



**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

**RETURN BIDS TO:  
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À :**

By e-mail to: - Par courriel au :

[tony.youness@tc.gc.ca](mailto:tony.youness@tc.gc.ca)

Attention: - Attention :  
Tony Youness

**Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin**

At - à :  
2:00 PM - 14:00

On - le :  
~~Tuesday, April 25, 2023~~  
**Monday, May 1, 2023**  
Time Zone - Fuseau Horaire :  
Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)  
Heure avancé de l'Est (HAE)

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Professional services to support Microsoft Power Platform		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b>  5
<b>Solicitation No. N° de l'invitation</b> T8080-220407	<b>Date of Amendment Date de modification</b> April 21, 2023	
<b>Address enquiries to : - Adresser toute demande de renseignements à :</b> Tony Youness  <b>E-Mail Address - Courriel :</b> Tony.youness@tc.gc.ca		
<b>Destination</b> See herein - Voir aux présentes		

**Instructions:** Municipal taxes are not applicable. Unless otherwise specified herein all prices quoted must include all applicable Canadian customs duties, GST/HST, excise taxes and are to be delivered Delivery Duty Paid including all delivery charges to destination(s) as indicated. The amount of the Goods and Services Tax/Harmonized Sales Tax is to be shown as a separate item.

**Instructions :** Les taxes municipales ne s'appliquent pas. Sauf indication contraire, les prix indiqués doivent comprendre les droits de douane canadiens, la TPS/TVH et la taxe d'accise. Les biens doivent être livrés « rendu droits acquittés », tous frais de livraison compris, à la ou aux destinations indiquées. Le montant de la taxe sur les produits et services/taxe de vente harmonisée doit être indiqué séparément.

<b>Delivery required Livraison exigée</b> See herein - Voir aux présentes	<b>Delivery offered Livraison proposée</b> Not applicable - Sans objet
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print):   La personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie) :</b>	
<b>Name - Nom</b>	<b>Title - Titre</b>
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>



**THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT IS RAISED TO:**

1. Provide clarification and answers to questions from potential supplier

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

<p><b>Question 22</b></p>	<p>On Page 13 (iv) - 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 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. Can you please confirm that MC1 and RC1 are corporate requirements only and the definition on page 13 for previous similar projects does not apply.</p>
<p><b>Answer 22</b></p>	<p>All requirements in the RFP with the designations MC and RC in "Attachment 4.1 "are solely and specifically corporate criteria and will be evaluated as per "Attachment 4.1". Resource criteria are designated M and R and found in "Appendix C to Annex A".</p>
<p><b>Question 23</b></p>	<p>On Page 19 section 4.4 point 7, there is a pricing example, there seem to be errors in the formula on the pricing score showing incorrect financial scores. Can it be corrected?</p>
<p><b>Answer 23</b></p>	<p>TC reviewed your request and agreed to amend section 4.4 point 7, pricing example. See amendment A below.</p>
<p><b>Question 24</b></p>	<p>Given the influx of solicitations that Canada is releasing with similar deadlines and the level of detail required to respond to this solicitation, would Canada kindly grant a two-week extension to May 9th, 2023?</p>
<p><b>Answer 24</b></p>	<p>TC have reviewed your request. The recent closing date remain as May 1,2023 at 2:00 PM</p>
<p><b>Question 25</b></p>	<p>Due to the changes in corporate requirement MC2 and the new requirements for signed client letters, we would like to request a three-week extension to the solicitation closing date. This will ensure that vendors are able to gather all the required information and submit high quality responses that provide the best value to the Crown.</p>
<p><b>Answer 25</b></p>	<p>TC have reviewed your request. The recent closing date remain as May 1,2023 at 2:00 PM</p>



Question 26	Corporate requirement MC1 states that each contract being cited must be worth \$3M (including Canadian taxes). Would the Crown please consider amending this requirement and accepting two (2) contracts, out of which, (1) contract must be valued at \$3M? Contracts that involve Power Apps development typically engage a small number of consultants on work that is short-term and highly specialized, and as a result, the contract spend does not typically exceed \$3M.
Answer 26	We have reviewed your request. The requirement remains unchanged
Question 27	Regarding requirement MC2 where Canada is requesting for Bidders to be a “Microsoft Business Partner”, to the best of our knowledge, Microsoft does not have a “Business Partner” designation, while it does refer to Systems Integrators with deep Microsoft experience as “Partners”. Based on the requirements in the RFP for experience around the Power Platform, we understand that Canada is looking for validation that the Bidder has such deep experience, which would be represented by Microsoft’s “Cloud Business Applications, Customer Engagement Gold Competency”. Can Canada please confirm that this is the requirement, and that Bidders would be required to produce a letter or certificate by Microsoft, demonstrating it meets the requirements of this competency?
Answer 27	TC have reviewed your request: For MC2, See answer #2 in RFP Amendment 2.
Question 28	In regard to RC3 where Canada is requesting for the number of Consultants associated with the Bidder, can Canada please confirm that by "associated" you mean "employed"? We believe this would provide the best certainty to Canada that a Bidder has the right bench strength and access to certified consultants to mitigate risks or issues with unqualified consultants should the consultants be purely contractors vs. employees.
Answer 28	Associated in this context refers to the consultants engaged by the organization for providing relevant professional services. Employed was not used as the employer/employee relationship does not exist for firms subcontracting consultants.”
Question 29	For RC3, would Transport Canada accept resource certification; <b>Microsoft Certified: Power Platform Fundamentals</b> ?  Transport Canada currently accepts the exam PL-900 within the resource certifications grids, and the skills measured directly align to Transport Canada requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe the business value of Microsoft Power Platform</li> <li>• Identify foundational components of Microsoft Power Platform</li> <li>• Demonstrate the capabilities of Power BI</li> <li>• Demonstrate the capabilities of Power Apps</li> <li>• Demonstrate the capabilities of Power Automate</li> <li>• Demonstrate complementary Microsoft Power Platform solutions</li> </ul> As described on <a href="https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/certifications/power-platform-fundamentals/">https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/certifications/power-platform-fundamentals/</a>
Answer 29	PL-900 is valid certification and would qualify if the appropriate MCID# and supporting transcript is included.



Question 30	Rated corporate criteria RC3 is asking for MCID numbers and transcripts for each resource identified. As this solicitation is not assessing resources at this point, and therefore resources are not specifically being proposed, will the Crown accept the total number of resources in each listed category, and the total number of those resources that hold certifications without double counting?
Answer 30	We have reviewed your request. The requirement remains unchanged
Question 31	In reference to Financial Evaluation section 4.3.2 (A).2.d, it states: <b>“If a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that is higher than the Upper Band Limit, TC will consider the bid as non-compliant and will give no further consideration to the bid.”</b> This approach may result in the Crown disqualifying an entire bid as a result of having only one resource out of the 6 categories with a price that is slightly outside the upper band. The financial evaluation approach already results in a lower financial score for higher bid rates, which seems reasonable. Would the Crown consider removing the clause mentioned above, so as to avoid the risk of eliminating very qualified bidders inadvertently?
Answer 31	We have reviewed your request. The requirement remains unchanged

**THIS SOLICITATION IS HEREBY AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

**Amendments:**

A) DELETE section 4.4 point 7, pricing example its entirely and REPLACE with:

		Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
<b>Overall Technical Score</b>		115/135	89/135	92/135
<b>Bid Evaluated Price</b>		\$55,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$45,000.00
<b>Technical Merit Score</b>		$115/135 \times 70 = 59.63$	$89/135 \times 70 = 46.19$	$92/135 \times 70 = 47.70$
<b>Calculations</b>	<b>Technical Merit Score</b>	$45/55 \times 30 = 24.55$	$45/50 \times 30 = 27$	$45/45 \times 30 = 29$ <b>30</b>
<b>Combined Rating</b>		84.18	73.19	77.70
<b>Overall Rating</b>		1 <sup>st</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**