

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

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Communication Procurement Directorate/Direction de
l'approvisionnement en communication
360 Albert St. / 360, rue Albert
12th Floor / 12ième étage
Ottawa
Ontario
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet GRAPHIC DESIGN SERVICES		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-133360/B		Date 2013-10-07
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-13-3360		Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
File No. - N° de dossier cx011.EN578-133360	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$CX-011-63447		
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2013-09-06
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-10-10		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Amaral(CX Div.), Paola		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur cx011
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 993-5642 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (613) 993-2581	
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		

AMENDMENT 005

This solicitation amendment is issued to provide responses to questions received in response to this RFSO (continued from Amendment 004).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question #62:

Regarding Solicitation EN578-133360/B, as per section M.5 References in the proposal requirements:

Question: If we don't have reference letters on file, are we instead permitted to submit reference contact information (i.e. name, title, institution, phone number, email, etc) for each project sample submitted in M.4?

Answer #62:

As stated in Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, M.5 References, the Offeror must provide a **letter** of reference that corresponds with each project sample submitted in M.4.

Only providing reference contact information will **not** be accepted.

Question #63:

“use an environmentally-preferable format including black and white printing instead of colour printing, printing double sided/duplex, using staples or clips instead of cerlox, duotangs or binders”.

Our proposal is a large number of pages, therefore, cerlox binding would make it easier to manage rather than clipped.(It will be too large to staple.) Would the use of cerlox binding negatively impact our overall score of our proposal? In other words would we be penalized if we did cerlox bind our proposal?

Also, By the same token, would a proposal that was not printed double sided be penalized in any way?

Answer #63:

Although we request that Offerors incorporate environment considerations into the procurement process in Part 3 - Offer Preparation Instructions, not doing so will not impact the overall score of the proposal.

Question #64:

I did not see any direction as to what needs to be included on the proposal package when delivered to the bid receiving unit (ie RFSO reference number, Attention to, etc...) and also by the same, do we need to include any specific details on the covers of our proposals themselves?

Answer #64:

As stated in the 2006 (2013-06-01) Standard Instructions - Request for Standing Offers – Goods or Services – Competitive Requirements, it is the Offeror's responsibility to: ensure that the Offeror's name, return address, RFSO number, and RFSO closing date and time are clearly visible on the envelope or the parcel(s) containing the offer.

Also, as stated in Part 3 – Offer Preparation Instructions, Offerors should clearly label all hard and soft copies of their offers with their name and solicitation number.

Question #65:

I two questions regarding Solicitation EN578-133360/B Graphic design services regarding the financial evaluation excel spreadsheet. I feel the current evaluation system is subject to undue interpretation that does not reflect the true nature of the graphic industry. Due to the fact each category is evaluated upon an average of the rates divided by the number of positions proposed, places a significant disadvantage to anyone not entering rates into every category.

For instance, most graphic design project require a three person team. Typically a design manager, and a senior designer. Typically each of these positions are the highest paid. If we only place those individuals rates in the spreadsheet our average Bid Evaluation Value is very high, compared to a submission that puts in rates for every category, (office manager, account coordinator, account manager) the rates are much lower, and they will end up with a much lower BEV.

Consider the following scenario:

We put in a rate for example, our design director initial/optional (\$100), senior designer (\$100), and junior designer (\$50). This leaves us with a BEV of 166. Someone who puts in those same rates, but also includes all of the other categories, which bill a much lower rate, and have a BEV of about half. If entrance onto the list is dependent upon a BEV with a certain standard deviation, there is a huge disadvantage to not filling out all the rates, as there are many more low value positions than high value positions. I think it provides the potential for unfair evaluation, as everyone wants to put forth a competitive rate, and we all know what the acceptable industry standard is, however the way it is outlined and evaluated leaves things very open to misinterpretation since it does not reflect how projects are billed in reality.

Answer #65:

Thank you for your comment, the Financial Evaluation and the Basis of Selection remain unchanged.

Question #66:

When a contract is awarded a company on the standing offer list in the future, will it be project based, or personnel based. Given we are committed to the financial rates for the term of the RFSO, will the government be accepted our offer for a Senior graphic designer for a number of weeks? Or our office manager for a number of weeks? Or is the BEV the rate in which we will bill for projects per hour on the whole?

Answer #66:

Call-ups will be issued by the Identified Users in accordance with Part 6 – Standing Offer and Resulting contract Clauses, Section A. Standing Offer, Article 8. Call-up Procedures, Sub-Articles 8.1 and 8.3.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EN578-133360/B

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

cx011

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

EN578-13-3360

File No. - N° du dossier

cx011EN578-133360

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.