

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 GROUP TRAINING / NCR		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-093429/C		Date 2012-11-27
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20093429		Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
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-505-25051		
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 2013-01-08		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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
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		

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 38

The requirements of the point-rated criteria are different for the various work streams, so does that mean we cannot propose the same backup advisor for three primary advisers?

Example: For full-time group training (C, PRTC 2.2.2), the advisor (teacher) must have experience in full-time GROUP training, and for individual training (E, PRTC 2.2.2), the advisor (teacher) must have experience in INDIVIDUAL training.

Answer 38

If the proposed backup pedagogical adviser meets Mandatory Technical Criterion (MTC) 2.3 for each work stream for which an offer is submitted, this backup pedagogical adviser may be proposed for these work streams.

In the example provided for PRTC 2.2.2 in RFSOs EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/E, points will be awarded to the teacher on the basis of experience demonstrated to meet the requirements of each of the evaluation criteria and each of the work streams for which an offer is submitted. The proposed adviser could therefore be awarded a different number of points in the offer submitted in response to RFSO EN578-093429/C, work stream 1 and/or 2, than in the offer submitted in response to RFSO EN578-093429/E, work stream 7 and/or 8.

Question 39

This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/E.

For part-time individual training, work stream 9A, could you confirm that the minimum capacity required to submit an offer is 100 learners (20 classrooms), since in your example you mention 50 learners?

If it is indeed 100, do we have to have 20 classrooms available even if the courses are given on the Offeror's premises AND at the institution?

Answer 39

The minimum capacity required for work stream 9A is indeed 100 learners, so to meet MTC 1, item 2 (Number of classrooms offered) for this work stream, the Offeror must have 1/5 the number, i.e. 20 classrooms.

Question 40

This question applies to RFSOs EN578-093429/D and EN578-093429/E.

Can a school located in downtown Ottawa or Gatineau (areas set out in 3A and 9A) submit an offer for work stream 3B (instead of 3A) or work stream 9B (instead of 9A)?

Answer 40

We assume that the question is addressed to the work streams on the offeror's premises. Offerors may submit an offer for any of the work streams, provided that they have facilities in the area defined for the work stream in question.

Regarding the example in Question 40 on work stream 3B and/or 9B, an Offeror may submit an offer for work stream 3B and/or 9B only if the Offeror has facilities in the area defined for work stream 3B and/or 9B, i.e. in the Outaouais region of the province of Quebec within a 10 km radius from the centre of the river behind the library of the Parliament Building on Wellington Street, Ottawa, Ontario, except for the predefined area in stream 3A and/or 9A, as applicable.

Question 41

Regarding experience in training adults that is acquired outside Canada prior to the year 2000 but in the same context as teaching English and/or French to adults in a recognized institution currently operating in Canada and in a foreign country, where the experience was acquired, if an organization that submits an offer has such experience, is the experience deemed to meet the year 2000 criterion? There is nothing anywhere that indicates it is not.

Answer 41

We assume that your question applies to PRTC 1.1. Only experience acquired since January 2000 will be considered.

Question 42

If someone offered individual language training services in French and English prior to the year 2000 and this person is submitting an offer now as a registered service provider (not incorporated), could experience acquired prior to the year 2000, when the person acted as an individual, be considered to meet the year 2000 criterion?

Answer 42

If your question applies to PRTC 1.1: Only experience acquired since January 2000 will be considered.

If your question applies to PRTC 2.1.3: Yes, experience acquired prior to January 2000 will be considered if it meets PRTC 2.1.3. However, the Offeror must demonstrate that the owner of the registered service provider is the same person who worked as an individual prior to the year 2000.

Question 43

There are three solicitations: 578-093429/C, 578-093429/D and 578-093429/E

Service providers can submit offers for one or all work streams at the same time. Our question is regarding the pedagogical advisers. We assume that solicitations C, D and E are different and that it is possible for a service provider to submit an offer for all the work streams and then be awarded just one of them. Our question is, if a service provider submits an offer for a specific stream and uses, for example, Mr. X and Mr. B as the primary pedagogical adviser and the backup pedagogical adviser respectively for this work stream, can this service provider use Mr. X and Mr. B in the same capacity for another stream and in another solicitation with a different number? If not, then why not, since there is no guarantee that the Offeror will be awarded all three work streams in which Mr. X and Mr. B are proposed as the pedagogical advisers?

Answer 43

We assume that Mr. X is the proposed primary pedagogical adviser and Mr. B is the proposed backup pedagogical adviser in relation to MTC 2.

Yes, the same primary and backup pedagogical advisers may be proposed for more than one work stream if the ratios listed in MTC 2 are adhered to.

Question 44

This question applies to RFSO EN578-093429/E.

PRTC 2.1.2, backup advisor

Can a teacher who has over 8,000 hours of full-time GROUP teaching experience qualify to give individual training? If so, could you add this, as the criterion mentions INDIVIDUAL training only?

Answer 44

Yes, the MTC allows for one or the other (group training and/or individual training). However, the PRTC gives points for experience in full-time individual training only. No minimum number of points is required for PRTC 2.1.2.

Question 45

For work stream 7, Full-time individual training in French on the Offeror's premises or at a federal institution, you indicate that an Offeror must have a minimum capacity of 10 learners. Is there a maximum capacity for the number of learners?

Answer 45

No, there is no maximum capacity.

Question 46

For work streams 7, 8, 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D and 10, could you confirm that you want the same rate for courses provided on the Offeror's premises and at the federal institution?

Answer 46

The Offeror may choose to submit offers at the same rate or at different rates for each work stream, and at the same rate or at different rates for each training location, i.e. one rate for training given on the Offeror's premises and another rate for training given at the federal institution.

Question 47

In light of all the contract information made public in the last year, it is clear that language schools in the private-sector language industry in the NCR are engaged in fierce, if not unacceptable, competition with respect to hourly rates, unacceptable because, when the issue at hand is providing professional language training to Canadian public service employees and the hourly rate is about \$30, one can't help but wonder about the quality of service provided, the wage rate the language teachers receive, and the quality of the training facilities, for example.

One also wonders about the client organization's quality controls (teacher expertise checks, quality of furniture/equipment, etc.) and about adherence to certain standard acquisition clauses in some offers (e.g. guarantee of the Offeror's financial capability to manage multi-million-dollar contracts that greatly exceed the Offeror's budget, etc.).

But this rate competition is also connected to the use of the "lowest price" clause, sometimes without any additional rated technical consideration given to quality (e.g. bid solicitation 24062-120135/A for the Treasury Board as buyer).

In the report entitled *Internal Audit of the Canada School of Public Service's Language Training and Maintenance Program*, submitted on May 1, 2012, the issue of quality language training is fundamental and comes up repeatedly. In line with the presentation given by PWGSC's senior director of procurement of professional services at the meeting with AILIA on May 7, which emphasized maintaining the quality of services, all the experts know that quality language training comes at a price... and certainly not around \$30 an hour.... And CSPS knows this very well, since in the same report CSPS, a true standard bearer of quality, was going to run a deficit again for the third year in a row in 2012–2013, according to the Projection of the School's Financial Position for Language Training and Maintenance Based on Continued Direct Delivery (deficits of \$2.7 million in 2010–2011 and \$5.2 million in 2011–2012 and a projected deficit of \$6.9 million in 2012–2013).

a) Considering all these points and documented observations, in particular the dubious rate practices and the problem of leadership with respect to value for money, which involves much more than awarding points for "free parking," what does PWGSC/CSPS plan to do to ensure, concurrently in the 16 work streams, the actual quality of the services proposed by the Offerors and their actual financial, human and logistical capability to deliver on such contracts for quality services?

b) What are the tools or methods that will allow PWGSC/CSPS to regulate, control and evaluate the quality of the services provided on a regular and frequent basis?

c) Do PWGSC and CSPS consider training provided at \$30 or \$32 an hour to be professional training?

d) If, as indicated in the standing offers, PWGSC/CSPS recognizes that experienced language professors must have at least 500 hours of teaching experience and these same teachers are earning between \$15 and \$18 an hour because the Offeror wants to submit an offer at \$30 an hour, what should we say to former CSPS teachers who were laid off in January 2012 and who do not understand why

private schools cannot offer them salaries comparable to what they earned at CSPS...even though they understand the competitive lowest-price policy?

Answer 47

a) The basis of selection for the offers will be the lowest evaluated price per point, i.e. the evaluated price divided by the overall score that the offer receives for all the point-rated technical criteria detailed in Attachment 1 to Part 4.

The evaluation criteria were defined on the basis of departments' needs and resources. According to PWGSC, the basis of selection described in the RFSOs represents the best balance for obtaining quality training at a competitive price.

With respect to the financial capability of potential offerors, please see the Standard Instructions, clause 10 - Legal Capacity and section 1. Part 6 - Security and Financial Requirements of the RFSO clearly states regarding financial capability that the contractor must have the financial capability required to meet this need.

Lastly, regarding actual human and logistical capabilities to deliver on such contracts for quality services, we are convinced that the evaluation criteria have been written in such a way that we (PWGSC and CSPS) will be able to conduct regular checks to ensure that the requirements are met for the duration of the standing offers.

b) Compliance with the requirements in the Statement of Work will be regularly checked by the technical authority.

c) These public requests for standing offers must be handled through a transparent, fair, equitable and competitive process. All language training providers are invited to submit competitive rates, taking into account the clauses and conditions as well as the needs defined in the RFSOs.

d) See the previous answer.

Question 48

This question refers to RFSOs EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/E for the work streams on the Offeror's premises.

With regard to the requirement of having access to one computer in each room used for language training, we would like to know whether we can wait until the contract has been awarded to meet this requirement.

Our institution has a computer room, which is available to all of our clients, but we do not currently assign individual computers.

However, it would be very easy for us to install a computer on every desk within 48 hours.

Answer 48

Yes; however, if the Offeror indicates in its offer that a certain number of classrooms are equipped with one computer per learner to meet PRTC 3.1 of the work stream(s) for which it has submitted an offer, it

will have to maintain the number of rooms equipped with computers indicated in its offer throughout the duration of the Standing Offer.

Once the RFSO is closed, it will be impossible for the Offeror to amend the Basis of Payment to add costs related to purchasing computer equipment or any other equipment or material indicated in the offer to meet the technical evaluation criteria in the RFSO(s).

Question 49

On-line course evaluation form.

Are you planning to change the satisfaction survey given that you have eliminated or amended a number of requirements (e.g. printing of training materials, furnishings, access to kitchens)? Otherwise, the schools will become the target of learners' criticism when it was PWGSC's decision to make these amendments.

The private sector will once again be held accountable, and its services will be compared to those that CSPS used to provide (quality of course facilities).

Answer 49

Yes, the satisfaction survey has been amended to reflect the new requirements.

Question 50

Point-rated technical criteria – Experience of the Offeror and pedagogical advisers.

For an offeror to obtain the highest scores, you require that the experience of the Offeror and pedagogical advisers to have been acquired through CSPS programs (PFL₂ A, B and C and CEWP). However, there is an equivalent program used for members of the Canadian Forces: Curriculum de français des forces canadiennes (CFFC) and Canadian Forces English Curriculum (CFEC).

CFFC and CFEC (newly revised) were developed using a performance-based model in response to Canadian Forces operational requirements and are based on a communicative training and adult education approach.

The required proficiency levels are the same as for PFL₂ and CEWP, and members of the Canadian Forces, who too are government employees, must meet the same linguistic profiles as federal public servants and must undergo the SLE. These programs have been recognized as equivalent to PFL₂ and CEWP in past CSPS solicitations.

Will you accept these programs, which are recognized as suitable to adequately prepare federal government employees for the SLE tests, to demonstrate the experience of the Offeror and its pedagogical advisers?

Answer 50

No, only the CSPS programs (PFL₂ A, B and C and CEWP) will be used to offer language training under these RFSOs. However, the Offeror can use additional activities to complement or enhance those of CSPS.

For evaluation purposes, PWGSC will recognize CFFC and CFEC as being "any other second language adult education program" for these RFSOs.

Question 51**This question refers to RFSOs EN578-093429/C and EN578-093429/D**

Can you confirm that if a group of four learners that is due to begin training in a few days loses one participant and “drops” to three learners, this training/group will be cancelled? In this case, how do you plan to compensate the supplier?

Answer 51

As indicated in article 13 (Cancellation and Postponement of Training prior to commencement of Training) 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 52

Do you plan to award SO holders budgets that are proportionate to their offers in terms of volume and that will enable them to provide the volume capacity they are offering? This capacity also includes their investments in human resources to provide and manage the services.

Answer 52

No, proportionate budgets will not be awarded to SO holders.

Question 53

-- Page 8: Section 1: Technical Offer: clarify “four (4) hard copies and one (1) electronic copy on CD”.

-- Section II: Clarify “Financial Offer (two (2) hard copies)”.

-- Section III: Clarify “Certifications (one (1) hard copy)”.

-- Clarify “b) use a numbering system that corresponds to that of the Request for Standing Offer”.

-- Page 9: Clarify “Financial Offer”.

Answer 53

a) Section I: The Offeror must submit 4 hard copies of its technical offer and one copy on CD in accordance with the instructions in the RFSO, Section I: Technical Offer.

Section II: The Offeror must submit 2 hard copies of its financial offer in accordance with the instructions in the RFSO, Section II: Financial Offer.

Section III: The Offeror must submit 1 hard copy of the certifications in accordance with the instructions in the RFSO, Section III.

-
- b) In its offer, the Offeror should use the same numbering system used in the RFSO. For example, to meet Mandatory Technical Criterion MTC 1 - Offeror's Capacity, the Offeror should indicate "MTC 1" in its technical offer before the information provided by the Offeror to meet Mandatory Technical Criterion MTC 1.
- c) Section II – Financial Offer and Attachment 1 to Part 3 - Pricing Schedule provides clear instructions on the information that the Offeror should provide in its financial offer.

Question 54

The best practices and challenges of the current program.

Answer 54

This question does not apply to the Request for Standing Offers process under way. For your information, your questions could be addressed in the near future (early 2013) when we will be publishing the Request for Information (RFI) regarding the National Language Training Services Strategy.

Question 55

Success rate for first-time takers of the SLE test and average number of hours that learners must attend to obtain the level required.

Answer 55

We do not have these statistics.

Question 56

Program evaluation - what will you measure in order to determine if a service provider is meeting the SO standards.

Answer 56

See Appendix 5 - Teaching Evaluation Report in Annex A - Statement of Work.

Question 57

What do you consider to be the biggest challenge for a potential new supplier?

Answer 57

See answer 54.

Question 58

This question refers to RFSO EN578-093429/D.

Please explain why in MTC 1 (PW-\$\$ZF-505-2505) for streams 4 and 5, which are training that will be delivered at federal institutions, you ask Offerors to demonstrate their capacity to deliver this training (number of rooms, facilities, etc.)?

Answer 58

MTC 1 has been amended.

See Amendment 9 to Part B-2, which deals with the changes to RFSO EN578-093429/D.

Question 59

For pedagogical advisers: is a combination of supervising and teaching experience possible? No such scenario is suggested. Let's say an adviser started supervising in 2009 but had taught before then. How many points would the adviser be given?

Answer 59

Yes, it is possible. See Mandatory Technical Criterion MTC 2.3.1.2 c) and Technical Criterion PRTC 2.1.3.

Question 60

Given the quantity of work required in the SOs, is it possible to postpone the closing date?

Answer 60

The closing date has been postponed to January 8, 2013.

Question 61

MTC 2.3.1

It reads: "As proof of education, an original document OR a copy of the original certified as true by the OFFEROR...shall be submitted for each proposed adviser." Therefore, a notary does not have to certify the documents, is that correct?

Answer 61

That is correct.

Question 62

PRTC 4.2 - Points for free parking (work streams 1, 2, 7 and 8) and PRTC 3.2 (work streams 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 5, 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D and 10).

You are awarding 10 points for free parking: can you specify the number of parking spaces required (number of vehicles) because a supplier with 1 or 3 or 5 or 30 spaces could be awarded the same number of points. Furthermore, if you require 30 spaces and the Offeror has 60 students or more who want parking, how will parking spaces be assigned? We have had this problem before because all the students wanted free parking given that they were paying for their courses at the same rates.

It would be preferable to eliminate these points if only for the environmental reasons indicated in Part 3: "In April 2006, Canada issued a policy directing federal departments and agencies to take the necessary steps to INCORPORATE ENVIRONMENTAL considerations into the procurement process...."

Answer 62

See Amendment 9, Part B1, for RFSO EN578-093429/C

See Amendment 12, Part B2, for RFSO EN578-093429/D

See Amendments 11 and 12, Part B3, for RFSO EN578-093429/E

Question 63

This question refers to RFSO EN578-093429/E.

For streams 7 and 8, is the minimum capacity 10 learners for each stream or for the two? (7 and 8) Is one adviser required for the two or for each stream?

Answer 63

As indicated in clause 1.1 - Participation in the RFSO, each work stream must be considered as separate and will be evaluated independently, without taking into account the other work streams for which an offer was submitted by the Offeror.

Therefore, the minimum capacity is 10 learners per work stream.

It is possible to have a single adviser for the two work streams if the ratio in MTC 2.1 is respected.

Question 64

This question refers to RFSO EN578-093429/D.

You have changed MTC 2.1: you are accepting a primary adviser for 50 groups but for the previous criterion (MTC 1), you require a minimum capacity of 100 groups for streams 4 and 6.

a) For stream 4, do we have to propose a minimum of 2 advisers or 1?

b) For stream 6, do we have to propose 2 other advisers or 1?

c) Lastly, can we submit a bid for 50 groups using 1 primary adviser and 1 backup adviser for streams 4 and 6? (25 groups for French and 25 groups for English).

Answer 64

a) We assume that your question refers to primary pedagogical advisers. In order to meet Mandatory Technical Criterion MTC 2.1, if the Offeror submits an offer for work stream 4, which requires a minimum capacity of 100 groups, the Offeror must propose 1 primary pedagogical adviser per 50 groups. In your example, the Offeror must propose 2 primary pedagogical advisers to meet a capacity of 100 groups.

b) We assume that your question refers to primary pedagogical advisers. In order to meet Mandatory Technical Criterion MTC 2.1, if the Offeror submits an offer for work stream 6, which requires a minimum capacity of 100 groups, the Offeror must propose 1 primary pedagogical adviser per 50 groups. In your example, the Offeror must propose 2 primary pedagogical advisers to meet a capacity of 100 groups.

c) Each stream must be considered separate and will be evaluated independently, without taking into account the other work streams for which an offer is submitted. For work stream 4, the Offeror must have a minimum capacity of 100 groups and requires 2 primary pedagogical advisers and 1 backup

pedagogical adviser. For work stream 6, the Offeror must also have a minimum capacity of 100 groups and requires 2 primary pedagogical advisers and 1 backup pedagogical adviser.

Question 65

This question refers to RFSO EN578-093429/E

Would PWGSC agree to amend 5.2.1.1, page 88, to remove the requirement for 1) multimedia projector or equivalent and 2) 70 x 70 wall screen.

Typically, in a one-on-one training environment, the learning office is equipped with a white board, normally measuring 40" x 30". As well, instead of a multimedia projector, the computer monitor is how we view online content or videos.

Would PWGSC agree to amend this requirement for the one-on-one training only?

Answer 65

In the English version only, in section 6.2.1.1 - Computer Equipment in Section II of Annex A-1 - Statement of Work, remove the:

- 2200- to 3500-lumen XGA multimedia projector or equivalent and
- 70 x 70 wall screen

And insert:

A 19-inche minimum screen

See Amendment 13 to Part B-3 of RFSO EN578-093429/E.

Question 66

This question refers to RFSOs EN578-093429/C AND EN578-093429/D

The measurements for the group rooms is slightly excessive for groups of the prescribed size. Would PWGSC amend the requirement to reduce the size from 300 square feet to 270 square feet?

Answer 66

No changes to the RFSOs.

Question 67

This question refers to all the RFSOs. You require certified true copies of the original diplomas to be included with each copy of every offer. This means that if we submit three offers (five copies for each offer) with the minimum number of pedagogical advisers, this would mean a minimum of 30 certified copies (and the figure could be three times as high if we proposed the maximum number of pedagogical advisers). You know that having a copy certified costs approximately \$25.00, which means that the cost could be between \$750.00 and \$2,250.00. We are wondering if this is really necessary when we do not even know whether we will be awarded the SOs. Would it not be easier to provide you with uncertified photocopies of the diplomas and, if we obtain the SOs, then provide you with the original diplomas or certified true copies?

Answer 67

As indicated in MTC 2.3.1, the Offeror has the option to provide a copy of the original certified as true by the Offeror OR by a commissioner of oaths. It is therefore not mandatory to provide a notarized certified copy.

As stated in our answer to Question 20 in the previous amendment to the RFSO, if you are referring to each of the Requests for Standing Offers (RFSO), a certified copy must be attached to each RFSO; therefore, three certified copies in total.

Question 68

Is it possible to add subcontractors along the way? When are subcontractors authorized and when do they enter the picture? Do they need to be registered before the end of the solicitation process?

Answer 68

Refer to Section 06 - Subcontracts of the General Conditions 2035 (2012-11-19).

Question 69

This question refers to RFSO EN578-093429/E

Regarding PRTC 1 for Solicitation No. EN578-093429/E

You are asking for proof of experience since the year 2000 for maximum points. What happens if the client no longer works for the department and their records no longer exist. Is there another way to prove this experience? (e.g. paid invoices?)

This is an example of an answer that I received by email.

"No, sorry - my records would have been destroyed by now I'm sure.

Why do you need the information?

Do you know who I could speak to that could verify the number of hours and the dates of your language training in 2004 with Health Canada?

Answer 69

Refer to Answer 7 in the previous amendments to the RFSO.

Question 70

This question refers to RFSO EN578-093429/E

MTC 2.3.1, pages 22

"at least one (1) year of experience since January 2007 supervising at least two (2) teaching resources while delivering full-time English or French as a second language courses to

adults, on an individual or group basis. One (1) year of experience in full-time training is defined as at least 30 hours per week, over a period of at least 40 weeks within a period of 12 consecutive months;"

Would you like us to show a pedagogical advisor who has supervised 2 resources (that have 1 year of experience teaching each)

Or

Would you like us to show a pedagogical advisor who has supervised 2 resources (while he/she is also teaching for 1 year) and if so how much experience do the resources' need?

Answer 70

For the purposes of MTC 2.3.1 a), a year of experience in full-time training is defined as the equivalent of at least 30 hours a week over a period of at least 40 weeks within a period of 12 consecutive months. The pedagogical adviser must have supervised at least two teaching resources at the same time while the latter were delivering full-time training as defined here.

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

Amendment 6

Remove MTC 1 - Offeror Capacity from Attachment 1 to PART 4 in its entirety and replace it with:

MTC 1	Offeror's Capacity
To meet this criterion, the Offeror must, as a minimum, provide the following information:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none">Offeror's volume capacity (overall capacity of groups that the Offeror intends to <u>train concurrently</u> during the SO period, including extension periods). For its offer to be considered responsive, an offeror must have a minimum capacity of 10 <u>class</u> groups, and a maximum capacity of 30 groups.Number of classrooms offered. The number of classrooms must correspond to the capacity (volume) stipulated by the Offeror to meet item 1 above, and the classrooms must comply with the requirements set out in clause 6.0, The Offeror's Facilities, in Section II, Annex A - Statement of Work. For example, if the Offeror indicates that it has capacity for 20 groups, it must also have 20 classrooms.Number of facilities offered and their location, in addition to the number of classrooms per location.	
<u>If the Offeror has submitted an offer for both stream 1 and stream 2, it must indicate, in its offer, its capacity for each of the work streams for which it has submitted an offer.</u>	

Amendment 7

Remove the following paragraph from article 2.1 of MTC 2 Offeror's Pedagogical Advisors:

"A primary pedagogical adviser cannot be proposed as a backup pedagogical adviser (and vice versa)."

And insert:

"A primary pedagogical adviser cannot be proposed as a backup pedagogical adviser (and vice versa) in the same work stream."

Amendment 8

Remove the paragraph of 23.a) of MTC 2 Offeror's Pedagogical Advisors and insert:

" a) at least one (1) year of experience since January 2007 supervising at least two (2) teaching resources, at the same time, while delivering full-time English and/or French as a second language courses 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. A full-time course is defined as a minimum of 30 hours per week; "

Amendment 9

Remove PRTC 4.2 from Attachment 1 to PART 4 in its entirety and replace it with:

PRTC 4.2	<p>The facility or facilities proposed by the Offeror are served by a parking lot* (<u>free parking or pay parking</u>) that is located no more than 0.50 km from the proposed facility or facilities.</p> <p>The parking lot(s) must not have a waiting list and/or if a parking permit is required, it may be obtained within one month prior to the start date of the training.</p> <p>For evaluation purposes, on-street parking will not be considered an acceptable parking lot.</p> <p><u>*To be deemed responsive, the parking lot must contain, at a minimum, a number of available spots equivalent to the Offeror's capacity as stated in its response to MTC 1.</u></p>	<p>The offer should include the following information:</p> <p>a) address(es) of the identified parking lot(s);</p> <p>b) distance(s) between the parking lot(s) and the proposed facilities;</p> <p>c) whether there is a charge for parking and/or parking is free; and</p> <p>d) for parking lots where a permit is required, whether the permit may be obtained within one month prior to the start of training.</p>	<p>For PRTC 4.2, points will be awarded as follows:</p> <p>For free parking: 10 points</p> <p>For pay parking: 5 points</p> <p>If the Offeror has more than one facility, each of the facilities will be evaluated, and the sum of the points obtained will be divided by the number of facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 10 points</p>
-----------------	---	---	--

Amendment 10

In Article 1 - Standard Instructions, Clauses and Conditions of PART 2:

Delete the third paragraph: The 2006 (2012-07-11) Standard Instructions - Request for Standing Offers - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, are incorporated by reference into and form part of the RFSO.

And replace with: The 2006 (2012-11-19) Standard Instructions - Request for Standing Offers - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements are incorporated by reference into and form part of the RFSO.

Amendment 11

In clause 2.1 - General Conditions of PART 7-A:

Delete the first paragraph: 2005 (2012-07-16) General Conditions - Standing Offers - Goods or Services apply to and form part of the SO.

And replace with: The 2005 (2012-11-19) General Conditions - Standing Offers - Goods or Services apply to and form part of the Standing Offer.

Amendment 12

In clause 2.1 - General Conditions of PART 7-B:

Delete the first paragraph: 2035 (2012-07-16), General Conditions - Higher Complexity - Services, apply to and form part of the Contract.

And replace with: The 2035 (2012-11-19), General Conditions - Higher Complexity - Services apply to and form part of the Contract.

Amendment 13

In article 8.1 - Section I of the Annex A ,
Add the following paragraphs at the end:

With TA's approval, 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 can complete in this manner one group per session per program. The Offeror must ensure that the learning pace and the level of the external candidate(s) match those of the group. The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work. The TA reserves the right to demand the withdrawal of one or more external candidates if the quality of the training is affected by the group's composition or if the TA identifies any other problem related to the quality of the training. Once the group is approved by the TA, the Offeror must deliver the training for the whole session even if one or several external candidates should withdraw.

Amendment 14

In article 8.2 - Section I of the Annex A
Add the following paragraphs at the end:

With TA's approval, 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 can complete in this manner one group per session per program. It can also complete in this manner groups that will start their training at a date different than the start dates established at the beginning of each year of the SO. The Offeror must ensure that the level of the external candidate(s) match that of the group. The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work. The TA reserves the right to demand the withdrawal of one or more external candidates if the quality of the training is affected by the group's composition or if the TA identifies any other problem related to the quality of the training. Once the group is approved by the TA, the Offeror must deliver the training for the whole session even if one or several external candidates should withdraw.

Amendment 15

In article 8.3 - Section I of the Annex A

Add the following paragraphs at the end:

With TA's approval, 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 can complete in this manner one group per session per program. It can also complete in this manner groups that will start their training at a date different than the start dates established at the beginning of each year of the SO. The Offeror must ensure that the learning pace and the level of the external candidate(s) match those of the group. The training delivered to this group must comply with all the requirements defined in the Statement of work. The TA reserves the right to demand the withdrawal of one or more external candidates if the quality of the training is affected by the group's composition or if the TA identifies any other problem related to the quality of the training. Once the group is launched and the delay of 10 business days before the start date of the training has passed, the Offeror must deliver the training for the whole session even if one or several external candidates should withdraw.

ALL OTHER CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.