

RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES

SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government Services Canada/ Réception des soumissions Travaux publics et services gouvernementaux Canada
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2/Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Proposal To: Public Works and Government Services Canada

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the goods, services, and construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out thereof.

DEMANDE DE PROPOSITION

Proposition aux: Travaux Publics et Services Gouvernementaux Canada

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté la Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes ci-jointes, les biens, services et construction énumérés ici sur toute feuille ci-annexées, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

Instructions : See Herein
Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Comments - Commentaires

This document contains a Security Requirement

Vendor/Firm Name and address
Raison sociale et adresse du Fournisseur /de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution

PWGSC
Acquisitions Branch (ZQ-Division)
Portage III, 10C1
11, Laurier Street
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0S5

Title – Sujet Business Consulting	
Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 47419-218907 AMENDMENT 002	Date July 03, 2020
Client Reference No. – N° référence du client 47419-218907/A	
GETS Reference No. – N° de reference de SEAG	
File No. – N° de dossier 47419-218907/A	CCC No. / N° CCC - FMS No. / N° VME
SOLICITATION CLOSES – L'INVITATION PREND FIN à – at 14 :00 – 02 :00 PM le – on July 21, 2020	Time Zone Fuseau horaire EST/HNE
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Inquiries to : - Adresser toutes questions à: Robin.st-louis@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca	Buyer Id – Id de l'acheteur 020zq
Telephone No. – N° de téléphone : 613-858-6185	
Destination – of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination – des biens, services et construction : See Herein	

Delivery required - Livraison exigée See Herein	Delivered Offered – Livraison propose
Vendor/firm Name and address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Facsimile No. – N° de télécopieur Telephone No. – N° de téléphone	
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



The Purpose of this amendment #002 is to:

- 1) Provide answers to questions received with regards to this Request for Proposals (RFP).

The following questions were received from potential bidders

Question 11:

With regards to MT1, the Crown is seeking project experience in supporting project gating deliverables, specifically for TBS recognized Project Gating frameworks for IT-Enabled projects. In our experience, the same or very similar documents such as business cases, outcomes / benefit management plans and Independent Third Party Reviews are required and prepared for other types of organizations that may not follow TBS requirements, such as Federal Crown Corporations, Provincial and Municipal Governments. Often, the same skillsets, methodologies, tools and approaches are developed when preparing business cases, outcomes / benefit management plans and Independent Third Party Reviews for other levels of government.

If the vendor can demonstrate that a similar IT enabled project gating process was followed and one of the three deliverables were prepared (business cases, outcomes / benefit management plans and Independent Third Party Reviews), would the Crown accept projects performed on behalf of Federal Crown Corporations, Provincial and Municipal Governments?

Answer 11:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify MT1.

Question 12:

Would the Crown be willing to change the basis of selection? Currently, the Basis of Selection – Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit [70%] and Price [30%]. In our extensive experience on TSPS, this result will drive a race to the bottom regarding pricing and not provide Industry Competitive rates. In our experience, clients have had much more success with fair, competitive pricing by using the following method:

STEP 1 - ESTABLISHING THE LOWER AND UPPER MEDIAN BAND LIMITS FOR EACH PERIOD AND EACH RESOURCE CATEGORY: The Contracting Authority will establish, for each period and each Resource Category, the median band limits based on the firm per diem rates provided by the technically responsive bids. For each such Resource Category the median will be calculated using the median function in Microsoft Excel and will represent a range that encompasses any rate to a value of minus (-) 10% of the median, and an upper median rate to a value of plus (+) 40% of the median. 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.

Using this lower and upper band limits will improve the result of achieving strong competitive rates.

Answer 12:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify the basis of selection.

Question 13:

Both Corporate Mandatory 2 & 3 refer to organizations with 1000 or more employees. However, CBSA reports that its employee count is 13,900. Given that the corporate references refer to transformation projects, we are recommending that the requirements for both #2 and #3 are changed to organizations with 10,000 employees or more, which reflects similar size and scope to comparable organizational transformations.



Answer 13:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify the requirements.

Question 14:

Related to Corporate Requirement 1:

Would the Crown be willing to amend this requirement to state?

REPLACE WITH.....

The Bidder must provide descriptions of ten (10) projects that it has completed that demonstrate that it has developed & authored supporting project gating deliverables and complied with Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS)- recognized Project Gating frameworks for IT-Enabled Projects within ten (10) years from date of bid closing.

Project gating deliverables must include at least one (1) of each of the following:

- Business Cases with 'transformation' project values greater than \$50M;
- Approved and Funded Treasury Board Submissions;
- Departmental Outcomes / Benefit Management Programs;
- Independent Third Party Reviews for 'transformation' project values greater than \$50M.

Logic and reasoning behind the changes.

1. **Business Cases:** Hundreds of Business Cases are written annually in alignment with the TBS Project Gating framework for IT-Enabled Projects. We are recommending that a project value of \$50M or greater should be referenced.
2. **Treasury Board Submissions:** Many Treasury Board Submissions are often prepared on behalf of a departments, but not all are approved. We are recommending that this requirement states "Approved Treasury Board Submissions", which reflects the firm's experience of taking the TBSub from conception through to funding.
3. **Outcomes / Benefits Management Programs:** Latest changes in the Project Complexity Risk Assessment (PCRA) framework released by TBS has substantial guidance around benefits management and the need to build a benefits culture within an organization. Experienced firms with experience in developing such programs would provide CBSA with substantial expertise in tying the financial investment to realized benefits to improve organizational capabilities.
4. **Independent Third Party Reviews:** Needs to reflect 'transformational', in alignment with the statement of work.

Answer 14:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify the requirement.

Question 15:

Rated Requirement – Corporate RT1 requires bidders' to cite experience providing Independent IT Project Review services; however, the "Independent IT Project Reviewer" resource category is unique to the TBIPS vehicle and is not present within TSPS. The Crown also does not state any tasks related to Independent IT Project Reviews within Annex A – Statement of Work, outside of "Third Party Project Reviews" being listed as a deliverable. Third Party Reviews are best performed by independent resources to ensure objectivity, as such it is best practice to procure the services of project reviewers separately and independently. As requests for Independent IT Project Review services are not consistent with the TSPS vehicle, and given that the Crown requires Third Party Project Reviews to be performed, would the Crown please remove RT1 from the solicitation and instead procure the services of an Independent IT Project Review resources separately through the TBIPS Vehicle.

Answer 15:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify the requirement.



Question 16

With respect to Corporate Mandatory Criterion M1, the Crown requires bidders to demonstrate 10 completed projects within the last 10 years developing supporting project gating deliverables which comply with TBS submission requirements. We find this requirement to be excessive for the following reasons:

1. TBIPS Tier II already prequalifies companies capable of handling large scale projects. To re-examine corporate qualifications based on volume is redundant.
2. Qualified firms pride themselves on both the quality and efficiency of the work delivered (i.e. how well projects are managed, meaningful outcomes) which is a far better measure for ability versus the required volume.
3. While companies may have successfully delivered projects that would qualify for this requirement within the last 10 years, the requirement that bidders must demonstrate 10 projects is unrealistic for the vast majority of Tier II suppliers and unduly eliminates smaller firms from bidding. Small firms can deliver outstanding work but if they are not given the chance to successfully bid on larger scale work such as this requirement from CBSA, they cannot grow.

It is for these reasons that we respectfully request the Crown remove Corporate Mandatory Criterion M1 in its entirety.

Answer 16:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify the requirement.

Question 17:

Due to the complexity of preparing a response to this solicitation and the large number Tier 2 and multi-resource bids currently out to tender, we would like to request a two-week extension to the solicitation closing date to ensure that vendors are able to submit high quality responses that provide the best value to the crown.

Answer 17:

COVID-19 was taken into consideration when deciding on the closing date of this solicitation. Canada decided not to extend the closing date of this solicitation.

Question 18:

Rated Technical Criterion RT8 and RT14 request that the proposed resources have 10 years of experience within the last 10 years in order to score the maximum amount of points. This is extremely restrictive and disqualifies all candidates who have had any lapse in employment over the course of 10 years. In order to allow vendors to source well qualified senior resources and in consideration of the transitory nature of contract placements please amend RT8 and RT14 to allow for experience "within the last 15 years".

Answer 18:

After careful consideration, Canada decided not to modify the requirements.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.