



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

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)

Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre 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 Division / Division

des services professionnels en informatique

Les Terrasses de la Chaudière

10, rue Wellington, 4ième

étage/Floor

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Accessibility Conformance Testing	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 2B0KB-219754/A	Date 2023-04-26
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client REQ 97540	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
File No. - N° de dossier 611zm.2B0KB-219754	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-631-41348	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2023-02-17	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT on - le 2023-05-01 Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: St-Cyr, Audrey	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 611zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (000) 000-0000 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

PART A – Question and Answers

Q&A 1-6 of March 15

Q1: Can you please confirm that the contract needs Secret Clearance?

A1: After the contract is awarded the individual Government of Canada Department or Agency will determine the security requirements for each individual project. However, it is anticipated that requirements will require either Reliability or Secret security levels based on the needs of departments.

RFSO reference:

- Part 1 – General Information (refer to: 1.9 Security Requirements)
- Part 6 – SECURITY AND INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS (6.1 Security Requirements)
- PART 7 - STANDING OFFER AND RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES (A. Standing Offer),

7.2 Security Requirements

The following security requirements (SRCL and related clauses provided by the Contract Security Program) apply and form part of the Standing Offer.

1. The Contractor must, at all times during the performance of the Contract, hold a valid Facility Security Clearance at the level of SECRET, issued by the Contract Security Program (CSP), Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC).
2. The Contractor personnel requiring access to CLASSIFIED/PROTECTED information, assets or sensitive site(s) must EACH hold a valid personnel security screening at the level of SECRET, or RELIABILITY STATUS, as required, granted or approved by the CSP, PWGSC.

Q2: If we're just interested in the web accessibility, will that be a disadvantage for us applying?

A2: No, there will not be a disadvantage to bid for any individual category. We accept bids for any of the six categories.

RFSO reference: ANNEX "A" - STATEMENT OF WORK (2. Resource Categories).

Q3: VPATs are an old limited format. OpenACR is a format that was developed for the USA's GSA <https://gsa.github.io/openacr-editor/> that is better suited for modern web development. Is this something that would consider supplying?

A3: Not at this time

Q4: We can deliver documents in English, but the RFP says, "All work and deliverables must be in English and / or French." - is that our choice or the department's choice?

A4: For the purpose of the bid, the deliverables can be submitted in the offeror's choice of language.

After the contract is awarded the individual Government of Canada Department or Agency will determine the language of the deliverables (English only, French only, or bilingual) based on the contact agreement.

Q5: WCAG 2.2 is about to be released, will you be wanting support for ACRs which align with the latest WCAG recommendation when it is released?

A5: The EN 301 549 (2021), which includes WCAG2.1, is the standard at this time.

RFSO reference: Annex "A" – Statement of Work (2. Resources Categories):

The Offeror's Named Resource must perform one or more Accessibility Conformance Testing services against the EN 301 549 (2021) standard.

If and when Canada implements a newer version of the EN 301 549 standard, the Offeror must be notified in writing and the Offeror's Named Resource must test against the updated version of the standard within 6 (six) months of the updated standard being released.

Q6: If all the mandatory requirements of required completed reports for the categories are met, however, the clients are not willing to approve submission of their reports due to confidentiality (redacted or unredacted). Would the Crown be willing to accept sample reports based on the Crown's provided content?

Many of our clients are not willing to allow us to provide the compliance reports we have produced for them due to confidentiality concerns. To provide PSPC the ability to evaluate our capabilities, would it be possible for PSPC to provide representative web pages and documents to assess? This would allow vendors to demonstrate their capabilities and the level of detail provided in their reports.

A6: No, the offeror must pass the mandatory corporate criteria evaluation to participate in the test.

RFSO reference:

- Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Criteria, 1.1.3 Guidelines on submitting ACRs

The following guidelines apply to all mandatory criteria and point-rated criteria:

When submitting Accessibility Conformance Reports, offerors must secure

any necessary approvals before submitting the reports. All Accessibility Conformance Reports must be evaluated on a third party ICT solution. The unredacted reports must clearly state the solution name and the names of the evaluators. If necessary, images displaying confidential/product functionality can be removed from the report providing that in the bid submission it is made clear information has been removed due to confidentiality. Anonymous and redacted reports will not be accepted – as redacted reports are often not accessible.

- Annex A1 - Testing scoring guide and instructions for the Sample EN 301 549 (2021) accessibility conformance test (Sample ACT)

The Offerors that are compliant to the mandatory criteria will be invited to participate in our tests and will have 48h to ask questions at the beginning of the 10-day testing period.

Note:

We take confidentiality very seriously and would like to assure bidders that the six (6) significant and independent Accessibility Conformance Reports for websites or web applications completed within the last twenty-four (24) months, which were requested, will not be shared with anyone outside of GC (Canada) evaluation team for this specific bid. These reports are intended solely for evaluation purposes and will remain within the confines of GC (Canada).

Q&A 7-29 of March 28

Q7: In Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Criteria, it's our understanding that the Mandatory resource (MR 1.2) can be different from the Rated Resource (RR1.2) are different. Can you please confirm ?

A7: No, the named resources at MR must be the same at RR, per category.

Q8: In Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Criteria, would it be possible to use the same qualifications that are requested for MR1.2 for RR1.2? If not, is it possible that the rated resource be provided at a later date for example at the time of the test ?

A8: No, the qualifications requested in MR1.2 will not be used at RR1.2. As indicated in the answer to question 7, the Named Resource proposed for each RR must be the same as the one proposed for the MR of the same category. The point rated criteria are additional criteria for the same resources.

All RR criteria are to be submitted at a later stage following bid closing, as per section 4.1.1.3 of the RFSO. This is also clarified in amendment 003.

Q9: Is it possible to request for an extension to the submission deadline?

A9: Yes, see amendment 003 for extension.

Q10: In Part 1, General Information, regarding 1.8, are we understanding correctly that the only way to submit our bid that is entirely made up of electronic documents is via the Canada Post system mentioned in the RFP?

A10: You can submit your offer to PSPC Bid Receiving Unit by fax at the number provided on the cover page or electronically via Canada Post Corporation (CPC) Connect services as per the instructions detailed in Part 2 – Offeror Instructions, section 2.2 Submission of offers of the RFSO.

Q11: At Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation where criteria ask for VPAT experience, do we have to send the VPATs with our bid or only tell you they exist (and are available upon request)?

A11: Yes, the Offerors have to send the VPATs with their bids by providing the requested number of reports following the VPAT format as per the criteria.

Q12: Regarding PART 3 and 3.1 Offer preparation Instructions of the English RFSO, what is supposed to go in Section IV?

A12: Section IV is merged with Section III. Please see amendment 003 for correction and refer to Part 3 – Offer Preparation Instructions and Part 5 – Certifications of the RFSO for what to include in Section III.

Q13: Regarding section 3.2 of Part 3 of the RFSO, are we allowed to provide Sections I, II, and III in one document?

A13: As indicated in section 3.1 of the RFSO and in amendment 003, the offer must be separated in three sections (I, II and III).

Q14: Regarding Section II Financial Offer of 3.2 Offer submission Form, is HST an excise tax or an “Applicable Tax”?

A14: HST is an Applicable Tax.

Q15: At subsection 1.1.1 of Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation Criteria, where the RFSO says “Project names of all projects where the Named Resources performed in this role”, for some of our Named Resources this could be dozens of projects: do you really need them "all"? Same question for “Company (client) names of **all** projects...”?

A15: The projects must meet the criteria and the period. For example, if a criterion asks for 12+ months of experience in web accessibility testing, you must provide as many projects related to web accessibility testing to cover that period.

Q16: Regarding the table in 2.1 Mandatory Corporate (MC) of Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation Criteria, in the “Reference in Bid” column in the table, what are you imagining we would put in the cells for each of the rows MC1.1 through MC1.6 in order to “demonstrate our compliance” from a “corporate” perspective. We’re eager to please, but we are confused as to what kind of wording or information you are expecting in that column (or within another document we will provide that will be referenced in that column)?

A16: You must provide a reference (section, page number) to where in your bid you provided the information to demonstrate that you meet the criteria. This will allow us to easily find it.

See amendment 003 for clarifications of what is required to demonstrate conformance to some MC criteria.

Q17: Regarding section 2.2 Mandatory Resource (MR) of Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation Criteria, for example, the MR 1.1 and MR 2.1 row, you request that we describe the testing methodology for the Named Resource. Does this mean that we are only to provide one Named Resource per category? Or are you saying that every Named Resource for a given category must provide a separate methodology? We have one methodology we use corporate-wide for a given category, so we’re unclear as to why, if we name more than one Named Resource per category, as to why each one needs a personal methodology (rather than providing our corporate methodology for all people involved in each category).

A17: While you can bid for an individual category, you must propose, at a minimum, one named resource per category in which you are interested. It is acceptable to use the same testing methodology for different named resources and categories, provided that it satisfies the criteria, and it is explicitly stated as such.

Q18: Regarding certifications of the corporate as well as certifications for the Named Resources in Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Evaluation Criteria for items such as IAAP WAS certification, do we simply tell you what we know to be true and you will ask for evidence if you need it later ...or must we attach certificates and the like to prove these statements to you as part of our bid?

A18: You must provide a copy of your valid membership, accreditation, and/or qualifications. See amendment 003 for clarifications.

Q19: Regarding Annex B1 (Self-Evaluation Grid) of the RFSO, how are we to fill in Annex B1 before the Sample ACT testing has occurred (which doesn't happen til after the bid date), seeing as the outcomes of that testing make up part of the grid?

A19: This Annex must be completed and submitted at the time of the testing, and not at bid closing. Refer to section 4.1.1.3 Test of the RFSO and amendment 003 for clarifications.

Q20: Regarding section 7.2 Security Requirements of Part 7 of the RFSO, *“The Contractor must, at all times during the performance of the Contract, hold a valid Facility Security Clearance at the level of SECRET, issued by the Contract Security Program (CSP), Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC).”* must we already have this in place in order to submit a compliant bid?

A20: No. As indicated in section 6.1 Security Requirements, the conditions must be met prior to issuance of an SO. At bid closing, the Offerors should provide a completed Application for Registration (AFR) form to be given further consideration in the procurement process. Please refer to section 5.2.2 Security Requirements – Required Documentation for more details.

Q21: Regarding Annex C - Security Requirement Checklist, are we correct that there is nothing we need to do regarding the Security Requirements Check List before the RFSO closing date?

A21: Not in regards to this Annex, however Offerors are reminded to obtain the required security clearance and, as applicable, security capabilities promptly.

Q22: Regarding Annex D – Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Certification, must we provide a filled copy of this form with our bid?

A22: Yes. Please refer to Part 5 of the RFSO.

Q23: There are some links in the RFSO that still do not work following amendment 001, can you fix them? (For example: multiline URLs, the Information Technology Industry Council (ITIC) website page for the VPAT® link at section 3.2 of Attachment 1 to Part 4, the FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid link at section 5.2.3 of Part 5 and the PWGSC Forms Catalogue website link at section 7.9 of Part 7A and Annex H.

A23: Please see amendment 003 and revised RFSO. Some links are clickable and working, while for others you have to copy and paste into your browser.

For multi-line URLs that are clickable but not working, when copying and pasting it into a browser, you may get a page not found message due to missing spaces or hyphens. To reach the page, you need to edit the URL to add the missing spaces/hyphens as per the URL in the RFSO.

Information Technology Industry Council (ITIC) website page for the VPAT® link at section 3.2 of Attachment 1 to Part 4 has been provided in amendment 003.

The FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid link at section 5.2.3 of Part 5 is the same link than the ones at Part 5 - 5.2.3, Part 7A - 7.12 and Part 7B-7.8 of Annex H.

The PWGSC Forms Catalogue website link at section 7.9 of Part 7A and Annex H is only available to the GC. In call-ups where these forms may be used, Canada will initiate the completion of the forms and send them to the Offeror at this time.

Q24: For Website Accessibility Testing, MR1.3 at Attachment 1 to Part 4 asks for 6 ACRs, then RC 1 asks for 2 ACRs. Does this mean we need to submit a total of 8, or can it be a total of 6 ACRs?

A24: The Offeror must submit, at a minimum, a total of 6 ACRs for these criteria. The Offeror can use 2 out of the 6 ACRs from RC1 for MR1.3. The Offeror must explicitly specify which reports provided at RC1 are used for MR1.3.

Q25: We want to participate in multiple categories. At Attachment 1 to Part 4, MR6.2 asks for 6 ACRs. Can these be the same as the 6 ACRs we will provide in MR1.3?

A25: Yes, the Offeror must explicitly specify which reports are provided for which criterion.

Q26: At Attachment 1 to Part 4, for ACR formats, you have asked for the ACRs to be in VPAT version 2.0 or higher.

- Our reporting template (fully accessible in Excel and Word) is different but covers everything in VPAT 2.0 or 2.3. Can we supply our own reporting templates, or do you need us to port over the content of our reports in VPAT 2.3 format?
- Do we require the VPAT format for anything other than MR6.2 and RC1, report 1?

A26: VPAT format is required for ACR reports for MR6.2 and RC1. As per Annex A1, it will also be required for RR1.1, RR2.1, RR2.2, RR2.3 at the testing exercise of the evaluation described in section 4.1.1.3.

VPAT format is NOT required for ACR reports for MR1.3, MR2.2, MR3.3, MR4.3-A, MR4.3-B, MR5.2.

Q27: At Attachment 1 to Part 4, for Document Accessibility Testing, MR2.2 asks for 8 ACRs. We usually remediate documents (Word, PDF, Powerpoint, Excel) for our clients and send them back PAC 3.0 conformance reports with before (not accessible) and after (accessible) files.

- Are the PAC 3.0 conformance reports OK or do you need VPAT reports?
- If you need VPAT reports, do you want them for both broken AND corrected files or just the broken OR corrected files?

A27: VPAT format is required for ACR reports for MR6.2 and RC1. As per Annex A1, it will also be required for RR1.1, RR2.1, RR2.2, RR2.3 at the testing exercise of the evaluation described in section 4.1.1.3.

VPAT format is NOT required for ACR reports for MR1.3, MR2.2, MR3.3, MR4.3-A, MR4.3-B, MR5.2.

Offerors must submit ACR reports for both corrected and broken files.

Q28: Regarding Attachment 1 to Part 4, and the first paragraph of Annex A1, can you please confirm that:

- We do not address RR1.1, RR2.1, RR2.2, and RR2.3 in the bid, but these require a test that is done after we pass the mandatory requirements.
- We must submit the other RR items (RR1.2, and RR2.4 to RR6) with the bid.

A28: All RR criteria are to be submitted at a later stage following bid closing, as per section 4.1.1.3 of the RFSO. This is also clarified in amendment 003.

Q29: Regarding Attachment 1 to Part 4, MR2.2 requests ACRs for documents, can these ACRs be based on the industry-standard W3C's WCAG-EM Report rather than be an ACR based on the VPAT template?

A29: VPAT format is required for ACR reports for MR6.2 and RC1. As per Annex A1, it will also be required for RR1.1, RR2.1, RR2.2, RR2.3 at the testing exercise of the evaluation described in section 4.1.1.3.

VPAT format is NOT required for ACR reports for MR1.3, MR2.2, MR3.3, MR4.3-A, MR4.3-B, MR5.2.

Q&A 30 of April 14

Q30: Regarding MR1.3 & MR2.2 technical criteria, given that some accessibility reports produced by resources are confidential by nature (and/or because of the signed NDA) and the tight/limited time period of past 24 months, some of our resources are unable to produce the required no. of reports described in the criteria, therefore we would like to

request to the crown to reduce the no. of reports needed in half, example: MR1.3 from 6 reports to 3 reports; MR2.2 from 8 reports to 4 reports?

A30: Canada will not reduce the number of reports required, but will instead extend the acceptance period from 24 months to 48 months, allowing reports completed within the last 48 months to be considered. Please see amendment 004 below and note that all criteria with an acceptance period of 24 months has been changed to 48 months.

Q&A 31 of April 26

Q31: Will some of the software will involve artificial intelligence?

A31: Software is defined broadly and may involve artificial intelligence.

**THE FINAL DATE TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS IS APRIL 26 2023.
QUESTIONS RECEIVED AFTER THIS DATE MAY NOT BE ANSWERED.**