



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

Title / Sujet Funding Collaboration in the Context of Canada-United States Regulatory Cooperation		Date 2015-07-02
Solicitation No. - No de l'invitation 50023-14		Amendment No. - No. de la modification 002
Client Reference No. - No de référence du client N/A		
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at -2:00 PM on -2015-08-10		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)
FOB - FAB Does not change - Ne change pas		
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Kim McKortel		
Email Address - Courriel kim.mckortel@pco-bcp.gc.ca		Fax No. - No de Fax 613-947-0484
Destination of Goods, Services and Construction: Destinations des biens, services et construction : Does not change - Ne change pas		

Instructions : Does not change

Instructions : Ne change pas

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée Does not change - Ne change pas	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de telephone 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



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 10th, 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 108 points overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 155 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 108 points overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 155 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 regarding statutes, rules and policies related to Canadian or U.S. government financial authorities and procedures.</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 federal government financial management and systems/policies in both Canada and the U.S.</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>		



	<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>Experience of the Bidder</p>		<p>Maximum Points Available</p>	<p>Points Obtained</p>	<p>Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV</p>
<p>R2</p>	<p>The Bidder should have experience in conducting research, or providing policy analysis/advice, or implementing government decisions in the past ten years involving financial management authorities, policies and/or processes specific to relevant Canadian and/or U.S. regulatory departments. See Statement of Work for a list of relevant departments.</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>No experience: 0 pts</p> <p>Experience with one relevant department: 5 pts</p> <p>Experience with two relevant departments: 10 pts</p> <p>Experience with three or more relevant departments: 15 pts</p>		



	Understanding of the Requirement	Maximum Points Available	Points Obtained	Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV
R3	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate an understanding of the complexity, objectives and scope of the project.</p>	<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
R4	<p>Proposed approach and discussion of methodologies used for collecting data and conducting research towards ensuring project objectives will be met.</p>	<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>		



	Project Management Methodology	Maximum Points Available	Points Obtained	Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV
R5	<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 R4.</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 tasks to be completed; with no flaws identified: 11 to 15 pts</p>		



	Example of Written Work From the Bidder	Maximum Points Available	Points Obtained	Cross-Reference From Relevant Experience From Proposal and/or CV
R6	<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 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</p>		



		paper: 20 to 25 pts		
	Maximum Points Available – 155 Minimum Points Required – 108			
	TOTAL POINTS ACHIEVED			