

## 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 0A1/ Noyau 0A1

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

Cette demande d'offres à commandes comprend des dispositions en matière de sécurité.

This Request for Standing Offers includes provisions for security.

## Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

## Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Linguistic Services Division / Division des services linguistiques

PSBID, PWGSC / DIASP,TPSGC

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

10C1/Place du Portage, Phase III

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> FULL-TIME GROUP TRAINING / NCR		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-093429/C		<b>Date</b> 2012-12-10
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20093429		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 505zf.EN578-093429	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZF-505-25051		
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2012-10-31
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-01-08</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Bélair, Christine		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 505zf
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-7018 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-2675	
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>		
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>		
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> 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

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b> <b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No - Non</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
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)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EN578-093429/C

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

505zf

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

20093429

File No. - N° du dossier

505zfEN578-093429

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

**See electronically attached document for the content of the  
Amendment 005 of the Request for Standing Offers (RFSO)**

**This Amendment to the Request for Standing Offers (RFSO) is intended to:**

**PART A:** answer questions from bidders  
**PART B:** amend the Request for Standing Offers  
B-1: amendments to RFSO EN578-093429/C  
B-2: amendments to RFSO EN578-093429/D  
B-3: amendments to RFSO EN578-093429/E

**NOTE TO POTENTIAL OFFERORS:** Questions received from potential offerors are grouped together in a single document entitled "Amendment to the Request for Standing Offers," in order to avoid any potential errors or omissions in the three RFSOs. Offerors that do not want to submit an offer for more than one work stream or for more than one RFSO are to take into account only those questions that apply to the work stream(s) or the RFSO(s) in respect of which they would like to submit an offer. Questions not specifying a particular RFSO number apply to all the RFSOs, namely EN578-093429/C, EN578-093429/D and EN578-093429/E.

#### **PART A: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Translation of the Question 56 in the French Amendment 003 to the RFSO EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/E and Amendment 004 to the RFSO EN578-093429/D**

L'évaluation du programme - Qu'allez-vous mesurer afin de déterminer si un fournisseur de services est conforme aux normes de l'OC.

**Translation of the Question 69 in the French Amendment 003 to the RFSO EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/E and Amendment 004 to the RFSO EN578-093429/D**

En ce qui concerne le TC1 pour l'invitation no EN578-093429 / E

Vous demandez une preuve de l'expérience acquise depuis 2000, pour un maximum de points. Qu'advient-il si le client ne travaille plus pour le département et leurs dossiers n'existent plus. Y a-t-il une autre façon de prouver cette expérience? (par exemple les factures payées?)

Ceci est un exemple d'une réponse que j'ai reçue par e-mail.

«Non, désolé - je suis certain que mes dossiers ont été détruits à ce jour.

Pourquoi avez-vous besoin de cette information?

Savez-vous à qui je pourrais parler et qui pourrait vérifier le nombre d'heures et les dates de votre formation linguistique que vous avez eu en 2004 avec Santé Canada?

**Amendment of the Answer 71 in the Amendment 004 to the RFSO EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/E and Amendment 005 to the RFSO EN578-093429/D**

Each of the following programs are considered separate programs:

- PLF2 A and B
- PFL2 C
- CEWP

If the Offeror has experience with one OR more of these three programs and meets the requirements of PRTC 1.1, the Offeror will be awarded 10 points.

In this example, the Offeror could receive 10 points.

**Amendment of the Answer 74-3) in the Amendment 004 to the RFSO EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/E and Amendment 005 to the RFSO EN578-093429/D**

3) As indicated in article 13 - Cancellation and Postponement of Training prior to commencement of Training of Part 7A and article 2 - Cancellation and Postponement Fees, Annex B – Basis of Payment, if the federal institution (or Identified User) provides notice of 10 or more business days before the start of the training, Canada must not be liable to the Offeror. If notice of less than 10 business days is given before the start of the training, the Identified User will have to pay the provider 100% of the initial value of the next session indicated in the Call-up for the learner in question, and the group training will proceed with the remaining three learners.

**Question 78**

Criteria 2.3.2 of RFSO /D states that we must provide the following information to substantiate the pedagogical adviser's experience:

- client organization name;
- name and current telephone number and/or e-mail address of a contact person who will be able to corroborate the information provided in the offer;
- number of hours of experience as a pedagogical adviser or teaching resource;
- start and end dates, i.e. from [month/year] to [month/year] for each example of demonstrated experience;
- number of resources supervised as a pedagogical adviser or number of groups and Learners in each group for demonstrated experience as a teaching resource;
- training mode (full-time or part-time);
- language taught; and
- training program used by the teaching

If we understand the criteria well, the Adviser needs to possess either (a) 1 year's experience supervising 2 instructors or (b) 1,200 hours of experience supervising at least 2 resources or (c) at least 3,600 hours of teaching experience -- but not all 3 (a, b, c) OR experience described in point 2.

If the adviser we wish to propose has 1 year's experience supervising 2 instructors (a), how does PWGSC want us to demonstrate this experience. It would appear that the information to substantiate requested in the RFP would not be relevant to this criteria. In this case, does the offeror need to change the information to substantiate as follows:

- client organization becomes name of instructor supervised
- name and current telephone number... becomes contact information for that instructor
- number of hours: number of hours supervised by instructor supervised
- start and end dates: start and end dates supervised that instructor
- number of resources supervised as a pedagogical adviser... becomes number of instructors supervised
- training mode remains
- language taught remains
- training program used is not relevant

**Answer 78**

Modifications have been made to this criterion.

See amendment 3 in Part B-1 of Amendment 003 to RFSO EN578-093429/C.  
See amendment 3 in Part B-2 of Amendment 004 to RFSO EN578-093429/D.  
See amendment 3 in Part B-3 of Amendment 003 to RFSO EN578-093429/E.

No change to the RFSO.

#### **Question 79**

**Cette question s'adresse à la DOC EN578-093429/C et la DOC EN578-093429/E**

We note on Section II, Annex A, paragraph 6.1.1 that Offerors must provide computers with, among other things:

- operating system Windows 2000, XP or Vista
- internet explorer or firefox internet browser

We wish to propose the Android operating system as it is just as effective as the Windows platform and much less expensive.

Is there a reason why PWGSC is insisting on a specific manufacturer's platform instead of leaving it to Offerors to decide. If we understand the necessity correctly, PWGSC wishes learners to access resources over the web, including the Canada School material. This can be done using other platforms.

As for the browsers, Chrome is another popular and effective browser. Is there a particular reason why PWGSC is not allowing Chrome browser?

We request that PWGSC make the following changes:

- operating system can be Windows (Windows 2000, XP, Vista or more recent versions) OR the Android operating system
- browser can be latest version of Internet Explorer, Firefox or Chrome

#### **Answer 79**

Changes have been made.

See Amendment 16, Part B-1 for RFSO EN578-093429/C

See Amendment 17, Part B-3 for RFSO EN578-093429/E

#### **Question 80**

**This question refers to EN578-093429/E**

For stream 9A

You require 1 primary adviser for every 100 learners on the Offeror's premises (minimum requirement), but you have just added a precision (amendment 7) to MTC 1 that the Offeror must indicate its capacity for training that will be held at a federal institution AND its capacity for training on its premises. So, do we have to propose one or two primary advisers for this stream?

#### **Answer 80**

For part-time individual training, primary advisers can have a maximum of 100 learners (on the Offeror's premises and/or at a federal institution). For a total capacity of 100 learners in work stream 9A, you must propose one primary pedagogical adviser and one backup pedagogical adviser.

#### **Question 81**

If a supplier wishes to bid on all work streams for RFSO EN578-093429/D, that is, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D 4, 5, 6, does the Offeror need to supply 7 proposals, one for each work stream? Or can 3A, 3B, 3C and 3D be combined into one proposal?

#### **Answer 81**

The Offeror can submit one offer for all the work streams in the same RFSO, but as indicated in the Offer Preparation Instructions set out in Part 3, the Offeror must clearly indicate which work stream(s) the offer is being submitted for. Furthermore, the offer must clearly indicate, for each technical evaluation criterion, which work stream the information provided applies to, as each work stream will be considered separate and evaluated independently (separately), without regard to the other work streams for which an offer is submitted.

#### **Question 82**

How does PWGSC want Offerors to package their proposals?

Does PWGSC want each proposal for each work stream for all RFSO's in separate container envelopes/boxes which contain the technical proposals in a separate envelope, the financial proposal in a separate envelope and the certifications in a separate envelope within the container envelope or box?

#### **Answer 82**

As stated in Section 1.1 - Participation in the RFSO, Part 3 - Offer Preparation Instructions, Offerors provide their offers in separately bound sections.

Section I : Technical Offer

Section II: Financial Offer

Section III: Certifications

It is not necessary to send each of the three sections in three separate envelopes/boxes. However, if the Offeror submits one offer for the three RFSOs (EN578-093429/C, D and E), the Offeror must submit each offer separately, and the offer must correspond to the RFSO for which it is being submitted.

#### **Question 83**

Bid closing date

We appreciate the initial extension to January 8, 2013. However, most of the learners, including those from the CSPS are on leave (mandatory leave) during the holiday season, from December 25, 2012, to January 2, 2013, and a good number of employees at the language schools are also on leave and not available to conduct the complex research required to prepare the bid documents. We request therefore that you postpone the closing date to January 15.

#### **Answer 83**

The closing date of the RFSO remained unchanged.

**Question 84**

Part 3 - Offer Preparation Instructions

Would you allow the electronic offers to be submitted on a USB key rather than on a CD?

**Answer 84**

No, electronic copies must be submitted on a CD. The reason for this is that information on a CD is permanent and cannot be deleted or modified.

**Question 85**

Point-rated Technical Criteria PRTC1.2 - Offeror's Experience

If the demonstrated experience was acquired with a single client department for at least five years, can we provide just one reference for the whole criterion or do we absolutely have to provide three references?

**Answer 85**

Yes, if the department was your only client for the duration of the demonstrated experience.

**Question 86**

You have confirmed that, in order for a teacher to qualify as a pedagogical adviser, his or her teaching experience can be in French or in English. This means that a French teacher could become a pedagogical adviser for the English courses without ever having heard of the CEWP or another method for teaching English. For all the English work streams, we request that you modify your scoring grid for the point-rated criteria or modify the criterion so that additional points are awarded for experience in supervision and/or teaching under an English training method. The same justification and the same criterion could be used for an adviser to qualify for teaching French courses.

**Answer 86**

No change to the RFSO because the method, tasks, approach, and so on, are the same for both the English and French CSPS programs.

**Question 87**

Clarification on the answer to question 43

You specify that the same people can be proposed as long as the ratios specified in MTC 2 are achieved. Please clarify whether this means that

- a) the same adviser can be used in a number of work streams if the maximum number of groups, individuals, and so on, that would cause the adviser to have a full-time workload is not reached;
- b) if the maximum number of groups or individuals is reached, the indicated backup adviser can be used for that specific work stream (or can the services of another qualified primary adviser be used?);
- c) the same primary adviser can be proposed for all the work streams and his or her services will be used in the work stream the Offeror qualifies for.

We still do not understand which services can be proposed for the same pedagogical adviser without knowing how much work we will receive.

#### **Answer 87**

a) The same pedagogical adviser can be used for a number of work streams if the total number of groups and learners in the various work streams does not exceed the maximum workload, as defined in MTC 2.1.

b) If your question refers to the case where a backup pedagogical adviser must replace a primary pedagogical adviser at full capacity AND another primary pedagogical adviser must be replaced, you can replace the second primary pedagogical adviser with another pedagogical adviser who meets the requirements of MTC 2, with the approval of the TA.

If your question refers to the case where a primary pedagogical adviser has a full workload (e.g. he or she is responsible for 10 full-time groups and you have a total capacity of 15 full-time groups), you would have to propose two primary pedagogical advisers (the second would have only half the workload, i.e. five groups) and one backup pedagogical adviser.

c) The same primary adviser can be proposed for all the work streams only if the ratio specified in MTC 2.1 for his or her total workload is achieved. If a primary pedagogical adviser is proposed for a work stream for the maximum number of groups or learners, as defined in MTC 2.1, the same primary pedagogical adviser cannot be proposed for other work streams. For example, if a pedagogical adviser is proposed for Work Stream 1—full-time group training in French on the Offerors premises—for 10 groups, the pedagogical adviser cannot be proposed for another work stream because he or she will have reached full capacity according to the ratio specified in MTC 2.1.

See amendment 21 in Part B-1 concerning amendments to RFSO EN578-093429/C.

See amendment 20 in Part B-2 concerning amendments to RFSO EN578-093429/D.

See amendments 20 and 21 in Part B-3 concerning amendments to RFSO EN578-093429/E.

#### **Question 88**

##### **This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/D**

Work streams 5 et 6

You require the Offeror to propose a capacity of 100 English training groups (on the Offeror's premises and at a federal institution), which is the same capacity required for the French courses. You expect 139 learners for Work Stream 5 and 257 for Work Stream 6. We therefore request that you reduce the Offeror's capacity, so that the criterion more realistically reflects the expected requirements.

#### **Answer 88**

The capacity for work streams 5 and 6 have been modified. The minimum capacity for the work streams is now 50 groups.

See Amendment 19, Part B-2 for RFSO EN578-093429/D

#### **Question 89**

Some departments require that instructors possess a SECRET clearance for training held at a federal institution.



How does PWGSC plan on assigning a Task Authorization/Call-Up to a supplier on the standing offer should a federal institution require SECRET clearance?

**Answer 89**

The present Standing Offers does not require offerors to hold personnel security clearance at SECRET level.

If a call-up requires the supplier to hold a personnel security clearance at SECRET level, supplier may refuse the call-up in the context of the present Standing Offers.

**Question 90**

**This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/E**

Would like clarification on MTC 1, item 2.

If the Offeror has 4 locations and wishes to submit a proposal for work stream 9A and can accommodate 100 learners in total in all of facilities, does this meet the criteria? For example, we have 4 locations. Location 1 can accommodate 25 learners, Location 2, 30 learners, Location 3, 20 learners and Location 4, 25 learners. Would this combination be compliant as it totals the minimum capacity requirement?

**Answer 90**

If the 4 locations that the Offeror submits are located within the limits of the territory defined for work stream 9A, the combination in your example will meet the required minimum capacity.

**Question 91**

Since our staff will be on leave during the Christmas holidays, would it be possible to postpone the bid closing date to January 15, 2013?

**Answer 91**

The closing date of the RFSO remained unchanged.

**Question 92**

PRTC 2.1.3 states that the proposed pedagogical advisor is an experienced teacher with more than seven (7) years of experience in teaching and/or supervising for at least two (2) teaching resources in language training for adults in English and/or French as a second language, using one or more CSPS programs or any other language training program in English and/or French as a second language of work.

Could you confirm that we can propose a pedagogical adviser who does not have university training?

**Answer 92**

Yes, a pedagogical adviser who does not have university training can be proposed if he or she has the required experience, as defined in article 2 of MTC 2.3.1.

**Question 93**

In reading the amendments related to parking, we understand that PWGSC requires offerors to have one parking spot (whether free or paid) for each full-time learner. Is this the intent? Does PWGSC assume that every single learner will drive to the Offeror's facility?

We would like PWGSC to reduce this requirement to 1/5th of the capacity identified in MTC 1, the same number for part-time learners.

**Answer 93**

The Offeror is not required to have a parking lot.

However, for full-time work streams: To be deemed responsive to PRTC 4.2, the parking lot must contain, at a minimum, a number of available sports equivalent to the Offeror's capacity, as stated in its response to MTC1.

For part-time work streams: To be deemed responsive to PRTC 3.1 the parking lot must contain, at a minimum, a number of available sports equivalent to 1/5 of the Offeror's capacity, as stated in its response to MTC1.

See amendment 9, Part B-1 to the Amendment 003 to the RFSO EN578-093429/C.

See amendment 12, Part B-2 to the Amendment 004 to the RFSO EN578-093429/D.

See amendment 11 and 12, Part B-3 to the Amendment 003 to the RFSO EN578-093429/E.

**Question 94**

**This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/D and RFSO EN578-093429/E**

Work streams 3 to 6 and 9 and 10

Criteria 2.1.2 and 2.1.3: In criterion 2.1.2, the evaluation does not take into account part-time training provided by a teacher who has a bachelor's degree. However, in criterion 2.1.3, teachers who do not have the required diploma can have seven years' teaching experience without the teaching experience having been on a part-time basis. Could you remove the part-time aspect from criterion 2.1.2 and accept full-time teaching experience, as you do in criterion 2.1.3?

**Answer 94**

No changes to the RFSOs.

**Question 95**

With regard to submitting statistics on the teaching hours of the instructors we want to propose as pedagogical advisers:

a) Given that repeat groups take full-time training for more than 16 weeks with over 30 hours per week, can we use the cumulative teaching hours in the consolidation groups to demonstrate the real number of teaching hours accumulated by the teacher?

b) To show real number of teaching hours accumulated the instructor's, can we use the hours spent teaching full-time training groups that ran for more than 16 weeks with over 30 hours per week, even if the teacher taught only 1/6 of the total number of hours while managing other full-time groups?

**Answer 95**

a) No, only training of at least 16 consecutive weeks with a minimum of 30 teaching hours per week will be considered.

b) We assume you mean that the teaching resource taught only 1/6 of a training course that ran for more than 16 weeks with over 30 hours per week. No, this type of experience does not meet the requirements of the criterion.

#### **Question 96**

In RFSO EN578-093429/C, MTC 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 cause confusion: Under which sub article of MTC 2.3 should an experienced pedagogical adviser who carries out only the duties of a pedagogical adviser and who has not taught since 2000 be proposed—2.3.1 (a), (b) or (c) or 2.3.2 (a), (b) or (c)?

#### **Answer 96**

A pedagogical adviser with no teaching experience can be proposed for criteria 2.3.1.1 (a), 2.3.1.1 (b) or 2.3.1.2 (b) if he or she meets all the requirements of the criterion in question.

#### **Question 97**

##### **Attachment 1 to Part 4**

In order to avoid any confusion regarding sub article 2.3.1 (a) of MTC 2 and to clarify it, could you specify the following?

- It is clear that the adviser must have carried out supervision for 30 hours per week over the course of 40 weeks for 12 consecutive months,  
**but**
- must supervised teachers ALSO have taught 30 hours per week for at least 40 weeks?  
**or**
- can the adviser have supervised a number of teachers (simultaneously) during the same period, regardless of the number of hours these instructors teach per week, as long as they teach learners who are enrolled in full-time courses of at least 30 hours per week?

#### **Answer 97**

See amendment 8 in Part B-1 of Amendment 003 to RFSO EN578-093429/C. Supervised teaching resources must have taught on a full-time basis.

## **PART B-1 - AMENDMENTS TO REQUEST FOR STANDING OFFERS (RFSO) EN578-093429/C**

### **Amendment 16**

Article 6.1.1, Computer Equipment, of Section II of Annex A – Statement of Work

#### **Delete:**

- 2. Windows 2000, XP or Vista
- 11. Internet access, Internet Explorer 6.x or later or Firefox 3.s or later

#### **Replace with:**

- 2. Windows 2000, XP or Vista or any other operating system that enables the use of CSPS programs on MyAccount
- 11. Internet access, Internet Explorer 6.x or later or Firefox 3.x or later, or any other browser that enables the use of CSPS programs on MyAccount. The Offeror must ensure that the Internet speed allows the CSPS on-line programs to run smoothly.

### **Amendment 17**

**Delete** in its entirety amendment 13 in Part B-1 of Amendment 004 to RFSO EN578-093429/C, which refers to article 8.1 of Section I of Annex A – Statement of Work and **replace it with the following:**

With TA's approval, **and only once per session per program**, the Offeror can add one or more external candidates, i.e. candidates that were not registered by a call-up to the SO, in order to form a group that meets the number of candidates and the requirements specified in clause 4 of Annex A - Statement of Work. For example, if 3 candidates registered by call-ups to the SO in one step of the short program have not been placed in a group, the Offeror can add 1, 2 or 3 external candidates in order to form the group. Another example: if the Offeror receives 4 call-ups to the SO for the long program, it can launch one group of 4 or add 1 external candidate and launch a group of 5.

The Offeror must ensure the external candidate(s) **is(are) Public Servants and that their level is(are) at the same learning level as the learners registered by the Identified Users**. The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work.

### **Amendment 18**

**Delete** in its entirety amendment 14 in Part B-1 of Amendment 004 to RFSO EN578-093429/C, which refers to article 8.2 of Section I of Annex A – Statement of Work and **replace it with the following:**

With TA's approval, **and only once per session**, the Offeror can add one or more external candidates, i.e. candidates that were not registered by a call-up to the SO, in order to form a group that meets the number of candidates and the requirements specified in clause 4 of Annex A – Statement of Work. For example, if 3 candidates registered by call-ups to the SO have not been placed in a group, the Offeror can add 1, 2 or 3 external candidates in order to form the group. Another example : if the Offeror receives 4 call-ups to the SO, it can launch one group of 4 or add 1 or 2 external candidates and launch a group of 5 or 6.

The Offeror must ensure the external candidate(s) **is(are) Public Servants and that their level is(are) at the same learning level as the learners registered by the Identified Users**. The training delivered to this

group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work. The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work.

#### **Amendment 19**

**Delete** in its entirety amendment 15 in Part B-1 of Amendment 004 to RFSO EN578-093429/C, which refers to article 8.3 of Section I of Annex A – Statement of Work and **replace it with the following**:

With TA's approval, **and only once per session**, the Offeror can add one or more external candidates, i.e. candidates that were not registered by a call-up to the SO, in order to form a group that meets the number of candidates and the requirements specified in clause 4 of Annex A – Statement of Work. For example, if 2 candidates registered by call-ups to the SO in one step of the short program have not been placed in a group, the Offeror can add 1, 2, 3 or 4 external candidates in order to form the group. Another example : if the Offeror receives 4 call-ups to the SO for the long program, it can launch one group of 4 or add 1 external candidate and launch a group of 5.

The Offeror must ensure that the external candidate(s) **is(are) Public Servants and that their level is(are) at the same learning level as the learners registered by the Identified Users**. The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work.

#### **Amendment 20**

Article 6.0 - The Offeror's Facilities of Section II of the Annex A - Statement of Work :

**Delete** : Learners must have access to parking near the Offeror's facilities.

**Replace with**: **It is preferable that learners have access to parking near the Offeror facilities.**

#### **Amendment 21**

**Add** the following paragraph to **MTC2.1 - Proposed Primary Pedagogical Adviser and Backup Pedagogical Adviser**, of Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures - Work Streams 1 and 2 :

**If the pedagogical adviser is proposed for more than one work stream, the offer must clearly indicate the total workload, taking into account all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for. In order for the bid to be deemed responsive, the total workload for all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for must meet the ratio specified in MTC 2.1, even if the Offeror is not awarded all of the RFSOs for which pedagogical adviser was proposed. The Offeror who proposes the same pedagogical adviser for several work streams and who does not comply with the ratio stated in MTC 2.1 for the pedagogical adviser's total workload for all the work streams for which he or she is proposed will be declared non-responsive for all the work streams for which that pedagogical adviser is proposed. All the bids in which that pedagogical adviser is proposed will therefore be rejected.**

**ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED**

## PART B-2 - AMENDMENTS TO REQUEST FOR STANDING OFFERS (RFSO) EN578-093429/D

### Amendment 17

**Delete** in its entirety amendment 16 in Part B-2 of Amendment 005 to RFSO EN578-093429/D, which refers to **article 8.0** of Section I of **Annex A – Statement of Work** and **replace it with the following**:

#### **For work streams offered on the Offeror's premises only**

With TA's approval, **and only once per session**, the Offeror can add one or more external candidates, i.e. candidates that were not registered by a call-up to the SO, in order to form a group that meets the number of candidates and the requirements specified in clause 4 of Annex A – Statement of Work. For example, if 4 candidates registered by call-ups to the SO have not been placed in a group, the Offeror can add 2 or 3 or 4 external candidates in order to form the group. Another example : if the Offeror receives 6 call-ups to the SO, it can launch one group of 6 or add 1 or 2 external candidate and launch a group of 7 or 8.

**The Offeror must ensure that the external candidate(s) is(are) Public Servants and that their level is(are) at the same learning level as the learners registered by the Identified Users.** The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work.

### Amendment 18

Article **6.2** - The Offeror's Facilities of Section II of the Annex A - Statement of Work :

**Delete** : Learners must have access to parking near the Offeror's facilities.

**Replace with:** **It is preferable that learners have access to parking near the Offeror facilities.**

### Amendment 19

**Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures - Work Streams 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 4, 5 and 6, point 1** of MTC 1 - Offeror's Capacity

**Delete:**

- f. Work stream 5 : 100 groups.
- g. Work stream 6 : 100 groups.

**Replace with:**

- f. Work stream 5 : **50** groups.
- g. Work stream 6 : **50** groups.

## **Amendment 20**

**Add the following paragraph to MTC2.1 - Proposed Primary Pedagogical Adviser and Backup Pedagogical Adviser, of Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures - Work Streams 3B, 3C, 3D, 4, 5 and 6 :**

If the pedagogical adviser is proposed for more than one work stream, the offer must clearly indicate the total workload, taking into account all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for. In order for the bid to be deemed responsive, the total workload for all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for must meet the ratio specified in MTC 2.1, even if the Offeror is not awarded all of the RFSOs for which pedagogical adviser was proposed. The Offeror who proposes the same pedagogical adviser for several work streams and who does not comply with the ratio stated in MTC 2.1 for the pedagogical adviser's total workload for all the work streams for which he or she is proposed will be declared non-responsive for all the work streams for which that pedagogical adviser is proposed. All the bids in which that pedagogical adviser is proposed will therefore be rejected.

**ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED**

## **PARTIE B-3 - AMENDMENTS TO REQUEST FOR STANDING OFFERS (RFSO) EN578-093429/E**

### **Amendment 17**

Article 6.1.1.1, Computer Equipment, of Section II-1 of Annex A – Statement of Work

#### **Delete:**

- 2. Windows 2000, XP or Vista
- 11. Internet access, Internet Explorer 6.x or later or Firefox 3.s or later

#### **Replace with:**

- 2. Windows 2000, XP or Vista or any other operating system that enables the use of CSPS programs on MyAccount
- 11. Internet access, Internet Explorer 6.x or later or Firefox 3.x or later, or any other browser that enables the use of CSPS programs on MyAccount. The Offeror must ensure that the Internet speed allows the CSPS on-line programs to run smoothly.

### **Amendment 18**

Article 6.2 - The Offeror's Facilities of Section II-1 of the Annex A - Statement of Work :

**Delete :** Learners must have access to parking near the Offeror's facilities.

**Replace with:** It is preferable that learners have access to parking near the Offeror facilities.

### **Amendment 19**

Article 6.2 - The Offeror's Facilities of Section II-2 of the Annex A - Statement of Work :

**Delete :** Learners must have access to parking near the Offeror's facilities.

**Replace with:** It is preferable that learners have access to parking near the Offeror facilities.

### **Amendment 20**

**Add** the following paragraph to **MTC2.1 - Proposed Primary Pedagogical Adviser and Backup Pedagogical Adviser**, of Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures - Work Streams 7 and 8 :

If the pedagogical adviser is proposed for more than one work stream, the offer must clearly indicate the total workload, taking into account all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for. In order for the bid to be deemed responsive, the total workload for all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for must meet the ratio specified in MTC 2.1, even if the Offeror is not awarded all of the RFSOs for which pedagogical adviser was proposed. The Offeror who proposes the same pedagogical adviser for several work streams and who does not comply with the ratio stated in MTC 2.1 for the pedagogical adviser's total workload for all the work streams for which he or she is proposed will be declared non-responsive for all the work streams for which that pedagogical adviser is proposed. All the bids in which that pedagogical adviser is proposed will therefore be rejected.



#### **Amendment 21**

**Add the following paragraph to MTC2.1 - Proposed Primary Pedagogical Adviser and Backup Pedagogical Adviser, of Attachment 2 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures - Work Streams 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D and 10 :**

If the pedagogical adviser is proposed for more than one work stream, the offer must clearly indicate the total workload, taking into account all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for. In order for the bid to be deemed responsive, the total workload for all the work streams the pedagogical adviser has been proposed for must meet the ratio specified in MTC 2.1, even if the Offeror is not awarded all of the RFSOs for which pedagogical adviser was proposed. The Offeror who proposes the same pedagogical adviser for several work streams and who does not comply with the ratio stated in MTC 2.1 for the pedagogical adviser's total workload for all the work streams for which he or she is proposed will be declared non-responsive for all the work streams for which that pedagogical adviser is proposed. All the bids in which that pedagogical adviser is proposed will therefore be rejected.

**ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED**