



### 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, February 20, 2024~~  
**Tuesday, February 27, 2024**

Time Zone - Fuseau Horaire :  
Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)  
Heure avancé de l'Est (HAE)

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Application/Software Architect (Power Platform)		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 6
<b>Solicitation No. N° de l'invitation</b> T8080-230182	<b>Date of Amendment Date de modification</b> February 12, 2024	
<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>Question 20</p>	<p>Can you please clarify the following comments related to RFP Section (A) Financial Evaluation Method A (pages 17-20) of the above noted RFP because as currently written, Bidders may feel incented to inflate their prices?</p> <p>RFP Section (A) Financial Evaluation Method A: paragraph d (Page 18): “if a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for the Resource Category that is higher than the upper band limit, that Bidder's financial evaluation will be conducted using a per diem rate equal to the Median Rate for that Resource Category.”</p> <p>As written, Paragraph d (page 18) unfairly benefits a bidder who proposes 200% higher rates than the median rate by evaluating their bid equal to the (lower) median rate.</p> <p>Is the wording related to upper and lower median bands in paragraph d incorrect and should it read something like the following?</p> <p>Proposed Paragraph D wording: “If a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for the Resource Category that is higher than the upper band limit, that Bidder's proposal will be deemed non-responsive, TC will give no further consideration to the bid.”</p> <p>Since the Upper and Lower median bands will be based on proposed per diem rates for <b>each</b> option period, in a worst-case scenario, would a bid be eliminated for proposing per diem rates outside the median band limit in any option period?</p>
<p>Answer 20</p>	<p>TC reviewed your request and agreed to change section 4.3-Finacial evaluation, Method A.</p> <p>Please see amendment #F below</p>
<p>Question 21</p>	<p>Please clarify the following questions related to <b>MC1</b> changes applied in <b>Amendment 5, Q18</b> which added the wording “<b>Up to</b>” <b>3</b> distinct contract references.</p> <p>The following three scenarios relate to applying <b>minimum contract durations and number of SOW's</b> consistently in each instance because there is confusion in our understanding with the addition of the above amendment.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1 (based on original evaluation criteria MC1):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to the original criterion for <b>MC1</b>, a bidder submitting three (3) corporate contract references must provide a <b>minimum total sum for contract duration equal to 36 months</b> (and each contract must also be <b>minimum 12 months duration</b>).</li> <li><b>Three (3)</b> Statements of Work (SOW) related to <b>MC1</b> tasks must be provided and all three (3) related SOW's must be minimum 12 months.</li> </ol> <p><b>Scenario 2 (based on change in Amendment 5, Q18):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If a bidder submits one (1) corporate contract reference, must the minimum <b>total contract duration</b> equal 36 months?</li> <li>Must the Bidder in this scenario also provide <b>three (3) SOW's</b> with minimum duration of 12 months?</li> </ol>



	<p><b>Scenario 3: (based on change in <u>Amendment 5, Q18</u>):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a bidder submits two (2) corporate contract references, must the minimum contract duration for any single reference be 12 months?</li> <li>b. Must the <b><u>minimum sum of the two (2) contracts' duration</u></b> equal 36 months?</li> <li>c. Must the Bidder in this scenario also provide three (3) SOW's with minimum duration of 12 months?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Answer 21</b></p>	<p>Transport Canada has reviewed your request. MC1 remains unchanged.</p> <p><i>Explanation: The per contract requirements – as indicated in the current MC1 – remain unchanged. Each contract must be for a single vendor (a), be for a minimum of 12 months (b), include either a statement of work (SOW) or signed client letter (f), and demonstrate through Table 1 support for the listed project tasks. If less than three contracts are submitted, ALL must be for municipal, provincial, federal, or crown agency organization level of client (e). Combined value (c) and delivering 75% of contract value (d) is calculated on the total of all contract or contracts.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, submitting a single contract would require ONE SOW (f), be with a single vendor (a), a minimum of 12 months length (b), meet the contract type (e) and project tasks (Table 1). This contract would also need to be a minimum of \$8,000,000 with a minimum of \$6,000,000 already delivered and invoiced.</i></p>
<p>Question 22</p>	<p>The following question relates to <b>MC2</b> and the impact of <b>Amendment 2 Q6</b> on the original requirement and subsequent impact introduced with changes in <b>Amendment 5 Q18</b>.</p> <p>Since TC will only be evaluating SOW's in support of <b>MC1 Corporate References</b>, what criteria should Bidders expect will be used in <b>MC2</b> to evaluate "random" SOW's that are not presented or evaluated as part of the <b>"up to" 3 corporate references</b> demonstrated in support of MC1?</p>
<p><b>Answer 22</b></p>	<p>Transport Canada has reviewed your request. MC1 remains unchanged.</p> <p><i>Explanation: As stated in MC2, the Bidder must propose three distinct Power Platform Solution Architect resources who have passed the PL-600 exam (Microsoft Power Platform Solution Architect) and who worked for a minimum of twelve (12) months on contract(s) held by the Bidder where the project tasks comply with the criteria stated in MC1. For each contract submitted to meet the minimum 12 months, the submitted information must match that used in MC1 to substantiate the contract: a SOW or signed client letter, and demonstration via Table 1 support for the listed project tasks. Where the same contract is used in MC1 and MC2, this information would be identical. Note that MC2 only calls for meeting the project task criteria set by MC1; other criteria such as project value are not needed, and contract duration of less than twelve months are valid for MC2, subject to the length of all valid contract(s) must be at least twelve (12) months.</i></p>
<p>Question 23</p>	<p>We are seeking clarity on Transport Canada's rationale for the response to <b>Amendment 4 / Q15</b> with respect to removing Bonus points for bilingual resources for rated criterion RC1. As mentioned in the RFP, the language requirement does not mean that Transport Canada will not issue a Task Authorization during the contract period for a bilingual resource (<i>per page 27 of 64 Form and Content of draft Task Authorization: paragraph (j) the language profile of the resources requested</i>) to conduct work in the regions, particularly Quebec and/or New Brunswick.</p>



	<p>Given that bilingual resources could help Transport Canada now and in the future and since the Bonus points are rated criteria, there is no impact on any Bidders' capability to respond to the RFP or to restrict their ability to recruit resources going forward; therefore, we kindly request that TC reverse the decision regarding BONUS points for bilingual resources introduced in (<b>Amendment 4 / Q15</b>).</p> <p>Since Transport Canada previously reviewed and subsequently re-confirmed the original criteria in <b>Amendment #3, A10</b> reverting to the original criteria will certainly be supported across government as it addresses widely debated concerns about the lack of French requirements in GoC IT-related RFP's.</p>
<b>Answer 23</b>	Transport Canada has reviewed your request. RC1 remains unchanged.

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

**Amendments:**

F) DELETE under section 4.3-Finacial evaluation, the Section (A) Financial Evaluation - Method A , in its entirety and REPLACE with:

(A) **Financial Evaluation - Method A:** The following financial evaluation method will be used if three (3) or more bids are determined responsive:

**1. Calculation of Total Bid Price:**

The financial evaluation will be conducted using the pricing tables completed by the Bidders and the Firm Per Diem Median Rate Evaluation Method explained below. A financial calculation will occur for each Bidder by multiplying its firm per diem rates, or Median Rate(s) if applicable, for the Initial Contract Period and the option period(s) with the estimated number of days of work for each period, for all the Resource Categories stated in Attachment 4.2, Pricing Schedule. The sum of such rates will constitute the Total Bid Price for that Bidder.

**2. Firm Per Diem Median Rate Evaluation:**

- a. **Explanation:** The firm per diem median rate calculation will apply to modify the rate to be assessed in the financial evaluation of a Bidder, where that Bidder submits a firm per diem rate for a resource category that is lower than the Lower or Upper of the Band Limit as calculated below. The firm per diem median rate calculation is for evaluation purposes only, and the actual submitted per diem rate will be used in any resulting contract in all instances.
- b. Establishing the lower and upper median band limits for each period and each resource category: Using the per diem rate proposed for each individual Resource Category a Median Rate will be determined for each Resource Category for the Initial Contract Period, and for each of the option periods. For each Resource Category, the Median Rate will be calculated using the median function in Microsoft Excel. A Lower and Upper Band Limit will be calculated for each Resource Category and will represent a range that encompasses the Median Rate to a value of **minus (-) 20% of the median, and an upper median rate to a value of plus (+) 30% of the median.**



- c. If a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that is higher than the Upper Band Limit, that Bidder's proposal will be deemed non-responsive, and TC will give no further consideration to the bid.
- d. If a Bidder bids a firm per diem rate for a Resource Category that are lower than the established Lower Median Band Limit, that Bidder's proposal will be deemed non-responsive, and TC will give no further consideration to the bid.
- e. When an even number of technically responsive bids have been determined, an average of the middle two rates will be used to calculate the median band limits and for an odd number of technically responsive bids, the middle rate will be used.

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