excess Billed Days: The Bidder should demonstrate its billed days experience in excess of the minimum billed days required in mandatory technical criterion WS1M-2.

The Bidder's demonstrated Total Billed Days provided in response to mandatory technical criterion WS1M-2 will be used to evaluate this criterion. The Bidder will be awarded points for billed days in excess of the minimum billed days identified in the table of mandatory technical criterion WS1M-2, as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario below.

EXAMPLE EVALUATION SCENARIO

BILLED DAYS

Category	(A) Bidder Total Number of Billed Days under WS1M-2	(B) Min defined under WS1M-2	(C) Billed Days in excess of WS1M-2 (C) = (A) – (B)	(D) Bidder % increase to a max of 100 (D) = (C) / (B) *100
A.1. Application Software Architect – Cloud	2000	1500	500	33.33
A.1. Application Software Architect – Cloud Implementation	2250	2000	250	12.50
A.1 Application/Software Architect – Lead Cloud Architect	3200	2000	1200	60.00
BIDDER SCORE = SUM OF (D) FOR ALL CATEGORIES / 3 (which will be rounded to two decimal places)				35.28

In this example, the Bidder would score 35.28 points out of a possible 100 points.

MAXIMUM 100 POINTS

The Bidder's demonstrated "Total Billed Days" provided in response to WS1M-2 will be used to evaluate this criterion.
The Bidder will be awarded points as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario on the left side.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE BID SOLICITATION REMAIN UNCHANGED