

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

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT

MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Special Projects/Projets Spéciaux
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage/, Phase III
Floor 10C1/Étage 10C1
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet RELOCATION SERVICES	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation E60LM-110012/H	Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client E60LM-110012	Date 2014-05-01
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZL-109-27473	
File No. - N° de dossier 109z1.E60LM-110012	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-05-13	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Stephen, Renee	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 109z1
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6973 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-2675
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Amendment 007 is raised to provide clarification and answers to received questions.

Question 1:

1) With respect to the inference that Contractors have multiple options of shipping to northern locations, we do not believe this to be accurate. The overseas model was offered as an example however in this model, Contractors have multiple shipping lines, highly skilled and experienced origin and destination agents and other skilled 3rd party providers. In the North, Contractors have two airlines and almost no skilled labour to utilize. In addition, there are many unforeseen situations that will cost Contractors money in spite of best intentions and organization. Bidders will be forced to add cost to their bid for GAMS3PS in order to make sure they cover unforeseen and unpredictable costs, much over which they have no control. To illustrate, the following are some of the current challenges:

a) Airline A

- Contractors have no control over their pricing on charters or passenger flights for cargo and no control on pricing for flights from Ottawa to these locations and return for personnel;
- Contractors have no control when flights are cancelled due to weather or mechanical reasons - this results in additional cost for meals and hotels for the crews;
- Contractors have no control on their flight schedules. Many remote locations only fly in and out certain days - this causes additional expenses again for hotels, meals and hours;
- Contractors have no control on NAV Canada fees charged;
- Contractors have no control over the fuel surcharge the airline charges and this changes daily;
- Contractors have no control over priority of goods on flights.

b) 3rd Party Transport Companies in remote areas

- In many of the locations Contractors use Co-ops and similar type organizations. Often, Contractors are able to retain drivers and labour however frequently this is not the case regardless of the amount of preplanning. Contractors have no control over Third Party service availability and pricing. In many instances, Contractors have needed to use RCMP vehicle transport goods.

c) Northern Communities Accommodations/Meals/Transportation

- Contractors have no control of final costs charged by hotels nor incidentals such as taxi costs used in remote areas for transportation.

Will the Government consider a return to the current contract wording which would rotate these moves based on the contractor's percentage; keep the administrative fee of 10% for 3rd party services, pay for the services actually performed based on the 3rd party invoices?

Answer 1:

Please see amendment 004, answer to question 3; GAMS3PSP will remain unchanged.

Question 2:

2) The 110% rule is the standard when goods form movement can be visually inspected. This is not the case for locations in Nunavut outside of Iqaluit where visual inspections cannot be performed. It is recommended that the Government change this rule for Northern points, acknowledging that that the 110% rule should only apply when a visual estimate can be performed.

Will the Government exclude the 110% rule as it applies to non-visual surveys for Northern locations?

Answer 2:

As per Rule 12, constructive weight is deemed to be the actual and is to be used when non-visual surveys are used in GAMS 3PSP locations.

Question 3:

3) Currently the movement of Member vehicles across Canada is done by three national car carriers: Carrier 1, Carrier 2, and Carrier 3. There is one second-tier carrier who does not have the expertise, equipment, experience or quality to handle the volume required for the Government of Canada. There are many small local car carriers dotted across the country who only serve local markets and short haul markets and none of these have National capability.

The PMV rates are 10-35% lower than the current rates. This reduction is higher in more remote locations - up to 50% lower.

We strongly recommend keeping the current system in place which asks for three competitive quotes. This will ensure healthy competition between the three carriers for price and TTG. They will bid aggressively wanting to win the business over their competitors. The current system does not place administrative burden on the TA's/Reviewers as everything is done via FEAMS without manual entry.

Will the Government accept this practical solution and use the current bidding methodology?

Answer 3:

The financial evaluation required Bidders to submit rates for movement of PMVs, this will remain unchanged. As per Annex B - Basis of Payment; Section 3 - Additional Charges (Appendix 1), movement of PMVs to 3PSP locations will require quotes.

Question 4:

4a) Why are ten specific cities in the point rated RT1.1 and why are these cities segregated from the geographic areas?

Answer 4a:

The core centres in MT3 are mandatory, therefore all Bidders must have presence in each of these locations. Bidders do not have to have presence in all the centres in RT1 but rather, at least 5. A Bidder will be awarded a point for each centre where they have demonstrated a presence in RT1.

4b) Why aren't all the geographic areas in the point rated criteria?

Answer 4b:

While all Bidders must supply national coverage, Bidders must have presence in all core centres designated in MT3 as these areas have been identified by Canada as having a high number of moves.

Question 5:

5a) At the time of bidding, must a bidder have under contract confirmed subcontractors or service providers in the 25 core centres areas to be deemed responsive?

Answer 5a:

No, the bidder does not require their subcontractors to be confirmed at time of bid submission in order to be deemed responsive; the information requested is to demonstrate a Bidder's presence in the centre and coverage.

5b) Will bidders be required to identify each of these subcontractors or service providers at the time of their bid?

Answer 5b:

As per Part 5 _ Certifications; 1.4 Attachment 2 to Part 5, Certifications Required Subsequent to Services Commencement:

After notification of award of a contract to the successful bidders, the following conditions must be fulfilled by those successful bidders prior to the Contract effective date of October 01, 2014:

1. A certification is required from each subcontractor confirming its commitment to this Contract. A Sample of acceptable form to be used for subcontractor certification can be found at Attachment 2 to Part 5.

Question 6:

6) Local crews at origin will rarely have fuel receipts on the day of loading. This policy will almost certainly result in additional penalties to the Contractor. We recommend removing the requirement for provision of fuel receipts at origin. Local crews who will start their day with a tractor trailer or straight truck will most often be pre-fueled the night before.

Why does the Government require fuel receipts if the Government does the visual inspection in the fuel tank?

Answer 6:

Please see amendment 006, answer to question 20.

Under Annex A - Statement of Work; Section 2 - Scope of Work (2.8 b)

DELETE:

ensure that fuel receipts obtained prior to scaling and weigh scale ticket(s) are available for inspection at any time during the loading phases. If scaling at destination has been authorized then only the scale tickets are needed;

INSERT:

ensure that fuel receipts obtained prior to scaling and weigh scale ticket(s) are available for inspection at any time during the loading phases. If scaling at destination has been authorized then only the scale tickets are needed. If bulk fuelling tickets are used, then the contractor must provide the supporting documents on request demonstrating filling of the tanks within 10 business days to the QCI inspector;

Question 7:

Contractors must have air shipments weighed in advance of shipping due to restrictions on Members entitlements. We recommend changing this clause. This clause permits Contractors not to scale air shipments at origin. The concern is that Contractors may then ship greater weight than the Members' HG&E entitlement. Canada will only pay us up to the Member's entitlement. Contractors are then forced to try to collect COD from the Member.

7a) By not scaling at origin, what will happen when Member's weight entitlement is exceeded and this is only found out once Contractors have visibility of the third party carrier's scaled weight?

Answer 7a:

Since the identification of the overage is beyond the member's control (i.e. already packed and loaded), the Crown will pay the weight moved (including overage).

7b) Will Canada pay us for the weight over the shipper's entitlement?

Answer 7b:

Yes, please see answer above (question 7a).

Question 8:

Section 2 - 2.11, 2.12, and 2.8a: This represents additional miles to pay a driver and crew for additional labour plus the cost of fuel, plus the chance that if the fuel tanks are inspected they will not be completely full. 50 miles represents approximately two additional hours of labour cost and the additional fuel cost.

8a) Why was the mileage changed from 35 miles at origin and destination to 50 miles at origin and destination?

Answer 8a:

The distance was increased to 50 miles to allow the van lines more flexibility in finding a suitable scale at either origin or destination without having to contact the IDC.

8b) When a scale that is used that is 50-mile radius from origin or destination from residence, and should the fuel tanks be not "visually full" will Canada agree to not apply a LD4 Service Failure?

Answer 8b:

The choice of which scale to use within the defined radius is the van line's.

Question 9:

9) Contacting the TAs after getting "heavy weight" is not possible most of the time. There is a process already in place to determine weight variance.

How will Contractor's report a weight variance when an RCMP reviewer in Ottawa is dealing with a move in Vancouver and the reviewer's hours of work ends at 4:00 pm EST?

Answer 9:

The Contractor may still call the "heavy weight" in to the TA and leave a message or send an email, this will provide a record of the contact.

Question 10:

10) DDR's are extremely time consuming for Government TA's and Contractors. Contractors call 24 hours in advance to all our customers to make sure they are there for delivery and can obtain waiting time or SIV so again there is no necessity in keeping the DDR process. Removal of this requirement may save labour expenses for the Government.

Will the Government consider removal of the DDR process understanding that this is viewed as an unnecessary administrative process by Contractors?

Answer 10:

The Government is not prepared to remove this critical piece of information (DDR) which establishes entitlements for IL&M as well as other move related charges such as SIV/SIT.

Question 11:

SIT at origin was reduced from 500 to 300 miles.

11a) Why has SIT at origin changed from 500 miles to 300 miles?

Answer 11a:

When there is such a short distance involved, the travelling time of the member is also commensurately short. To standardize the storage options (SIT/SIV) 300 miles was used.

11b) Is there a change in Canada's moving policy for RCMP, DND and CRS that will increase direct delivery to residence?

Answer 11b:

The policy has always been to do door to door moves.

11c) Is there a reduction in "entitlements" for Members that would result in an increase in direct delivery to residence and if so what is the policy change?

Answer 11c:

There has been no change, the policy has always been to do door to door moves.

Question 12:

12) A shipment moving from Saskatoon to Big River Saskatchewan, the Agent must travel 186 miles to Meadow Lake and return to Saskatoon to put the shipment in LTS. The Agent would then travel 142 miles from Saskatoon to Big River to deliver out of LTS. On this shipment the linehaul is rated at 78 miles with a local delivery out of LTS.

Where Agent's must travel over 50 miles to pick up a shipment going into LTS, will Canada establish an empty mileage rate?

Answer 12:

Canada will not establish an empty mileage rate; this should be built it into bid rates.

Question 13:

13) Section 2.18: In this section it outlines the requirements for DDR's and only mentions that approvals are required from the TA's.

As only the TA's are mentioned in this clause, are DDR's required for RCMP and CRS?

Answer 13:

No, RCMP and CRS do not need DDRs.

Question 14:

Additional Packing Pick-Up: This has an especially large impact in remote area moves where many kms must be travelled to pick up packing. Even at the local level it is a very costly additional service to provide and is especially difficult during the APS due the volume of business.

14a) Why has an additional packing pickup within five business days (if required) been added as a requirement?

Answer 14a:

a) If an additional pickup is needed, this implies that a complete unpack was not performed. As the contractor did not do a complete unpack, the contractor is required to pick up empty cartons.

Under Annex A - Statement of Work; Section 2 - Scope of Work (2.19 e)

DELETE:

if an additional pick-up is required, the Contractor shall provide this one-time service within 5 business days of completion of unpacking. If the Shipper has not protected the packing material and empty cartons from inclement weather this service may be declined; and

INSERT:

if an additional pick-up is required, the Contractor shall provide this one-time service within 5 business days of being contacted by the Shipper. If the Shipper has not protected the packing material and empty cartons from inclement weather this service may be declined; and

14b) Will the Government remove the additional packing pickup?

Answer 14b:

Canada will not remove the requirement for an additional pickup. The contractor can avoid the requirement for an additional pickup by unpacking all of the HG&E.

Question 15:

15) There exists a host of potential variations in special operating instructions which would make it impossible to predict and follow. Contractors cannot be expected to risk potential injury to themselves or damage to a PMV where special operating instructions are required. The Contractor should only be responsible for transporting a normally operating vehicle. Any other special instructions must be performed by the shipper.

Will the Government delete this clause due to the liability & risk imposed on carriers?

Answer 15:

Canada will not delete this clause. By way of example, many vehicles have ignition disabling devices and if the battery dies, the code needs to be entered for the ignition to work. This would be a special operating instruction.

Question 16:

Contractors who must pick up cars in remote areas will exceed the mileage limitation forcing a penalty. Shippers have always had the option to deliver the vehicle to the Contractor. A new clause is recommended as follows: "The shipper has the option to deliver or pickup the vehicle to the Contractor's representative or a specified location given to the shipper not to exceed 25 miles".

16a) How will this 25 km limitation affect us when Contractors must exceed that limitation where the customer is further than 25 kms either at origin or destination?

Answer 16a:

Article 2.21 e(v) provides the option to agree to an alternate pick-up location with the shipper.

The limitation of 25 km is for the contractor to drive to load/off-load and effect delivery. If the distance exceeds this then the shipper is to be compensated for the additional mileage. The intent is that the vehicles will not be driven from one city to the next to put on a car carrier.

16b) Why is this measurement in kilometers when all other measurements are in miles?

Answer 16b:

Odometers on vehicles in Canada are in kilometers.

Question 17:

17) Contractors need the option to deliver cars to an alternate location. If the Member cannot accept the PMV then Contractors will put it into storage and the Member or Canada will have to pay for the storage.

As there is no provision for the contractor to store vehicles, please confirm that storage costs will be COD to the shipper?

Answer 17:

If the car was shipped, the shipper should be at the other end (destination) waiting for the car. If this is the second vehicle, the minimum TTG time is actually equal to the maximum distance the shipper is allowed to drive so they should be at destination waiting for the car. Any storage of PMV is outside the contract; the shipper would have to make separate arrangements and pay for this service.

Question 18:

18) Standard vehicle classifications include "current models" (0-24 years old), "antique models" (25-29 years old) and "classic models" (over 30 years old). This is standard Industry usage.

Why has the provision changed from the current contract from 15 years to no age limit for PMV's?

Answer 18:

The family conveyance needs to be a plated, functioning vehicle regardless of the age. This is what the shipper is entitled to ship.

Question 19:

19) Whose responsibility is it to disconnect and reconnect appliances?

Answer 19:

The Contractor is required to certify that the appliances were functioning properly prior to shipment, which would not be possible if the Shipper had them disconnected. As per Rule 5, the contractor is responsible for draining refrigerators, portable dishwashers and washing machines to prepare them for shipment; this would require disconnection from supply lines (water). Certification at origin and destination are at the Contractor' discretion; however, as per article 5.3 of Rule 5, the Contractor will be held liable for any damage to articles and appliances unless it can be conclusively proven that such damage was not move related.

Question 20:

20) Is the limitation 150 lbs of pet food and 150 lbs of consumables totalling 300 lbs or 150 lbs of pet food and consumables in total?

Answer 20:

The limitation is 150 lbs of pet food and consumables in total.

Under Annex A - Statement of Work; Rule 7 - Items Accepted in Limited Quantities (7.1 e)

DELETE:

pet food and household consumables (i.e. food) Limit 150 lbs per category.

INSERT:

pet food and household consumables (i.e. food): Limit 150 lbs.

Question 21:

By Canada's own statistics, and most recently in the VI Report of March 2012, Industry's weight was estimated at 33,175,035 and actual was 30,436,921 which is a variance of 8.3%. Our company's variance for the same period is 8.7%. The last three years historical data for both Industry and our company shows the estimate to actual variance to be consistently under 10%.

21a) Why is Canada revisiting a well-documented and proven fact surrounding estimated to actual weight?

Answer 21a:

Analysis has shown that there are still ongoing problems between estimated weight and actual weight.

21b) What is the rationale for putting Industry through a variance analysis when we fall well within the parameters the Government are aiming for?

Answer 21b:

The variance analysis between the estimated and actual weight is done on a move by move basis. This establishes the amount to be paid, the amount added to the register and, in terms of the actual, the amount of RCP (based on actual weight regardless of 110% rule). Canada is not using one financial code to pay for all the moves. An accurate estimate on one move against one financial code is not the same as an inaccurate estimate on another move against a different financial code. As an aggregate a contractor may be within an acceptable average but it makes a difference on an individual move and financial code and thus must stay as these may be for different departments, for different programs.

Question 22:

22) Third party Air providers do not make household goods a priority. The 3rd party carriers will not and do not commit to any delivery schedule. It is not possible to use TTG's for 3rd party. (Look at airline bill of lading rules that do not commit to a TTG).

Why is the Government applying TTG's on third party services like Air?

Answer 22:

The 3PSP TTG allows for the Contractor to choose their window for delivery once they are assured by the 3PSP their shipment will be delivered. The window is large enough to account for unforeseen circumstances after that point as well, but we will still address those case by case.

Question 23:

23) In the non-active posting season Contractors were allowed four additional days on the minimum and maximum TTG that was done to make allowances for seasonal volume. This permitted better service and ensured on time deliveries. Without this provision Contractors have the potential for more penalties and will not be able to provide consistent on-time delivery

Why were the additional 4 days dropped to 2 days in the non-APS and what was the reason for this?

Answer 23:

The TTG additional days for various conditions (e.g. peak/non-peak, regular ferry) allow for more time as they are accumulative. In the interest of reducing interim lodging requirements, the TTG is sufficient for both the shipper and the Contractor to effect the move.

Question 24:

In the current contract the TTG extension for Remote Areas on shipments with origin or destination in a remote area Rule 20, added an additional two days to both the minimum and maximum transit time. When both origin and destination are in remote areas, four (4) days will be added regardless of the number of remote areas encountered. This long TTG is still required for these two remote areas.

24a) Why has the 12 day TTG been eliminated and been dropped to 2 days for Goose Bay & Labrador City?

Answer 24a:

The adjusted TTG table and 3PSP extensions were deemed to provide enough time for all moves. Although the TTG extension may be shorter, the actual TTG is longer so the difference is not actually 10 days.

24b) What is the reason for this change in TTG?

Answer 24b:

Analysis has shown that the adjusted TTG table and 3PSP extensions provide enough time for all moves. Infrastructure has changed and many of the road surfaces are now paved in Labrador.

Question 25:

25) Clarification is requested to explain the use of the TTG window.

Does the 3-day TTG window start on 3 days before the DSR and end 3 days after the last day of the TTG?

Answer 25:

No, the 3-day TTG window is to be determined by the Contractor after consulting with the 3PSP as to provide the member with a reasonable time frame to be at destination.

Question 26:

26) Carton Average Bursting Strength - Appendix 4 (1.1): This is not the standard used by the Moving Industry.

Why has Canada increased the standard for average bursting strength in carton standards from 175 lbs/sq in to 200-lbs/square inch?

Answer 26:

Canada has removed reference to packing standards which might have hampered the Contractor's ability to deliver the required service and referenced ISO standards where they exist.

Question 27:

We have solicited comments on this draft RFP from the existing carriers that service PMV's on behalf of the Federal Government. In short, there is a significant gap in the expectation of the Government as it pertains to service and what occurs as refined industry practice in this mature mode of transportation. Thousands of vehicles are moved each year in Canada and the United States by these dedicated vehicle carriers and the inclusion of bureaucratic, administrative, and punitive service clauses only serve to remove capable service providers from participating; thereby increasing the overall service costs. The Government's attempt at control and unnecessary regulation of this portion of relocation has resulted in net cost increases and will continue to drive vehicles back to expensive Van Line transportation instead of the intended cost-advantageous third party carriers. The imposition of a Transit Time Guide, not considering the origin and destination, if applied, will produce significant service failures. The current contract method for obtaining the lowest TTG and price is fair, competitive, and proven. Using mileage bands without regard to traffic routes creates the probability of service failures. As an example, Moncton to Winnipeg is 2,353 miles in a highly travelled traffic route. The mileage from Winnipeg to Whitehorse is 2,238 miles in a very low travelled traffic route. Logically therefore, the Government cannot expect that the price and TTG would be the same for both.

27a) What model was used to create classes and mileage bands?

Answer 27a:

The classes and mileage bands were successfully used and bid in the international contract with input from industry.

27b) What would cause the Government to deviate from a method that has proven satisfactory, to a method that appears unworkable to Industry?

Answer 27b:

The method is presently in use in another government contract.

Question 28:

28) Charges are based on hundredweight (cwt) and are subject to a 500 lb minimum within Canada and a 1,000 lb minimum for moves the Continental United States. Shipments invoiced based on minimum weight of 500 lbs will not require scaling. There appears to be words missing.

Should this be worded "for moves to/from and between points in"?

Answer 28:

That is correct.

Under Annex B - Basis of Payment; Section 1 - General (1.1)

DELETE:

Charges are based on hundredweight (cwt) and are subject to a 500 lb minimum within Canada and a 1,000 lb minimum for moves the Continental United States. Shipments invoiced based on minimum weight of 500 lbs will not require scaling.

INSERT:

Charges are based on hundredweight (cwt) and are subject to a 500 lb minimum within Canada and a 1,000 lb minimum for moves to/from and between points in the Continental United States. Shipments invoiced based on minimum weight of 500 lbs will not require scaling.

Question 29:

29) The requirement to settle claims within 45 business days will present significant challenges; no allowance for parts on order and availability of customer; time adjustment when items are added to claim after initial filing; handling of large claims; refinishing of furniture.

Would the Government consider increasing the business days to settle a claim from 45 days to 90 days as it can be difficult to settle within 45 days due to customers' timing, large claims, furniture refinishing and other factors?

Answer 29:

Annex E; 1.6 (1.i) provides for an agreeable settlement offer being made within 45 days; this does not mean paid, but rather it means agreement on the items to be repaired/replaced and their value and approach (e.g. shipper to replace and provide receipt or Contractor to provide replacement).

Question 30:

30) Service Failure's impact on the VI.

What is the formula or weighting that will be used to calculate the impact of each major and minor shortfall on the value index?

Answer 30:

Annex D; 1.1 a and b give the formulas. Service Failures are accumulative, the weights are indicated for each service failure so totalling up the service failures per van line (adding them), multiply as per the formulas gives the result. CCI is compliance, service failure is a lack of compliance; in both formulas the multiplier is 0.6.

Question 31:

31) What is the maximum gain or loss percentage that any contractor could receive in a single contract year throughout the reallocation opportunities?

Answer 31:

The gain or loss of business share is predicated on the performance of the other contractors. If other contractors are underperforming then they may lose business share. There is no max/min on gain/loss as it is all relative to the others. See examples in Annex D; 1.3.

Question 32:

32) Why is the Government reverting to an older "Intent to Claim" procedure?

Answer 32:

It is Canada's intent to have the shipper alert the Contractor as soon as possible that there is a problem so that it can be resolved at the earliest possible moment. There is no form called "Intent to Claim" in the RFP.

Question 33:

Clear communication of the unusual or unique circumstances ensures that Contractors are properly prepared for the situation.

33a) What is "unique and unusual" situation and who will be responsible to determine this?

Answer 33a:

Unique is described in c), below. It is at the Contractor's discretion to determine the application. The shipper may escalate this to their Departmental Authority if they feel justified in requesting the extension at which point the DA may contact the Contractor regarding the situation.

33b) Do "unusual or unique circumstances" include hypothetical moves, deceased, divorce, and retirement?

Answer 33b:

Hypothetical moves and retirement moves are not unique as the shipper is at the other end receiving the unpacking services as noted in the response below c).

33c) What other definitions are included in this?

Answer 33c:

An ordinary move means that the complete unpacking has been performed by the Contractor and damages noted. A unique or unusual move would mean that for unforeseen circumstances the Contractor could not perform the unpacking and note any damages. If the shipper could not subsequently perform the unpacking to note damages due to illness, deployment, etc. then this would qualify as unique.

Question 34:

34) The personnel that contractors/car carriers use to pick up vehicles are not trained mechanics, therefore not able to determine whether there are mechanical or electrical malfunctions of the PMV. This clause is places significant risk onto the contractor from a liability standpoint.

Will the Government consider instructing the members to have their vehicles certified within 48-72 hours of the pickup date at their local mechanic to ensure that Contractors are picking up operable vehicles and not having to deal with illegitimate claims that are no fault of the contractor?

Answer 34:

If a vehicle is plated and registered to be operated then it must be by definition of the motor vehicle act roadworthy. Provision has been made per amendment 006, answer to question 7.

Question 35:

35) While Contractors agree that a vehicle rental should be provided to a member in cases where vehicle repairs will exceed two calendar days, Contractors do not agree that we should be responsible for paying collision coverage, damage waiver, and additional mileage charges in such cases. Car rental firms routinely charge exorbitant fees for these items, and Contractors cannot afford to expose ourselves to those arbitrary fees every time a member rents a vehicle. The Members' own personal insurance policy actually covers them under those circumstances, and there is no need to purchase additional coverage through the rental car company.

Will the Government remove this clause based upon the reasons outlined above?

Answer 35:

The contractor may make the rental arrangements for the time period when the vehicle is under repair, this is actually the preferred method of replacing the vehicle while the shipper's is in the shop. The contractor can even make arrangements for the shipper to take the vehicle to a place where there is a free courtesy car while theirs is in the shop.

Question 36:

36) Vehicle condition reports are performed to capture the physical condition of a vehicle at the time of pickup and/or delivery. While Contractors endeavour to record every instance of obvious dents, scratches, damages, etc. on the viewable surface of the vehicle, Contractors cannot be expected to inspect vehicles for issues affecting the drive train, transmission, suspension, undercarriage, or exhaust system. In order to do so, Contractors would need to bring a mechanic with them to every pickup and delivery attempt. This clause does not reflect the realities of the vehicle transportation process whatsoever, and it exposes the various carriers to all kinds of potential illegitimate claims. Contractors do not inspect "under the hood", and it is not reasonable to expect them to do so in the future. Contractors are not aware of members' past driving habits, or the individual history of each member's vehicle, and whether or not the vehicle has been abused before being transported.

Will the Government remove this clause based on the facts outlined above?

Answer 36:

Please see amendment 006, answer to question 7.

Question 37:

37) Why has the Government changed the business distribution ending with two main contractors when all historical evidence points in favour of three contractors to maintain required service levels in the posting season, and understanding that the impact of awarding 45%, 45%, 10% will serve to reduce competition and service availability among contractors capable of being responsive to the RFP and its SOW?

Answer 37:

The first and second ranked bidders will be offered "up to 45% of the business volume" but are not required to take the full 45 % if they do not wish to. The aim of the bid evaluation process is to achieve 100% of the business volume for the lowest overall cost with the fewest number of responsive Bidders.

Question 38:

38) How will the award of contract process be made visible to the responsive bidders? For example, will the Government provide the award positions in advance of offering the share distribution, how much time will be provided to each bidder to select their volume of business before it is offered to the next responsive bidder?

Answer 38:

As per RFI #3 - amd 002 - the Bidder will be informed of their ranking position and the percentage of business awarded.

Bidders being offered a share of the distribution will be given 2 business days to select their volume

Question 39:

39) What is the minimum percentage of the business allotment offered that a successful bidder must accept?

Answer 39:

There is no minimum percentage of business that a Bidder must accept.

Question 40:

40) What is a reasonable time to expect as a date of decision following the RFP close?

Answer 40:

It is anticipated, for planning purposes, that evaluations will be completed in 3 to 4 weeks.

Question 41:

41) Containers, including intermodal containers, have been used for decades for the movement of household effects in Canada and the US and is the worldwide industry standard for moving household goods. We understand that the statement is the result of a failed experiment many years ago, resulting from improperly equipped containers and incapable service providers. The Government itself contradicts the prohibition as intermodal containers are required to ship goods to northern locations (including Sealift service to Iqaluit NU from Montreal) and for the Government's international business. In addition, Unit Load Devices (ULDs) are used for shipping goods to northern locations and are by definition intermodal containers.

Will the Government remove this clause understanding that: intermodal containers are presently in use by all Contractors for domestic service; all international shipments requiring ocean transportation use intermodal containers; and that it is the worldwide industry standard?

Answer 41:

Canada may examine this on a trial basis if presented with a properly documented business case post contract award, provided it remains within the scope of work and is deemed beneficial to Canada.

Question 42:

42) What will the distribution method be for the allocation of PMVs to contractors and how will PMVs impact the equalization register as described in Annex D?

Answer 42:

PMV will be awarded to the same contractor as the HG&E. If the PMV is moving alone (i.e. no HG&E) then the PMV is allocated to the contractor furthest away from the business share allocation.

Question 43:

43) Because your new model will be paying Contractors different amounts for different services, what internal controls will be enacted to eliminate any possibility of TAs manually manipulating the equalization register to assign moves?

Answer 43:

TAs don't have access to the register to manipulate it at all (cannot log in through back door to the database). If the move is to/from a 3PSP location, then the other parts of the move to that location need to be given to the contractor that has been awarded the 3PSP portion. If the move is from LTS then the move needs to be allocated to the same company that has the LTS lot. Rush moves are allocated using the process described in Annex F; Appendix 4.

Question 44:

44) Can a successful bidder rely on the IRP to remain consistent throughout the contract, as it has been since 2009?

Answer 44:

We are unable to speculate on the consistency or changes to the IRP program, as this is outside the purview of this RFP.

Question 45:

45) Are bidders to complete the excel document supplied by PWGSC (Financial_Evaluation_for_RFP_FINAL_to_Bidders.xls) with their bid rates or does PWGSC require these as tables to be presented within the financial bid response? Please clarify.

Answer 45:

We request Bidders to fill out the Excel document and submit it on a portable storage device as part of the financial proposal.

Question 46:

46) Providing a Respondent/Bidder meets and is compliant to all mandatory requirements of "Independence", in its additional qualification criteria of "Major Accounts" can that Respondent/Bidder use the Federal Government Business it has received and serviced from their respective Van Line as a result of binding agreements between parties as one (01) of the Qualifying Accounts to satisfy the requirements of the RFP

Answer 46:

No, as this business is considered the Van Line's account.

Question 47:

47) Can PWGSC please confirm/clarify that the response to item 1 (g) in Amendment 3, applies to all related transportation activity, estimating, packing, transportation, unpacking, storage, claims and invoicing.

Answer 47:

In accordance with MT1, claims settlement functions and financial controls systems must be separate and distinct.

Question 48:

48) We understand that the over the road portion of the moves that fall under Rule 14 will be paid based on the GAMS table and that all other charges related to the preparation, handling, freight, shipping of packing/wrapping materials, crew/travel costs, and other services are paid using the GAMS3PSP table. How will local transportation between the air/water/rail location the residence be compensated? As an example, a move from Pond Inlet, NU to Sudbury, ON would typically be transported by road (locally) to the hangar in Pond Inlet, then by air to Ottawa, and then transported over the road (long distance) to the residence in Sudbury. In this case, would we apply the GAMS rate table (1-50 miles) for the origin over the road transportation and then the GAMS rate table (again) for the long distance move. If this is not the case, then how will the local transportation/cartage be handled for the over the road portion in Pond Inlet?

Answer 48:

GAMS3PSP would be used for any movement of goods in the 3PSP location. In the example provided, GAMS3PSP would be used until the goods are transferred for the over the road portion in the non-3PSP location.

Question 49:

49) In Amendment 002, we were advised that an extension to the closing date was not being considered. However, there are a number of questions that were not addressed through the last LOI process and through the Enquiry process to this RFP and we have concerns that the answers to these questions might not come in time to allow interested companies an opportunity to present a quality response to the RFP. Has any more consideration been given to an extension?

Answer 49:

The solicitation closing date was extended in amendment 006; no further extension is being considered.

Question 50:

50) The RFP has a number of references to SIT over 120 days. At what point does SIT convert to LTS?

Answer 50:

SIT does not convert to LTS. LTS is authorized for very specific posts only and will be identified at time of booking the move.

Question 51:

51) With regards to Table 2 of Annex C - Liquidated Damages, LD7 penalizes the contractor for delays outside of the TTG. However, this LD also seems to apply to split shipments where a small portion (overflow) of the HG&E may not have been able to be loaded on the same unit at the time of loading. Though this is not ideal and would not have been done with intention, there is still a possibility that this will happen due to a number of uncontrolled variables. If the Shipper is able to set up residence and there is no cost to the Crown, how can the same Liquidated Damage be applied?

Answer 51:

The move contract is issued to move entire households. By not delivering all of the household effects, the Contractor is not in compliance with the contract. Service Failures and Liquidated Damages are assessed for non-compliance.

Question 52:

52) The Answer to Question 1 in Amendment 005 regarding the re-establishment of the base price of fuel used in the fuel surcharges does not state the exact method that Canada proposes to re-establish the base price and therefore remains open to interpretation by bidders.

It should be noted that the price of diesel fuel is not specifically represented in the CPI, and that even if gasoline were substituted, its weighting in the CPI is approximately only 1.5%. Also, since Canada would not know the portion of fuel cost within a contractor's GAMS rate, it is incorrect to make any adjustments to the base price of fuel, which was taken into account in each contractor's bid. Because of these reasons, we recommend that Canada delete the final sentence in Annex B 3.1b and 3.2b.

If deletion of this clause is not amenable, then the following wording reflects the only way that can properly account for EPA fluctuations to GAMS after the second year (since Annex B, 1.0 f, states that "All rates will remain fixed for two years from the contract start date...":

"Commencing after the second year of the contract on 1 October 2016, and annually thereafter, the fuel surcharge rates will be adjusted to offset the effect of the EPA determined in Annex B, 1.0f.

"By way of example: A GAMS amount of \$1,000 with a Fuel Surcharge rate of 0.75% will yield \$7.50 in Fuel Surcharge. Effective 1 October 2016, it is determined that the EPA is 2.0%, and the GAMS amount above would become \$1,020. To maintain the same Fuel Surcharge amount of \$7.50, the rate (and not the fuel prices) would need to be reduced by 2.0% to 0.735%. $\$1,020 \times 0.735\% = \7.50 and the same Fuel Surcharge amount is maintained.

Answer 52:

Canada will not delete the final sentence in Annex B 3.1b and 3.2b. The 600 consumer goods included in the CPI all basket have the cost of transport of the goods to market included in their price. Fuel is needed for the transport, ergo the CPI reflects the cost of fuel. The same can be said for the For Hire Motor Carrier Freight Services Price Index.

Question 53:

53) Our review and analysis of the RFP has identified a significant discrepancy between the weight (point value) of each rate table in the RFP that will be used by the Government for bid evaluation purposes, and the percentage of the overall cost of services that each category has historically represented. This discrepancy is concerning and does not reflect accurate historical information or industry practice.

Will the Government provide historical information in the weighting tables 1 through 13 of the RFP to all bidders? If not, will bidders who have this historical information be putting themselves at any risk if they use their historical information when formulating their bid?

Answer 53:

The weighting of the rate tables for allocation of points is not meant to be a reflection of the frequency of occurrence. Historical numbers have been provided to all bidders in each rate table as an indication of use and for valuation. These numbers are a reflection of total utilization. The weighting given to each table does not give an advantage to an incumbent over a new entrant, as everyone has the same historics on which to base their bids.

Question 54:

54) The proposed business distribution model of awarding 45%/45%/10% is a fundamental shift in the allocation of business between service providers. Traditionally, it has taken all of the resources of the historic van line service providers to handle the moving volume of the federal government, particularly in the Active Posting Season. Under this new scheme, one or more of the of the historic van line service providers will receive 10% or less of the government business, which is not enough to keep them solvent. This will result in significant risk of increased service failures to government shipments and over time increase the cost of services to Canada as a result of reduced competition in the marketplace.

In addition, by changing the distribution model to 45%/45%/10%, the government is removing the incentive for bidders to achieve the highest point total in the bid evaluation process. By changing the payment model to pay each successful bidder a different rate, and by continuing to distribute the moves on the percentage of dollars, theoretically the Government will be paying the bidder with the second highest point score (presuming the price will be higher than the bidder with the highest point score) the same amount of money to perform less services than the bidder with the highest point score; in fact making the second award position the most favorable.

Given all of the aforementioned risks, will the Government consider changing the distribution model back to the original proposal of 45%/35%/20%?

Answer 54:

The Distribution model will remain unchanged. The first and second ranked bidders will be offered "up to 45% of the business volume" but are not required to take the full 45 % if they do not wish to. The aim of the bid evaluation process is to achieve 100% of the business volume for the lowest overall cost with the fewest number of responsive Bidders.

Question 55:

55) The Consumer Price Index escalation clause excludes adjustment of prices for US Surcharges, RCP, Hourly Rate, and Re-pack. Is this an error in not updating the CPI clause when these items were removed from previous proposals of what was included in the GAMS? Will the Government of Canada amend the CPI adjustment clause to include these items?

Answer 55:

Please see amd 006, answer to question 24.

Question 56:

56) The Government's sample size for bidding purposes is 10,512 moves. During the Industry Day Meeting in Ottawa on September 4, 2013 Major Lori Woods stated that the GAMS analysis was based on a 9,700 move sample which was just DND. The sample does not include the most costly relocations and the most unpredictable relocations with respect to cost; the northern and remote relocations. Without the inclusion of all of the 15,000 move dataset which the IDC has indicated they have, we will not have the correct data upon which to base our bid.

Will the dataset be changed to include the 15,000 moves?

Answer 56:

The GAMS table used for bidding does not include weights for GAMS 3PS locations which are the most expensive. Attachment 1 to Part 3; Table 13 has average weights for the various modes of GAMS3PS. Additional 3PSP information is in the historical volumes in Annex A; 1.3 - Historical Volume Data.

The distribution of distances and weights are no different between DND, CRS and the RCMP.

Please see tables at the end of this document for number of moves to 3PSP locations by mode of transport.

Question 57:

57) The SIT Table Schedule B page indicates 14,164,344 lbs versus amendment 004 that was 4,312,455 lbs. This change of weights will have an impact on costs and the price bidders will propose. Can you please clarify the source of the modification of the SIT weights? Is this a result of a change in policy or government requirement that has increased the weight by about 10,000,000 lbs?

Answer 57:

The parameters of the bidding approach were modified which resulted in a change in the estimated utilization.

Question 58:

58) A schedule was added for SIT over 120 days. After 120 days SIT converts to LTS; why was a schedule for SIT over 120 days added?

Answer 58:

Periodically the need for SIT exceeds 120 days which is the maximum coverage as we understand it for RCP on a move so provision was made for SIT exceeding 120 days the rate of which includes RCP. SIT does not convert to LTS. LTS is a different authorization from SIT in terms of government moves.

Question 59:

59) The SIV table changed from 14,715,468 lbs. in amendment 004 to 9,321,795 lbs. in the RFP. This change of weights will have an impact on costs and the price bidders will propose. Can you please clarify the source of the modification of the SIV weights? Is this a result of a change in policy or government requirement that has decreased the weight by about 5,000,000 lbs?

Answer 59:

The parameters of the bidding approach were modified which resulted in a change in the estimated utilization.

Question 60:

60) The Warehouse Handling table changed from 15,170,321 lbs in amendment 004 to 15,793,103 lbs. in the RFP. This change of weights will have an impact on costs and the price bidders will propose. Can you please clarify the source of the modification of the warehouse handling weights? Is this a result of a change in policy or government requirement that has increased the weight?

Answer 60:

The parameters of the bidding approach were modified which resulted in a change in the estimated utilization.

Question 61:

61) What are the seven specific service areas that Key Positions RT4 clause is referring to (the paragraph mentions invoicing, claims processing, and management but nothing else)?

Answer 61:

As outlined in RT3, the seven services areas are: pre-move consultation, pre-pack/pack, load, transport, storage, delivery, and unpack. For RT4, the Bidder should provide enough information to discern organizational responsibilities for each of the seven service areas, as well as invoicing, claims processing, and management including, if relevant, any separate structure for handling GAMS 3PSP moves.

Question 62:

62) In the field "# of contracts" the numbers bear no relationship to the historical number of moves the contractors perform. CRS=2,500, DND=351,150 RCMP=1,967 for a total of 355,567. We know there is no projection of move volumes for the contract, however, the numbers are so contrary, is this a typographical error? Is there a reason 351,150 moves was chosen for DND when the numbers will be less than 5% of that number?

Answer 62:

This number was a typo; the actual number of estimates should have been similar to the receipt number (i.e. 351,150 should have been 35,150). With regard to the variation between historical volumes in Annex A – Statement of Work; Section 1 – General (1.3) and the volumetrics in Annex F, a communication may be sent multiple time as data becomes available, which further revises the numbers. The updated table is as below:

Under Annex F - CRS/FEAMS; Appendix 1 - Volumetrics (Table 2)

DELETE:

Record Type	From	To	# of Contracts	Records Sent Per Contract	Record Size Min (Chars)	Record Size Max (Chars)	Minimum Characters Sent	Maximum Characters Sent
LHM - Long Haul Move Contract	DND	Contractor	2,000	2	50	1,009	1,200,000	24,216,000
LOC - Local Move Contract	N/A	Contractor	0	1.5	49	1,006	0	0
LTS - Long Term Storage Record	DND	Contractor	500	1.5	43	294	32,250	220,500
SIT - Storage In Transit Record	DND	Contractor	3,240	1.5	53	309	257,580	1,501,740
W/T - Waiting Time Record	DND	Contractor	1,350	1.5	61	215	123,252	435,375
REP - Receipt Reply	Contractor	DND	35,150	1	39	143	1,370,850	5,026,450
EST - Estimate Weight/Cost/Warehouse Code/Distance	Contractor	DND	351150	1	63	200	2,214,450	7,030,000
QCI - Quality Control Inspection Report	DND	Contractor	2,000	1	73	315	143,000	630,000
RWT - Reweigh Report	DND	Contractor	100	1	79	429	7,900	42,900
LDR - Liquid Damages Record	DND	Contractor	200	1	55	307	11,000	61,400
DEL - Deletion/Cancellation Record	DND	Contractor	200	1	36	541	7,200	108,200
WHS - Warehouse Data Record	DND	Contractor	200	2	67	350	26,800	140,000
CLM - Claim Record	DND	Contractor	4,000	1	38	273	152,000	1,092,000

INSERT:

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

E60LM-110012/H

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

109zl

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

E60LM-110012

File No. - N° du dossier

109zlE60LM-110012

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Record Type	From	To	# of Contracts	Records Sent Per Contract	Record Size Min (Chars)	Record Size Max (Chars)	Minimum Characters Sent	Maximum Characters Sent
LHM - Long Haul Move Contract	DND	Contractor	10,316	2	50	1,009	1,031,600	20,817,688
LOC - Local Move Contract	N/A	Contractor	1,366	1.5	49	1,006	100,401	2,061,294
LTS - Long Term Storage Record	DND	Contractor	500	1.5	43	294	32,250	220,500
SIT - Storage In Transit Record	DND	Contractor	3,240	1.5	53	309	257,580	1,501,740
W/T - Waiting Time Record	DND	Contractor	1,350	1.5	61	215	123,252	435,375
REP - Receipt Reply	Contractor	DND	27,771	1	39	143	1,083,069	3,971,253
EST - Estimate Weight/Cost/Warehouse Code/Distance	Contractor	DND	11,682	1	63	200	735,966	2,336,400
QCI - Quality Control Inspection Report	DND	Contractor	2,000	1	73	315	143,000	630,000
RWT - Reweigh Report	DND	Contractor	100	1	79	429	7,900	42,900
LDR - Liquid Damages Record	DND	Contractor	200	1	55	307	11,000	61,400
DEL - Deletion/Cancellation Record	DND	Contractor	200	1	36	541	7,200	108,200
WHS - Warehouse Data Record	DND	Contractor	200	2	67	350	26,800	140,000
CLM - Claim Record	DND	Contractor	4,000	1	38	273	152,000	1,092,000

Regarding Tables at end of document, sheet 4 (General All-Inclusive Moving Services [GAMS] Moves Originating in Canada and the United States, Price for Evaluation Purposes) is missing mileage band 51-100. Please note that the Excel spreadsheets are correct.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME

Modes of Transportation for IP Relocations 2011/12

Modes of Transportation In						Modes of Transportation Out					
IP Location	Air	Barge	Rail	Truck	Combination		Air	Barge	Rail	Truck	Combination
Alberta											
FORT CHIPEWYAN, AB	1						1				
HIGH PRAIRIE, AB											
Manitoba											
Lynn Lake, MB							1				
PUKATAWAGAN, MB	2						1				
SHAMATTAWA, MB	3						2				
Poplar River, MB	2						2				
Little Grand Rapids, MB	2						1				
Oxford House, MB	6						6				
Bloodvein First Nation, MB	1										
GOD'S LAKE NARROWS, MB	2						2				
Island Lake, MB	2						2				
Churchill, MB	1								1		
NORWAY HOUSE, MB	1										
The Pas, MB	1										
Saskatchewan											
Stony Rapids, SK	1						1				
Wollaston Lake, SK	4	1					4				
La Loche, SK							1				
Shoal Lake, SK							1				
Fond Du Lac, SK	3						3				
Black Lake, SK	2										
Newfoundland											
Hopedale, NL		2		1				3			
Makkovik, NL		1						1			
Happy Valley, NL								1			
NORTH WEST RIVER, NL	1										
Nain, NL		3		1				3			
Goose Bay, NL							2	1			1
Natuashish, NL		2					1				1
North West Territories											
SACHS HARBOUR, NT	1						1				
Fort Good Hope, NT	3						4				
Norman Wells, NT	2						1				
Fort Simpson, NT							1				
Paulatuk, NT	1										1
Rae, NT	1			1							
Aklavik, NT	3						2				
Fort Providence, NT	1										
Edzo, NT											
Hay River, NT	1										
Fort McPherson, NT											
Ulukhaktok, NT	2						1				
Inuvik, NT	1						2				
Tulita, NT	2						1				
Deline, NT	1						1				
Nunavut											
TUKTOYAKTUK, NU	3						4				1
SANIKILUAQ, NU	1						1				
Cape Dorset, NU	1										
KUGAARUK, NU											
Igloolik, NU	1										
QIKIQTARJUAG, NU											
CHESTERFIELD INLET, NU											
CORAL HARBOUR, NU	1										
Baker Lake, NU	1						1				
KUGLUKTUK, NU	1						2				
PANGNIRTUNG, NU							1				
Clyde River, NU	2						2				
Arctic Bay, NU	1						2				
Cambridge Bay, NU	4			1			3				
Whale Cove, NU	2										
GJOA HAVEN, NU	1						1				
Pond Inlet, NU	1						3				
Arviat, NU	2										
Iqaluit, NU	13	1					21				3
RANKIN INLET, NU	1						1				
Yukon											
Teslin, YT											
Old Crow, YT											
Watson Lake, YT											

Modes of Transportation for IP Relocations 2012/13

IP Location	Modes of Transportation In					Modes of Transportation Out				
	Air	Barge	Rail	Truck	Combination	Air	Barge	Rail	Truck	Combination
Alberta										
Assumption, AB						1				
Fox Lake, AB	1			1						
FORT CHIPEWYAN, AB	1					1				
Manitoba										
PUKATAWAGAN, MB	4			1		4			1	
SHAMATTAWA, MB	3					5				
Poplar River, MB	2					1				
Little Grand Rapids, MB	2					3				
Oxford House, MB	2					1				
Bloodvein First Nation, MB	1					1				
Flin Flon, MB	1									
GOD'S LAKE NARROWS, MB	2					2				
Island Lake, MB	3					2				
Churchill, MB			1					1		
NORWAY HOUSE, MB	1							1		
Saskatchewan										
Stony Rapids, SK	4					1				
Wollaston Lake, SK	3									
Cumberland House, SK						1				
Shoal Lake, SK	1									
Fond Du Lac, SK	2					2				
Newfoundland										
Hopedale, NL		2					2			
Makkovik, NL		1					1			
Nain, NL	1	2					2			
Rigolet, NL		1					1			
Grand Bank, NL						1				
Goose Bay, NL							1			
Natuashish, NL	1						1			
North West Territories										
SACHS HARBOUR, NT	1					2				
Fort Good Hope, NT	2								1	
Norman Wells, NT	3					1				
Fort Simpson, NT	1					2				
Paulatuk, NT	1					1				
Fort Providence, NT	1					1				
Edzo, NT						1				
Hay River, NT						1			1	
Fort McPherson, NT						2				
Wha-Ti, NT	1									
TUKTOYAKTUK, NT	1					1				
Uluksaktok, NT						1				
Inuvik, NT	2					1				
Lutselk'e, NT	2					2				
Tulita, NT	1					1				
Deline, NT	1					1				
Nunavut										
Cape Dorset, NU	2					2				
QIKIQTARJUAG, NU	1									
CORAL HARBOUR, NU	1					1				
Baker Lake, NU	2					2				
Repulse Bay, NU	2					1				
KUGLUKTUK, NU	3					3				
Kimmirut, NU	2					1				
Hall Beach, NU	2					1				
PANGNIRTUNG, NU	3					2				
Clyde River, NU	1					1				
Resolute Bay, NU						1				
Arctic Bay, NU	2					1				
Cambridge Bay, NU	2					2				
Whale Cove, NU	1					1				
Grise Fiord, NU	1					1				
GJOA HAVEN, NU	1									
Pond Inlet, NU	1									
Arviat, NU	2					2				
Iqaluit, NU	14	1		4		15	1		1	
RANKIN INLET, NU	3					3				
Yukon										
Old Crow, YT	1					1				
Ross River, YT						1	1			
Watson Lake, YT			1							