

SOLICITATION NUMBER 24062-19-130
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q.1 In Section 4.2 of the RFP, item c, page 24, it states: One or more resource(s) may be proposed for each scope / sub-scope. A separate grid for each proposed resource must be completed and included in the technical proposal.

Further, in item 1.2 of Attachment 1 to Part 4, page 28, it indicates Bidders must complete and submit with their proposal “the following grids (see below for the point-rated criteria)”.

- i) Could the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (TBS) please confirm that the grid with “Mandatory Project/Experience Information” in the header is the mandatory requirement grid for every resource for each Scope?
- ii) As the Rated requirements’ wording states “The Bidder”, could TBS please advise if the point-rated criteria grids, starting on page 30 of the RFP, are the point-rated criteria for resource qualification? If not, please provide the grids that should be completed for each of the proposed resources.

A.1 TBS wants to limit the number of pages a bidder has to provide information on the point-rated criteria. However, the Project/Experience Information would be required for all resources. So, to answer the question:

- i) Yes, for all proposed resources the Mandatory Project/Experience Information must be completed by the proposed bidder.
- ii) The point-rated grids are not to be completed for each individual resource. One point-rated grid is to be completed for all proposed resources. Bidders may use the collective experience of resources to satisfy the point-rated criteria. Evidence provided to meet the point-rated criteria must be associated with one or more of the resources proposed.

Q.2 In Attachment 1 to Part 4 (page 28) there is information on how to describe the proposed resources, but no detail on what resources are required. We kindly request that detail be provided to bidders on the resources required, their required qualifications and how they will be scored for each Scope of Work.

A.2 Resource requirements should be decided by the proposed bidder based on the respective tasks and deliverables section in the Statement of Work (page 66), and point-rated criteria in the Technical Evaluation Criteria (page 29). The number of resources may vary based on the expertise of each resource proposed. Resources will be evaluated, in aggregate, based on the point-rated criteria. The bidder should demonstrate how the proposed resource(s’) experience meets the point-rated criteria.

Q.3 The RFP on page 52 states that “The maximum allocation of funds (total liability) for each of the scopes / sub-scopes are as follows:

Scope 1, Digital Government Implementation: \$350,000.00 (after applicable HST)
Scope 2.1, Recruitment – Talent: \$300,000.00 (after applicable HST)
Scope 2.2, Recruitment – User Recruitment: \$150,000.00 (after applicable HST)
Scope 3, Targeted Training: \$125,000.00 for each sub-scope, or \$375,000.00 in total (after applicable HST)”

For Scope 1 it is anticipated that TBS will award 4 contracts. Is the allocation of funds per contract \$350,000.00 or is it \$87,500.00?

How will the issuance of a task order be determined across 4 contracts for Scope 1?

A.3 For all scopes and sub-scopes, the allocation of funds between contracts is flexible, but the total amount spent for all contracts within the scope cannot exceed the limit of expenditure. In the case of Scope 1, this means that the cumulative value of the four contracts in scope 1 cannot exceed \$350,000.00.

Q.4 Could TBS please confirm that the experience to be demonstrated and provided in response to the rated tables, starting on page 30 of the RFP, can be at the proposed resource level and not at the Bidder corporate level? For example, is it acceptable if the proposed resource X worked on a similar project/initiative that is not one of the Bidder’s corporate initiatives?

A.4 Task authorizations would be issued based on the availability of resources, the needs of CDS at a given time, and other factors. As mentioned in the RFP blog, the Task-Authorization will provide specifics on level of effort for the bidder to complete the tasks and deliverables required by CDS at that time.

Q.5 Would TBS accept a resource as part of a bid that previously worked directly with CDS and/or on related issues at TBS-CIOB prior to CDS’ launch, either as an employee (term or indeterminate) or as a contract/casual resource?

A.5 Yes.

Q.6 In Section 1.2 on Page 28, it states that the bidder should complete and submit with their proposal a mandatory project/experience information grid for each project required to demonstrate the proposed resource’s experience. Further, it states each proposed resource must have 3 client references. Are the 3 client references for 3 different projects or can they be clients associated with the same project?

A.6 References may be from different projects. However, no project may have less than two points of contact so CDS may contact the second, if they are unable to reach the first.

Q.7 If multiple resources are proposed by a bidder for Scope 1, would TBS allow the different project experiences of these resources to be blended or alternated in responses to the sub-criteria in order to meet criteria 1.1 on page 30 and criteria 1.2 on page 31?

A.7 Yes resources' experience may be blended or alternated, but it should be clear which individual resource is associated to the specific sub-criteria, as well as their role(s)/responsibilities.

Q.8 In the table "Scope 1: Digital Government Implementation", 1.1 and 1.2 reference a "digital transformation initiative" and a "specific service", respectively. In many cases the digital transformation initiative revolves around redesigning a specific service. Can the Crown please clarify how it would like bidders to understand and distinguish between these two concepts?

A.8 Evidence for qualification 1.1 may involve several individual services that were transformed, which collectively could form part of a broader organizational-wide transformation. Evaluation scoring for 1.1 includes points for the creation or enablement of structural elements and the stakeholder engagement that facilitated the initiative. Qualification 1.2 focuses on an in-depth case study of the transformation of one service and includes evaluation scoring for the specific methods used.

Q.9 Can you please confirm that bidders do not need to address each of the sub-scopes within "Scope 3: Targeted Training", but can still be considered for training in one or more areas?

A.9 Correct. Bidders can apply for one, or more of the sub-scopes in scope 3, targeted training. They only need to address the specific sub-scope(s) they apply for.

Q.10 Referring to page 46 (Section 7.3 Security Requirements) of the RFP, can TBS please confirm that any resources proposed for Scope 1, at a minimum, only require a valid security clearance at the level of Reliability Status.

A.10 Any resources proposed for Scope 1 must have, at a minimum, a valid security clearance at the level of Reliability Status.

Q.11 We kindly request that you describe the expected audience for Scope 3. In particular:

- i. How many public officials will be trained for each Subscope?
- ii. Will the same group of public officials be trained across all 3 Subscopes, or will Subscopes 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 have different audiences?
- iii. How senior are the public officials that will participate in the training?
 - a. Will the officials' level of seniority differ between Subscopes 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3? If so, how?

A.11 The number of public officials to be trained has not yet been determined. The technical authority will work with the Contractor at the point of task-authorization to determine the scope and nature of the training initiative.

Audiences for training are expected to differ for the sub-scopes of scope 3. For sub-scope 3.1 and 3.2, the audience for training will focus on public servants at the operational levels who are either directly (e.g., developer roles) or indirectly (e.g., policy roles) involved in the design and delivery of public-facing services.

The audience for sub-scope 3.3 would be government decision-makers, focussing on, but not limited to, senior executives (e.g., Chief Information Officers, Assistant Deputy Ministers, Deputy Ministers.)

Q.12 Can TBS please elaborate on the type of web links or samples to be provided?

A.12 Web links could include, but are not limited to:

- Links to the public-facing side of the service delivered (website, application, or other);
- Links to open code repositories;
- Links to personal Github accounts of proposed resources;
- Links to open Kanban boards or other work management tools, etc.

Q.13 Related to request for code repositories. For code repositories that are not open due to privacy, security, or proprietary concerns, proposed bidders should contact the Contracting Authority to make other arrangements."

If bidders provide a web link to the services provided, what additional information is the TBS expecting to get by asking for the associated code repositories. Generally, code repositories are proprietary and there are security and privacy concerns around its release.

a) can TBS please elaborate on the purpose of requesting the associated code repositories.

b) can TBS please elaborate on what other arrangements are available.

A.13 a) Code repositories play an important role in assessing software development, deployment, and security practices. Further, open code repositories or contributions to open source (as individuals or organizations) can show a commitment to contributing back to the community.

While working in the open is a core principle of CDS, we recognize that some bidders' code repositories may contain proprietary or sensitive information. If this is the case, note the lack of a code repository in the bid submission, the reason for excluding the code repository, and who CDS can contact in order to make other arrangements for CDS to inspect the code repository if necessary.

b) Other arrangements may include, but are not limited to:

- A non-disclosure agreement signed by CDS and CDS resources to view the code repository in person or remotely.
- Contacting a third-party to verify the development practices of the organization.
- Interviews with proposed resources to discuss development practices, with evidence from other projects.

While CDS will work with bidders to find a mutually agreeable arrangement, it is ultimately up to bidders to provide code repositories that can be assessed by CDS for the technical evaluation criteria.

Q.14 On page 16 of the RFP, Section 3.2, Joint Venture Experience, clause ii. states “Where the Bidder is a joint venture with existing experience as that joint venture, it may submit the experience that it has obtained as that joint venture” and clause iii. states “A joint venture bidder may rely on the experience of one of its members to meet any given technical criterion of this bid solicitation”.

Could the client please confirm that clause iii. is not subservient to clause ii. and that Joint Venture bids can rely on either the experience of Vendor A or Vendor B for any given criterion, even on initiatives where the joint venture had not previously existed?

A.14 Clause iii. is not subservient to clause ii. Joint Venture bids can in fact rely on either the experience of Vendor A or Vendor B for any given criterion, even on initiatives where the joint venture had not previously existed.

It should be noted, however, that the RFP states the following under clause iii.:

Example: A bidder is a joint venture consisting of members X, Y and Z. If a solicitation requires: (a) that the bidder have 3 years of experience providing maintenance service, and (b) that the bidder have 2 years of experience integrating hardware with complex networks, then each of these two requirements can be met by a different member of the joint venture. However, for a single criterion, such as the requirement for 3 years of experience providing maintenance services, the bidder cannot indicate that each of members X, Y and Z has one year of experience, totaling 3 years. Such a response would be declared non-responsive.