

Questions and Answers

Question 28: Please confirm the name of the department to be used in responses. The Corporate Name of the Recipient and Tendering Authority is Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. However, the RFP states that the mailing address is Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Answer 28: Either name can be used in proposals to reference the Department.

Question 29: On page 12/98 of the English version, it states that “There is no limitation on the number of Resources that a firm may propose at the time of the Proposal submission, and Bidders are encouraged to propose all those resources the Firm would like to qualify under any resulting SOA.”

This seems to contradict the statement later which states that “Where any one (1) of the Bidder’s named resources is determined by AANDC to be non-compliant with any part of this Mandatory Requirement, the Bidder will be determined non-compliant for the purposes of this RFP.”

Our question is the following: For our proposal to be considered compliant with mandatory requirement M1, should we qualify ALL the resources that we are proposing or simply qualify AT LEAST one resource in each of the categories? In the first instance, it works to our advantage to propose multiple resources; in the second, it is instead better for us to propose only those resources that we are absolutely sure will qualify so as not to increase the risk of seeing our proposal be rejected.

Answer 29:

These are two different requirements being addressed here. The first requirement protects the proposed resources in that every resource that qualifies under the RFP is proposed at the time the RFP is open. The second requirement protects AANDC ensuring that only qualified resources are proposed by the bidding firms. A third requirement, protects the firms by providing the right to fill vacant spots left on the Standing offer by employees who have left the employment of the firm. By proposing as many resources as possible that you know will qualify, the firm is protecting its right later on to replace resources, should the need arise.

Question 30: On page 17/98 of the English version, the RFP states that “the same named individual may be proposed by the Bidder within more than one of the above work categories.” We understand this to mean that the same resource can be proposed for the categories of Analysis and Writing, Research Services and Research Support. Our question is the following: In the event that the same resource is proposed in these three categories, does the resource have to demonstrate that he or she has 48 months of experience in conducting activities related to Analysis and Writing PLUS 12 months of experience in conducting activities related to Research Services PLUS 12 months of experience in conducting activities related to Research Support (in other words, 72 months of full-time experience in the past 10 years)? Or is the table showing

48 months of experience in conducting Analysis and Writing activities sufficient to qualify a resource in the lower categories?

Answer 30:

If a resource is proposed for Analysis and Writing, it is necessary to show that the resource has 48 months experience without any overlap. If you are also showing this same resource is capable of performing other activities during the same 48 month period, there is no need to be aware of any overlap between different activities. When calculating the number of months experience within a single activity, you must be aware of overlap.

Question 31: Is proof of education required at time of bid closing, or can it be provided later if the resource does not currently have access to their degree.

Answer 31:

Transcripts and photocopies of the degree can also be provided, if this is useful. This is a requirement of the RFP.

Question 32: RFP Page 18, M1 Bidder's Human Resources Capacity states "Proposed resource(s) for the [all categories] must be able to demonstrate within his/her CV: a minimum of an undergraduate degree in the social sciences (in a relevant discipline, including, but not limited to, history, native studies, anthropology)". Are any or all of the following degrees considered relevant: Political Science, International Studies, Archaeology and/or Geography?

Answer 32:

International Studies would not be considered relevant.

Question 33: Regarding RFP Page 83, Annex A Team Project Summary, are firms required to list all resources utilized for a project or just those resources utilized that the firm is currently proposing for TAG?

Answer 33:

It is only necessary to list those resources that the firm is currently proposing for TAG. However, it is necessary to state in a number the remainder of resources required to complete the project without stating their names because it then gives AANDC an idea of the scope of the project.

Question 34: Regarding RFP Page 19, Firms M2 Project Summary – "... must provide three (3) written project summaries of no more than 500 words per summary," does that 500 words include all sections in the table or just the "Extent and Role of the Bidder's Involvement in the Assignment, including project outcome and results". In other words, do the "words" provided for Resources Utilized, Role/Responsibility and Level of Effort count against the 500 word maximum? If your answer to our above question 2 was

“yes”, listing 40 resources would necessarily detract from our ability to aptly describe our project.

Answer 34:

The project summary of 500 words will be put into the section called, “Extent and Role of the Bidder’s Involvement in the Assignment...” It does not include the listing of the 40 resources.

Question 35: It is written (page 19): “All resources mentioned in the summaries must be proposed resources for the purpose of the standing offer.” If a resource worked on a project being summarized, but the resource is not being proposed under the RFP, does it mean that we can’t mention their name in the summaries?

Answer 35:

The Bidding Firm can mention any names in the summaries that they want to as long as it is made clear that the(se) person(s) is not being proposed as a resource.

Question 36: Can the same work experience in “Analysis and Writing” be used for Analysis & Writing Principal and Analysis & Writing if a resource has the required levels of experience in Analysis and Writing. In that case, can we use the same M1 Table in both cases?

Answer 36:

To answer your first question, yes. If a resource has the experience for both principal and Analysis & Writing, that resource can be proposed for both. Yes, the same M1 table can be used, providing it is clear that both levels are applied to that resource.

Question 37: The Instructions to Bidders state that "the month(s) of individual resource experience listed for a project in which the time frame overlaps that of another referenced project for the same named resource will only be counted once. Months named are months within work took place. For example: Project #1 time frame is July 2012 to December 2012; Project #2 time frame is October 2012 to January 2013; the total months of experience for these two projects is seven (7) months."

We understand that this applies only to overlapping projects worked on full-time during the period in question. We want to make sure that if two projects worked on part-time overlap in that time, one of them would not be automatically eliminated when calculating the months worked full-time.

More specifically, if we have a proposed resource in the M1 Resource table, who performed the equivalent of six months of full-time work on Project 1 within the period February 2, 2010, to March 31, 2012, and for Project 2 performed the equivalent of three months of full-time work within the period March 31, 2010, to March 31, 2011, could you confirm whether the second project will be counted in terms of experience?

Answer 37:

Using your scenario where there are two full-time projects, one of six months and one of three months within two years, completed without overlapping, yes, the experience for both projects could be counted within the same activity type.

Question 38: Given that there is no difference in terms of job description for Analysis and Writing (principal) and Analysis and Writing, it is possible, if we want to qualify a resource in both sections and have the required experience in both cases, to use the same experience in both tables?

Answer 38:

The only notable difference is that the principle is responsible for the research project. A single resource can qualify for both activities, therefore make sure that it is understood that the resource is to qualify for both activities in the Table entry.

Question 39: If someone has a number as an individual and is also a member of a firm, can we apply as an employee of the firm and as an individual?

Answer 39:

AANDC has not placed any restrictions to limit resources from being proposed by multiple firms or as both firms and individuals, provided that the requirements of the Request for Proposals (RFP) and the Certifications are met, and the Bidder meets the definition of firm or individual on page 12 of the RFP.