Public Works and Government Services Canada

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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

Title - Sujet FULL-TIME/PART-TIME INDIVIDUAL TRAI	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-093429/E	**Date** 2012-12-20
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20093429	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 008
File No. - N° de dossier 505zf.EN578-093429	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$$ZF-505-25053	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer **Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale**	2012-10-31
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-01-16	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Standard Time EST
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Bélair, Christine	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 505zf
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-7018 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** (819) 956-2675
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** ☐	**No - Non** ☐

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

Canada

See electronically attached document for the content of the Amendment 008 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

Question 135

We understood from the bidders' conference that you intended to think about the formula for the rate per learner and perhaps revise your requirement in terms of the financial proposal so that all schools provide an hourly price using the same starting point, thereby creating a level playing field, namely, a number of learners on which the prices must be based, even if the financial proposal would not be the rate used for the creation of groups that will contain a different number of students.

In Amendment 6, Answer 112, you say that a rate per learner would be the best solution for the departments. As we indicated at the bidders' conference, the rate per learner will encourage the schools to use different bases and thus may be adversely affected in setting prices. Can PWGSC and the CSPS consider establishing the number of students to be used in the preparation of the financial proposal and thus ensure fairness between the schools submitting bids?

Answer 135

As indicated in the instructions set out at the top of the page of Amendment 006 of RFSO EN578-093429/C and E and Amendment 7 of RFSO EN578-093429/D, questions that were answered and posted have not been reproduced in these amendments. Question 35, which made the same type of comment, was answered and posted in Amendment 002 of RFSO EN578-093429/C and E and Amendment 003 of RFSO EN578-093429/D. In addition, Answer 112 answered the questions relating to the hourly rate per learner raised by the attendees at the conferences on November 22.

Furthermore, at the request of the attendees, PWGSC and the CSPS published an amendment to the RFSO (see Amendments 17, 18 and 19 of Part B-1 of RFSO EN578-093429/C-Amendment 005 and Amendment 17 of Part B-2 of RFSO EN578-093429/D-Amendment 006) so that offerors could accept external participants (non-users of the standing offers) in order to make up groups with the maximum number of learners allowed.

Question 136

Once again, as we are now at 19 December 2012, we are expecting answers and our staff will be on vacation from Monday, December 24, 2012 until January 2, 2013, we kindly ask you to postpone the closing date of the 3 RFSO to January 15, 2013.

Answer 136

The closing date has been changed to January 16, 2013.

Question 137

This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/C

In RFP505-25-51, does the minimum capacity of 10 groups apply for stream 1 and stream 2 separately, or can they be combined? For example:

Could we take nine groups in French and one group in English and have the same primary advisor for them all? The reason for this question is that according to your statistics, there will not likely be enough participants in English to form 10 groups and thus occupy an advisor full time.

If not, would you allow us to bid for less than 10 groups for stream 2 of RFP505-25051?

Answer 137

Each work stream must be regarded as separate. The requirements for work stream 1 must be treated separately from the requirements for work stream 2. Therefore, if you are submitting an offer for both work streams 1 and 2, you must have the minimum capacity of:

Stream 1 : Work stream 1 : 10 groups, i.e. the equivalent of the maximum workload for one primary pedagogical adviser.

Stream 2 : Work stream 2 : 10 groups, i.e. the equivalent of the maximum workload for one primary pedagogical adviser.

In the example above, two full-time primary pedagogical advisers and one backup pedagogical adviser are necessary.

Question 138

This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/C

a) We think we understand the distribution of work explained on pages 17 and 18 of RFP505-25051. However, we would like to clarify the distribution of work among our pedagogical advisors. While complying with the minimum capacity of 10 groups, can we suggest two primary advisors for 5 groups each in stream 1 in order to also be able to place them in other work streams?

For example, if we bid for 10 groups in stream 1, 100 part-time groups in stream 3A and 20 full-time private courses in French in stream 7, in addition to 10 full-time private courses in English in stream 8, three primary advisors and one backup advisor would be needed, according to the RFP criteria. Would it be acceptable to distribute the advisors' work as follows?

	Stream 1	**Stream 3A**	**Streams 7 and 8**	**Total full-time workload %**
Primary Advisor X	5 groups/full-time = 50 %	20 groups/part-time = 20 %	Full-time individual 10 = 30 %	100 %
Primary Advisor Y	5 groups/full-time = 50 %	20 groups/part-time = 20 %	**Stream 7** Full-time individual 10 = 30 %	100 %
Primary Advisor Z		60 groups/part-time = 60 %	**Stream 8** Full-time individual 10 = 30%	90 %

1 backup Advisor for 3 Primary Advisors	**10 groups**	**100 groups**	**30 individuals**	

Would this distribution of the work be considered acceptable?

b) If the preceding distribution is appropriate, how will the evaluation of the two primary advisors (X and Y), each being responsible for five groups, be carried out under point-rated criteria PRTC 2.2.2 to 2.1.3? Will the average of the points obtained be used?

Answer 138

a) Yes, because the ratio for the maximum workload for every proposed pedagogical adviser is met.

b) See question/answer 38.

Question 139

We understand that the offeror must have a minimum capacity of 10 groups in streams 1 and 2 of the RFP (as indicated on page 17, MTC 1).

We would ask you to specify that while a minimum capacity applies to streams 3 to 10, the multiples of 5 do not apply if there are no other multiples.

Answer 139

The multiple of 5 was withdrawn in Amendment 6 of Part B-1 of RFSO EN578-093429/C-Amendment 003.

Question 140

Although at the Bidder's Meeting, the point was strongly made that we must take all three solicitations as separate entities, it seems that this is not at all the case with the Pedagogical Advisors. Could I ask that PWGSC allow bidders to use the same Pedagogical Advisors on separate RFSO's but *not* within the same RFSO, so that each RFSO would respect its internal workload as in MTC 2.1. For greater clarity, Streams 1 and 2, Streams 3 - 6, and Streams 7 - 10 are each separate entities. In this way, we would be able to propose for more RFSO's knowing that we will not win them all, but we would *not* face elimination from all competitions.

I would also like to make on final request:

Please extend the deadline to at least January 22, 2013.

Answer 140

The same pedagogical adviser can be proposed for more than one work streams, in more than one Requests for Standing Offers, provided that the requirements of the mandatory technical criterion MTC2 are met.

We cannot accept the same pedagogical adviser to be proposed for more than one work streams and/or in more than one Requests for Standing Offers if the ratio set out in MTC 2.1 is not met, because if the Offeror was granted all the work streams for which a bid was submitted, the

pedagogical adviser would no longer meet the requirements described in clause 8.1 of the Statement of work and MTC2, and therefore the offers would be rejected.

Question 141

There seems to be no PRTC: “Computer Equipment at the Offeror’s Facilities” for neither 505-25050 D (part-time groups) nor 505-25053 E streams 9&10 (individuals).
Please confirm that there is no point-rated criteria on the Offeror’s computer equipment for these streams.

Answer 141

There are no point-rated criteria on the Offeror’s computer equipment for the RFSO EN578-093429/D and RFSO EN578-093429/E – Work streams 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D and 10.

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

Amendment 27

Delete the paragraph of mandatory criterion MTC 2.3.1.1a) of Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures and replace with:

2.3.1.1a) at least one (1) year of experience since January 2007 supervising at least two (2) teaching resources, at the same time, who taught full-time, English and/or French as a second language, for a minimum of 30 hours per week, to adults, on an individual or group basis. One (1) year of experience in supervision is defined as at least 30 hours per week, over a period of at least 40 weeks within a period of 12 consecutive months.

ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED.

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

Amendment 27

Delete the paragraph of mandatory criterion MTC 2.3.1.1a) of Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures and replace with:

2.3.1.1a) at least one (1) year of experience since January 2007 supervising at least two (2) teaching resources, at the same time, who taught full-time, English and/or French as a second language courses, for a minimum of 30 hours per week, to adults, on an individual or group basis. One (1) year of experience in supervision is defined as at least 30 hours per week, over a period of at least 40 weeks within a period of 12 consecutive months.

ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED.

PART B-3 - AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUEST FOR STANDING OFFERS (RFSO) EN578-093429/E

Amendment 41

Delete the paragraph of mandatory criterion MTC 2.3.1.1a) of Attachment 1 and 2 to Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures and replace with:

2.3.1.1a) at least one (1) year of experience since January 2007 supervising at least two (2) teaching resources, at the same time, who taught full-time, English and/or French as a second language courses, for a minimum of 30 hours per week, to adults, on an individual or group basis. One (1) year of experience in supervision is defined as at least 30 hours per week, over a period of at least 40 weeks within a period of 12 consecutive months.

ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED.