



Privy Council Office  
Bureau du Conseil privé

## Return Bids to / Retourner les soumissions à:

Privy Council Office/Bureau du Conseil privé  
Mail Reception Area/Salle de réception de courrier  
11 rue Metcalfe Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1P 5K9

## 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

Procurement and Contracting Services/  
Service des acquisitions et des contrats  
90 Sparks, Room/pièce 800  
Ottawa, Ontario (Canada) K1A 0A3

<b>Title / Sujet</b> Examining the Canadian and United States Rule-Making Processes		<b>Date</b> 2015-07-02
<b>Solicitation No. - No de l'invitation</b> 50022-14		<b>Amendment No. - No. de la modification</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - No de référence du client</b> N/A		
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b>  at -2:00 PM on -2015-08-10		<b>Time Zone Fuseau horaire</b>  Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)
<b>FOB - FAB</b> Does not change - Ne change pas		
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Kim McKortel		
<b>Email Address - Courriel</b> kim.mckortel@pco-bcp.gc.ca		<b>Fax No. - No de Fax</b> 613-947-0484
<b>Destination of Goods, Services and Construction: Destinations des biens, services et construction :</b>  Does not change - Ne change pas		

**Instructions :** Does not change

**Instructions :** Ne change pas

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>  Does not change - Ne change pas	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de telephone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> (type or print)  <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b> (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>



This amendment is raised to remove the Mandatory Technical Criteria and make changes to the Point-Rated Technical Criteria and to extend the closing date to August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015. See changes below:

## **SOLICITATION REVISIONS**

### **1) Table of Contents, Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection**

**DELETE:** Attachment 1 to Part 4, Mandatory and Point-Rated Technical Criteria

**INSERT:** Attachment 1 to Part 4, Point-Rated Technical Criteria

### **2) Part 1 – General Information, 1. Introduction**

**DELETE:** The Attachments include the Pricing Schedule and the Mandatory and Point-Rated Technical Criteria

**INSERT:** The Attachments include the Pricing Schedule and Point-Rated Technical Criteria

### **3) Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 1. Evaluation Procedures, 1.1 Technical Evaluation**

**DELETE:** 1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria

Refer to Attachment 1 to Part 4

### **4) Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 2. Basis of Selection – Highest Rated Within Budget**

**DELETE:** 1. To be declared responsive, a bid must:

- a. comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation;
- b. meet all mandatory technical evaluation criteria; and
- c. obtain the required minimum of 98 points overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 140 points.

2. Bids not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) will be declared non-responsive. The responsive bid with the highest number of points will be recommended for award of a contract, provided that the total evaluated price (Attachment 1 to Part 3) does not exceed the budget available for this requirement.

3. If there is more than one bidder having the highest number of points, the Bidder with the lowest total evaluated price (Attachment 1 to Part 3) will be recommended for award of a contract. If there is more than one bidder having the highest number of points and the same total evaluated price (Attachment 1 to Part 3), the Bidder who



achieved the highest point-rated score for R1 criteria will be recommended for award of a contract.

**INSERT:** 1. To be declared responsive, a bid must:

- a. comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation; and
  - b. obtain the required minimum of 98 points overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 140 points.
2. Bids not meeting (a) or (b) will be declared non-responsive. The responsive bid with the highest number of points will be recommended for award of a contract, provided that the total evaluated price (Attachment 1 to Part 3) does not exceed the budget available for this requirement.
3. If there is more than one bidder having the highest number of points, the Bidder with the lowest total evaluated price (Attachment 1 to Part 3) will be recommended for award of a contract. If there is more than one bidder having the highest number of points and the same total evaluated price (Attachment 1 to Part 3), the Bidder who achieved the highest point-rated score for R1 criteria will be recommended for award of a contract.

#### **5) Attachment 1 to Part 4, Mandatory and Point-Rated Technical Criteria**

**DELETE in its entirety.**

**INSERT:**

##### **Attachment 1 to Part 4, Point-Rated Technical Criteria**

The information provided by the Bidder in this RFP will be assessed according to the point-rated criteria listed below.

At bid closing, the Bidder must demonstrate **BEYOND ANY DOUBT** that the information provided complies with and meets the requirements set out in this solicitation and as outlined under the evaluation criteria.

Where a criterion specifies a timeframe (e.g. “within the last ten (10) years”), the Solicitation closing date is the point of reference. Experience acquired or project completed before the specified timeframe will not be considered.



Bidders are requested to provide a start date, end date, and reference (name, title, telephone number and email address) for each experience or project used to respond to a criterion.

Failure on the part of the Bidder not meeting the minimum points required will result in the proposal being deemed non-compliant and no further consideration will be given.

Definition of “**at least**” or “**minimum**”: the minimal expectation for a requirement. No points will be given if the minimal expectation is not demonstrated.

Definition of “**project**”: a mandate with specific duties, deliverables and specific period, which involved a level of effort of at least 30 days on the part of the proposed resource. A project can be performed by a consultant, an academic, or as part of an employee’s regular work duties.

### POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA

Experience of the Bidder		Maximum Points Available	Points Obtained	Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV
R1	<p>The Bidder should have experience in conducting research, or providing policy analysis/advice, or implementing government decisions in the past ten years involving the Canadian or U.S. regulatory process, including the statutory and policy environment under which regulators operate.</p> <p>An additional 20 points will be awarded if the Bidder can demonstrate experience in conducting research, or providing analysis/advice, or implementing government decisions related to the regulatory process in both Canada and the U.S.</p> <p>To meet this criterion, only projects that include the experience of at least one of the resources proposed for this RFP will be considered for evaluation purposes.</p>	<p>Maximum points available: 60 pts</p> <p>1 project: 10 pts 2 projects: 20 pts 3 projects: 30 pts 4 or more projects: 40 pts</p> <p>Additional pts: 20 pts</p>		



	<b>Understanding of the Requirement</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	<b>Points Obtained</b>	<b>Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV</b>
<b>R2</b>	The Bidder should demonstrate an understanding of the complexity, objectives and scope of the project.	<p>No information provided: 0 pts</p> <p>Poor/Limited: limited understanding; re-states information provided in Statement of Work: 1 to 10 pts</p> <p>Fair/Good: demonstrates a fair to good understanding of the complexity, objectives and scope of the project; elaborating on what is in the Statement of Work: 11 to-19 pts</p> <p>Excellent: very comprehensive understanding of the complexity, objectives and scope of the project: supported by use of external documents/studies/research: 20 to 25 pts</p>		

Technical Approach		Maximum Points Available	Points Obtained	Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV
R3	Proposed approach and discussion of methodologies used for collecting data and conducting research towards ensuring project objectives will be met.	<p>No information provided: 0 pts</p> <p>Poor/Limited: approach and discussion of methodologies used for collecting data and conducting research, lacking sufficient detail to demonstrate that project objectives will be met: 1 to 5 pts</p> <p>Fair/Good: approach and discussion of methodologies towards ensuring project objectives will be met: 6 to 10 pts</p> <p>Excellent: approach and discussion of methodologies used for collecting data and conducting research, demonstrating ample knowledge, insight and detail to ensure project objectives will be met: 11 to 15 pts</p>		



	<b>Project Management Methodology</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	<b>Points Obtained</b>	<b>Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV</b>
<b>R4</b>	<p>The Bidder should describe their project management approach and methodology to ensure quality and achievement of project objectives. The methodology should be supported by a proposed work plan and a level of effort and schedule that demonstrates a logical organization of tasks to be completed. The level of effort for each task should align with the purpose and scope of the methodology, as well as with the technical approach described in R3.</p>	<p>No information provided: 0 pts</p> <p>Poor/Limited: project management approach and methodology are limited; does not demonstrate a logical organization of tasks to be completed; with flaws that could compromise the quality of the project or achievement of project objectives: 1 to 5 pts</p> <p>Fair/Good: project management approach and methodology demonstrate a logical organization of tasks to be completed and their scheduling; with flaws that do not necessarily compromise the quality or achievement of project objectives: 6 to 10 pts</p> <p>Excellent: project management approach and methodology demonstrate ample knowledge, insight and detail to ensure project objectives will be met using a logical organization of</p>		



		tasks to be completed; with no flaws identified: 11 to 15 pts		
	<b>Example of Written Work From the Bidder</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	<b>Points Obtained</b>	<b>Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV</b>
<b>R5</b>	<p>The Bidder should provide an example of previous work on a research and analysis project of similar scope and complexity (e.g., a final report, interim report) to demonstrate the Bidder's written and analytical capabilities.</p> <p>To meet this criterion, only work examples that have been produced by, (or by a team that included) at least one of the resources proposed for this RFP will be considered for evaluation purposes.</p>	<p>No work sample: 0 pts</p> <p>Poor/Limited: work sample is overly technical, uses an inappropriate tone and level of detail for the audience, is not logically sequenced, does not demonstrate analytical rigour or soundness of conclusions/recommendations: 1 to 10 pts</p> <p>Fair/Good: work sample is easily understood, covers key points, uses an appropriate tone and level of detail for the audience, presents points in a reasonable sequence, demonstrates sound analysis and provides conclusions/ recommendations which flow from the evidence in the paper: 11 to 19 pts</p> <p>Excellent: work sample is engaging and convincing to readers, thorough in its coverage of relevant issues, uses an</p>		





		appropriate tone and level of detail for the audience, is well-organized and logical in its flow, provides excellent or original analysis and evidence and provides convincing conclusions/ recommendations which flow logically from the evidence in the paper: 20 to 25 pts		
<b>Maximum Points Available – 140</b>				
<b>Minimum Points Required – 98</b>				
<b>TOTAL POINTS ACHIEVED</b>				