



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

Informatics Professional Services - EL Division/Services

professionnels en informatique - division EL

Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floor

10 Wellington Street

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Informatics Professional Serv DSB Services Professionnels en Informatique pour DGSN	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation E60ZR-211390/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20211390	Date 2022-03-17
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-637-40582	
File No. - N° de dossier 637el.E60ZR-211390	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 2022-04-11 Heure Normale du l'Est HNE	
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: Bitsene, Marlene	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 637el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-9976 ()	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

**BID SOLICITATION # E60ZR-211390/A
FOR A CONTRACT AGAINST A SUPPLY ARRANGEMENT FOR TASK- BASED
INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (TBIPS)**

WORKSTREAM 1 – WEB DEVELOPMENT

A1 APPLICATION/SOFTWARE ARCHITECT – LEVEL 2, LEVEL 3

A6 PROGRAMMER/SOFTWARE DEVELOPER – LEVEL 2

A7 PROGRAMMER/ANALYST – LEVEL 2

A8 SYSTEM ANALYST – LEVEL 2

A11 TESTER – LEVEL 2, LEVEL 3

A14 WEB DEVELOPER – LEVEL 2

B1 BUSINESS ANALYST – LEVEL 2

B14 TECHNICAL WRITER – LEVEL 3

I2 DATABASE ADMINISTRATOR – LEVEL 3

I3 DATABASE ANALYST / IM ADMINISTRATOR – LEVEL 3

P10 PROJECT SCHEDULER – LEVEL 3

WORKSTREAM 2 – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

B1 BUSINESS ANALYST – LEVEL 3

B7 BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION ARCHITECT – LEVEL 3

B14 TECHNICAL WRITER – LEVEL 3

I11 TECHNOLOGY ARCHITECT – LEVEL 2, LEVEL 3

P5 PROJECT EXECUTIVE – LEVEL 3

P7 PROJECT COORDINATOR – LEVEL 3

P9 PROJECT MANAGER – LEVEL 3

P12 RISK MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST – LEVEL 2

**FOR
PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT CANADA (PSPC)**

The Request for Proposal (RFP) Amendment 006 is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and includes an amendment.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q34 - With respect to R.1.1 (for both Workstream 1 and Workstream 2) we ask that the Crown please consider contract equivalency for large-scale contracts to allow Bidders to meet the requirements above and beyond the contracts required in M.1.3.

For example:

- A contract valued at \$4M is equivalent to 2 Projects;
- A contract valued at \$6M is equivalent to 3 Projects;
- A contract valued at \$8M is equivalent to 4 Projects;
- Etc.

A34 - No changes

Q35 – we respectfully request a two-week extension to the solicitation closing date.

A35 – The solicitation closing date is extended by two weeks. Please refer to the amendment below.

Q36 - Reference : RFP Workstream 2 M.1.3 and R.1.1 (pages 112 and 118 of 122)

For Workstream 2, M.1.3 and R.1.1 require the provision of a team consisting of four (4) or more resource categories. Due to the wide spectrum of categories across multiple TBIPS streams required under this solicitation and that many Government clients separate contracts into different workstreams with limited TBIPS streams per contract, making it challenging to demonstrate a wide range of categories under one (1) contract, as such would the Crown please consider reducing these requirements from four (4) resource categories to three (3) resource categories?

A36 – No changes to Workstream 2, M.1.3 and R.1.1.

Q37 - Due to the high level of complexity of the bid requirements, and the fact that we are approaching fiscal year-end, which typically creates higher than average workloads for most vendors, would Canada be willing to grant a four-week extension to the closing date of this RFP? This will provide companies with sufficient time to gather the information required for the corporate requirements, assemble reference information, do task mapping, and prepare a compliant submission to this RFP.

A37 – Please see answer to question 35.

Q38 - Reference: M.1.3 & R.1.1 – Category Levels

In Q&A#32, PSPC accepted the mapping of lower Levels to higher Levels under the condition that the client can attest that the resources placed were Senior level resources.

(a) Could you please confirm that if the lower Category is the same Category Name as the higher Category, then mapping is not required, and that the client attestation is sufficient demonstration?

(b) Also, we assume that Level 1 Categories can be proposed for Level 2 Categories with Client attestation. Could PSPC please confirm?

A38 – (a) In the event that the lower category has the same category name as the higher category, the task description must still correspond to that in the request for proposal.

(b) The proposition in question 32 also applies to Level 1 as long as the description matches the one in the RFP and that the client can attest.

Q39 - We respectfully request that PSPC extend the Solicitation Closing Date two weeks to Monday, April 11, 2022.

A39 – Please see answer to question 35

Q40 - R.1.1 – Workstreams 1 and 2, Category/Level Equivalencies – Please reference: 1) (iii) Previous Similar Projects: Where the bid must include a description of previous similar projects: (i) a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor or any affiliate of the Bidder); (ii) a project must have been completed [or, optional wording, replace "completed "with "commenced"] by the bid closing date; (iii) each project description must include, at minimum, the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address of a customer reference; and (iv) if more similar projects are provided than requested, Canada will decide in its discretion which projects will be evaluated. A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the TBIPS descriptions of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A. Work will be considered to "closely match" if the work in the provided project is described in at least 50% of the points of responsibility listed in the description of the given Resource Category. AND 2) APPENDIX A TO ATTACHMENT 4.1 , Client Reference Form NOTE: The requirement to list at least 50 % of the Statement of Work tasks applies to the "equivalent resources" and does not apply to referenced contracts that include the same or higher level categories of the RFP. However a summary of the scope, resource categories provided and key responsibilities specific to the development of the Informatics professional services must be provided and supported by a letter signed by the client or an e-mail confirmation from the client and not by the bidder.

Given that the window of acceptable experience has been expanded from 5 to 15 years for R.1.1 (Workstreams 1 and 2), some referenceable contracts may have been competed prior to the introduction of the over-arching TBIPS Supply Arrangement that came into effect in the year 2007. In these instances, can PSPC please confirm that mapping non-TBIPS categories and levels that are essentially the same as PSPC's Solicitation's categories and levels do not

require mapping for equivalencies? For example, would the following examples qualify/equate as the same and not require mapping:

	Non-TBIPS Contract	TBIPS Contract
1.	Senior Project Manager	Project Manager L3
2.	Senior Business Analyst	Business Analyst L2, L3
3.	Senior Software Developer	Programmer/Software Developer L2
4.	Senior Application Programmer	Programmer/Analyst L2
6.	Senior Application Analyst	System Analyst L2
7.	Senior Application Architect	Application/Software Architect L2, L3
8.	Senior Technical Writer	Technical Writer L3

Please confirm, 'Yes', or 'No'

A40 – Non

Q41 - With respect to R.1.1 where it is stated - For equivalent resource categories under a different title the Bidder must provide a letter signed by the client, or an email confirmation from the client, not by the Bidder, to certify that the tasks performed by the Resource Category (or Categories) and Level under each of the identified contract(s) include a minimum of 50% of the tasks identified in Article 3.2 of Annex A – Statement of Work. We have a substantial PWGSC/PSPC reference contract where we have billed over \$19 million. It is within the allowed 15-year requirement and thoroughly demonstrates our experience for R.1.1. Despite our best efforts however we cannot find a contact for the signed client letter as they are no longer working at PSPC or have retired. Given that provision of a signed, client certification is a mandatory requirement for this PSPC bid and that the very same Department who managed this contract is required to sign/certify this reference it stands to reason, given the volume of services rendered in the same/similar categories/levels and for such a large, multi-million dollar contract, that PWGSC/PSPC themselves have the ability validate and qualify the contract/data provided in our reference. It would not be a fair, open, transparent or competitive bid competition if our Company is unfairly penalized. Please advise how PWGSC/PSPC can remedy this situation, and how we may garner a letter or email confirmation for this most valid reference?

A41 – With respect to R.1.1, It is not required to support the Informatics professional services provided by a signed letter by the client or an e-mail confirmation from the client for reference contracts completed above the last five (5) years, prior to the bid closing date.

Q42 - 1. We recommend PSPC consider adding a Business Analyst L2 category. The work to be completed under this contract will be varied and digital, and the L2 category will allow for younger participants. This is especially relevant as work can include team based, milestone deliverables. Following procurement best practices, the rate should be set at a percentage of the Business Analyst L3 category (such as 90%) to disrupt gaming.

2. Business Analyst L3, M2, asks for ITIL and/or PMP certifications, neither of which is normally held by a business analyst nor is relevant to the SOW. We ask that PSPC remove certification requirements.

3. Technical Writer, M1, asks for work completed in French and English, effectively making this a bilingual position. Bilingual requirements are set at the TA issuance time. We ask that PSPC modify this M1 to be French or English.

4. Technical Writer, M2, has a circular reference back to M1 and M2 ("...performing tasks as described in M1 or M2"). Please clarify.

5. Project Executive, M1, asks for "10 years' experience within the last 15 years in defining components of systems and the relationships between them". This is not a common Project Executive task. Please clarify.

6. Project Coordinator, M2 & M3, ask for an excess of 10 years of relevant experience only on projects of \$1M+. We ask that the dollar value be reduced to \$500k to match that of the other grids or for the high value project experience to be reduced to 5 years.

A42 – 1. No changes

2. No changes

3. We modify the criteria in M1 for Technical writer from work completed in French and English to work completed in French or English

4. It should say as described in the SOW and not M1 and M2, criteria will be amended

5. Criteria is amended to : The Bidder must clearly substantiate and demonstrate that the proposed resource(s) have at minimum of ten(10) years' experience performing tasks specified in the attached SOW.

6. The value is reduced to \$500K

Q43 - RE: M.1.1, Workstream 1 and 2

As written, M.1.1 asks that bidders provide contract references that cumulatively billed \$2 million in a single year. Given that PSPC estimates the resulting contract will require over 35 resources over a potential 5-year period, M.1.1 does not align to the future requirement of PSPC. To ensure that bidders have relevant experience providing a large number of resources to clients over an extended period of time, and reduce future supply risks to PSPC, please amend M.1.1 to read:

"The Bidder must have billed more than \$2M (in Canadian dollars including taxes) providing Informatics Professional Services on a single contract for two of the three twelve (12) month periods of the last 36 months."

A43 – No changes

Q44 - Requirement M.1.3 and R.1.1

Form M.1.3 at the NOTE, states: "The requirement to list at least 50 % of the Statement of Work tasks applies to the "equivalent resources" and does not apply to referenced contracts that include the same or higher level categories of the RFP. However a summary of the scope, resource categories provided and key responsibilities specific to the development of the Informatics professional services must be provided and supported by a letter signed by the client or an e-mail confirmation from the client and not by the bidder.

- a) Are bidders required to provide a signed letter for each reference contract being used to demonstrate R.1.1?
- b) Are bidders required to provide a list of key responsibilities where the same or higher level category has been used to demonstrate experience against a role?

A44 – a) Yes a signed letter or email is required for each references provided by the bidder
b) Yes

Q45 - The requirements of this solicitation are extensive and require a significant amount of detail. As a result we are respectfully requesting that the Crown please consider granting an additional two week extension to the closing date of this solicitation?

A45 – Please see answer to question 35.

Q46 - We are reaching out to request a two (2) week extension to the submission deadline for E60ZR-211390/A - Informatics Professional Serv DSB.

Q46 – Please see answer to question 35.

solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
E60ZR-211390/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
E60ZR-211390

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
637el. E60ZR-211390

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
637el
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

AMENDMENT

1. At Page 1 of the Solicitation, the following change applies:

DELETE:

Solicitation Closes
at 02:00 PM on 2022-03-28
Eastern Standard Time (EST)

INSERT:

Solicitation Closes
at 02:00 PM on 2022-04-11
Eastern Standard Time (EST)

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED