



RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À :
Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada
Contracting and Procurement Section
340 Laurier Avenue West,
1st Floor Mailroom –
Ottawa ON K1A 0P8
Attention:

Request for Information

Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution
Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada
Contracting and Procurement Section
269 Laurier Avenue West
13th Floor, Office 13B-37
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P8

Title – Sujet A Study Group on Youth Delinquency and Transitions to Adult Crime in the Canadian Context	
Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 201601239	Date 2015-11-16
Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin	
At – à 02:00 PM	Time Zone
On – le 2015-12-01	Fuseau horaire EST
Delivery Required – Livraison exigée See Herein	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Barry McKenna	
Telephone No. – N° de telephone (613) 990-3981	FAX No. – N° de FAX (613) 954-1871
Destination – of Goods, Services and Construction: Destination – des biens, services et construction: Public Safety Canada 269 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P8	
Security – Sécurité No security provisions	
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 due fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date



**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) FOR
A Study Group on Youth Delinquency and
Transitions to Adult Crime in the Canadian Context
FOR
Community Safety and Countering Crime Branch
PUBLIC SAFETY CANADA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION OBJECTIVES

- A1.0 Background
- A2.0 RFI Objective
- A3.0 Requirement Definition

SECTION B: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- B1.0 Submission of Responses
- B2.0 Authorities
- B3.0 Industry Responses

SECTION C: PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

- C1.0 Procurement Strategy
- C2.0 Statement of Work
- C3.0 Evaluation Strategy
- C4.0 Pricing Schedule
- C5.0 Basis of Payment
- C6.0 Security Requirements

SECTION D: QUESTIONS FOR INDUSTRY

- D1.0 General
- D2.0 Statement of Work
- D3.0 Evaluation Criteria
- D4.0 Pricing Schedule
- D5.0 Basis of Payment
- D6.0 Procurement Strategy
- D7.0 Additional Comments

- Annex A Statement of Work
- Annex B Evaluation Criteria
- Annex C Pricing Schedule
- Annex D Basis of Payment



SECTION A: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION OBJECTIVES

A1.0 Background

Public Safety Canada (PS) is in the planning process to prepare a competitive Request For Proposals to engage a team of experts to conduct research into the connection between youth and adult crime in Canada.

A2.0 Objective

The purpose of the RFI is to provide interested parties with an opportunity to assess and comment on requirements, procurement strategy, evaluation criteria, pricing schedule, and basis of payment in order to maximize best value to Canada, while reducing potential problems when the RFP is posted.

This feedback will assist PS in finalizing the requirements of the RFP.

A3.0 Requirement Definition

The information provided by PS in this RFI is preliminary and may change. The final procurement approach may differ depending on responses to the RFI and other factors as the procurement process develops. This RFI is not a bid solicitation nor will it be used to pre-qualify or otherwise restrict participation in any future RFP. No contract will result from this RFI. Responses will not be formally evaluated.

Potential offerors may use this RFI to make known their comments on the draft Statement of Work, proposed procurement approach and methodology, potential evaluation and selection criteria or any other aspect of the requirement.

Suppliers are to send their written comments in response to this RFI by e-mail to the SO Authority named herein no later than **2:00 PM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on December 1 , 2015**.

SECTION B: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

B1.0 Submission of Responses

B1.1 Number of Copies

Responses submitted by e-mail - 1 copy.

B1.2 Location

Responses must be sent to the Contracting Authority by e-mail. Contact information is contained in B2.1.

The Respondent's name, address, RFI solicitation number and closing date should be clearly visible on the response. Responses to this RFI will not be returned.



B2.0 Authorities

B2.1 Contracting Authority

The Contracting Authority (or delegated representative) is responsible for the management of the procurement and RFI process:

Barry McKenna
Contracting and Procurement
Public Safety Canada
269 Laurier Ave West, Ottawa ON K1A 0P8
Telephone: 613-990-3891
Facsimile: (613) 954-1871
E-mail: barry.mckenna@ps.gc.ca

B3.0 Industry Responses

B3.1 Response Format

For ease of use and in order that the greatest value be gained from responses, Canada requests respondents to follow the structure outlined in Section D - Questions for Industry. There is no page limit on the information to be provided. Responses should be submitted in either Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF.

B3.2 Language of Response

Responses may be in English or French, at the preference of the respondent.

B3.3 Response Parameters

Responders are reminded that this is an RFI and not an RFP and, in that regard, Responders should feel free to provide their comments, concerns, and, where applicable, alternative recommendations on how the requirement may be satisfied. Also, in responding to this RFI, Responders are asked to clearly explain any assumptions they may wish to make.

B3.4 Response Confidentiality

Responders are requested to clearly identify those portions of their response that are proprietary to the Responder. The confidentiality of each Responders response will be maintained. However, due to the nature of the RFI activity Responders must be aware that aspects of their response may be used as a basis for modifying the draft documents as Canada prepares for the future procurement.

SECTION C: PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

C1.0 Procurement Strategy

C1.1 Contract Period

The proposed length of the contract is for a period from date of issuance to March 31, 2018.

C1.2 Task Authorizations

The proposed contract will be for an initial period of defined work (Phase1), which may be followed by one or more task authorizations over the remaining period of the contract. The task authorization(s) will define discrete research activities based on an agreed-upon statement of work.



The task authorization process will be as follows:

C1.2.1 For each task or revision of a previously authorized task, the Technical Authority will provide the Contractor with a request to perform a task containing as a minimum:

1. the task description of the Work required, including:
 - a) the details of the activities or revised activities to be performed;
 - b) a description of the deliverables or revised deliverables to be submitted; and
 - c) a schedule or revised schedule indicating completion dates for the major activities or submission dates for the deliverables, or both, as applicable;
2. the Contract basis (bases) of payment applicable to the task or revised task; and
3. the Contract method(s) of payment applicable to the task or revised task and, as applicable, the associated schedule of milestones

C1.2.2 Within five (5) calendar days of its receipt of the request, the Contractor must provide the Technical Authority with a signed and dated response prepared and submitted using the TA form received from the Technical Authority, containing as a minimum the total estimated cost proposed for performing the task and a breakdown of that cost in accordance with Annex B, to be provided, as applicable, per deliverable contained in the Schedule of Deliverables

C1.2.3 TA Authorization

C1.2.3.1 The TA Authority will authorize the TA based on:

1. the request submitted to the Contractor pursuant to paragraph 1.2.1 above;
2. the Contractor's response received, submitted pursuant to paragraph 1.2.2 above, and;
3. the agreed total estimated cost for performing the task or, as applicable, revised task and, as applicable, the breakdown of that cost per milestone contained in the Schedule of Milestones.

C1.2.3.2 The authorized TA will be issued to the Contractor by email by the Contracting Authority.

C1.3 Selection Methodology

The selection methodology is described in Item 3, Annex B.

C2.0 Statement of Work

The Statement of Work is contained in Annex A.

C3.0 Evaluation Strategy

C3.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria

The Mandatory Technical Criteria are contained in Annex B.

C3.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria

The Point-Rated Technical Criteria are contained in Annex B.

C4.0 Pricing Schedule



The Pricing Schedule is contained in Annex C.

C5.0 Basis of Payment

The Basis of Payment is contained in Annex D.

C6.0 Security Requirements

There are no security requirements associated with the contract

SECTION D: QUESTIONS FOR INDUSTRY

The respondent is requested to provide comments/feedback on the following set of questions preferably in the order in which they appear.

D1.0 General

D1.1 A brief corporate profile of the respondent (or the actual or intended respondent consortium) including name and phone number of a contact person, an indication of level of interest in a potential Solicitation in whole or in part including the size of the business (micro business 1- 4 employees, small business 5 - 50 employees, medium business 51 – 499 employees, large business 500+ employees).

D2.0 Statement of Work

D2.1 Do you see any challenges with establishing, coordinating and ensuring the commitment of the study group members over the duration of the project? If so please outline the challenges or concerns and offer recommendations to resolve them.

D2.2 Do you foresee and issues with data access and sharing? If so, please outline your concern(s) and any recommendations to resolve them.

D2.3 Do you have any concerns with respect to the tasks and/or reports and/or deliverables? If so, please outline your concern(s) and any recommendations to resolve them.

D3.0 Evaluation Criteria

D3.1 Are there any comments and/or concerns with any of the Mandatory Technical Criteria that make this requirement too restrictive and/or unrealistic? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D3.2 Are there any comments and/or concerns with any of the Point Rated Technical Criteria? Do you have any comments and/or concerns with respect to the Point Scale? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D3.3 Do the evaluation criteria facilitate the formation of a study group that has the appropriate experience and expertise to meet the objectives of the project?

D3.3 Do you have any additional comments, concerns, and/or alternate solutions with respect to the Evaluation Criteria?



D4.0 Pricing Schedule

D4.1 Are there any comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Pricing Schedule? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D4.2 Are there any additional comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Pricing Schedule? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D5.0 Basis of Payment

D5.1 Are there any comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Basis of Payment? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D5.2 Are there any additional comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Basis of Payment? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D6.0 Procurement Strategy

D6.1 Are there any comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Task Authorization approach identified in Section C1.2 above? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D6.2 Are there any comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Selection Methodology identified in Item 3 of Annex B? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D6.3 Are there any additional comments and/or concerns with respect to the proposed Procurement Strategy identified in Section C? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

D7.0 Additional Comments

D7.1 Are there any additional comments and/or concerns with respect to this proposed procurement that has not been addressed elsewhere? If so, what alternative solution would address your concern(s)?

ANNEX A

STATEMENT OF WORK

1. INTRODUCTION

Public Safety Canada has a requirement to engage a Contractor that will establish a Study Group to guide and undertake research into the connection between youth and adult crime in Canada. Once established, the Study Group will be engaged in research activities through one or more Task Authorizations which will define specific areas of research and the research products to be delivered. The Contractor will be responsible for all work performed by the Study Group and for the fulfillment all contractual obligations arising from the contract and the Task Authorizations, including provision of the deliverables as well as contract management (for example, task authorization agreements, invoicing, managing co-ordination of the Study Group members, etc.).

2. CONTEXT

The Government of Canada is committed to reducing crime and enhancing the safety of our communities through effective prevention, policing, and corrections. With respect to prevention, Public Safety Canada is responsible for the administration of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS). The Strategy aims to reduce offending among at-risk groups of the population by funding evidence-based interventions and knowledge dissemination projects. Its current priorities are to address early risk factors among children, youth, and young adults who are at risk of offending, respond to priority crime issues (youth gangs, drug-related crimes), facilitate exit from prostitution, prevent recidivism among high-risk groups, and foster crime prevention in Aboriginal communities.

In this context, the Crime Prevention (CP) Research Unit, within Public Safety Canada, aims to provide national leadership on effective and cost-efficient ways to prevent and to reduce crime by addressing risk factors in high-risk populations and places. Focusing on effective ways to prevent and reduce crime, the CP Research Unit continues to gather and collate both national and international evidence on “what works”, in order to help guide policy and program decisions. This information contributes to the overall body of scientific knowledge in the crime prevention domain. In support of these efforts, the work described below will focus generating new Canadian knowledge on the linkages between juvenile delinquency and adult crime, and help to identify the optimal points for intervention in order to avert long-term offending.

3. BACKGROUND

Over the last couple of decades, numerous theoretical and methodological advances have substantially enhanced knowledge of the onset, maintenance, and desistance of criminal activity over the life course (for reviews, see Farrington, 2005, MacLeod, Grove, & Farrington, 2012; Soothill, Fitzpatrick, & Francis, 2013; Thornberry & Krohn, 2003). Moreover, studies have also provided a better understanding of the relationships between risk factors and offending pathways (Farrington, 2003, 2007), as well as a more comprehensive picture of the cumulative monetary costs of long-term offending (Cohen & Piquero, 2009; Cohen, Piquero, & Jennings, 2010a, 2010b). Although the vast majority of longitudinal studies of criminal behaviour have been conducted in the United States (e.g., Doherty & Ensminger, 2014; Gilman et al., 2014; Huizinga, Weiher, Espiritu, & Esbensen, 2003; Loeber et al, 1998; Loeber & Farrington, 2012; Thornberry, Lizotte, Krohn, Smith, & Porter, 2003) and the United Kingdom (e.g., Farrington et al., 2006; Piquero, Farrington, & Blumstein, 2007), Canadian investigators have also made recent, substantial progress in understanding pathways from juvenile to adult crime based on research with a wide variety of cohort databases (e.g., Craig, Petrunka, & Khan, 2011; Day et al, 2012a, 2012b; Fontaine, Lacourse, Vitaro, & Tremblay, 2014; Giles, 2011; Koegl, 2011; Wanklyn, Ward, Cormier, Day, & Newman, 2012; Ward et al., 2010; Yessine & Bonta, 2009, 2012).

However, there have been no recent, systematic attempts to:

- integrate and collate the existing body of Canadian research on life course offending;
- summarize the main gaps; and
- formulate additional key questions regarding the linkages between youth and adult crime that could potentially be explored further with available databases .



ANNEX A STATEMENT OF WORK

An updated understanding of offending trajectories, particularly in the Canadian context, would facilitate the development of more effective criminal justice policy and programs. In particular, additional research will help to identify the optimal points for intervention, establishing baselines for monitoring program effectiveness with at-risk populations, and conducting cost-benefit analysis of crime prevention programs.

4. OBJECTIVES

Similar to initiatives recently carried out in the US (Loeber & Farrington, 2012) and The Netherlands (Hoeve, Slot, van der Laan, & Loeber, 2012), Public Safety aims to establish a Study Group (SG) which will aim to:

1. take stock of current research on the existing offender cohort databases that have already been established in Canada
2. conduct some novel analyses on the connections between youth and adult crime, using the databases to which members of the project team already have access;
3. prepare research reports and summaries that communicate the findings, implications, and recommendations effectively to researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.

5. SCOPE OF WORK

As described in more detail below, the work will be conducted in two phases.

5.1. Phase 1

The first phase focuses on:

- Assembling the SG.
- Developing a preliminary literature review that:
 - provides an up-to-date synthesis of research on criminal trajectories (i.e., transitions from youth to adult crime) and the various risk factors contributing to these trajectories, with a particular focus on Canadian studies and cohort databases;
 - identifies the major research gaps with regard to criminal trajectory research in the Canadian context.
- Creating a general research workplan for addressing the research gaps identified in the literature review, including a clear description of:
 - the nature of each gap;
 - the types of data sources required to address each gap; and
 - the analytical methods that will be applied.

Note that the SG will be formed externally by the successful Bidder (and not identified or nominated by Public Safety). It is anticipated that the SG will consist of 5-6 experts with scholarly track records based on quantitative research in the fields of criminal justice, crime prevention, and criminology. For the duration of the project, the members of the SG will be expected to collaborate under the general leadership of a Principal Investigator appointed by the Contractor.

The Contractor will be responsible for all aspects of the management and administration of the Study Group including, but not limited to the following:

- determining the frequency, agenda and location of all meetings of the SG and
- any administrative support required for the preparation and delivery of reports and presentations

5.1. Phase 2

On the basis of the literature review and general research workplan described in Phase 1, the Technical Authority will create detailed Task Authorization(s) outlining the preparation of specific deliverables, which will initiate the core research and analysis for the project. In general, the work under Phase 2 is anticipated to include (but not be limited to) the following:



**ANNEX A
STATEMENT OF WORK**

- performing descriptive and inferential statistical analysis on existing Canadian databases to answer novel research questions about the connections between youth and adult crime, as well the influence of risk factors on these offending pathways;
- preparing a series of 6-8 in-depth, thematic research reports
- writing a summary bulletin for each of the reports, which will highlight the key findings and recommendations for policymakers and practitioners;

The study methodology, research questions, and analytical methods will be developed and finalized based on discussions between the SG and the Technical Authority, and then specified in the Task Authorization(s) (TA).

The Contractor will collaborate with Public Safety researchers and evaluators on publications and presentations, and ensure that the information can be readily consumed by non-governmental organizations responsible for implementing crime prevention projects in the Canadian context.

6. DELIVERABLES AND SCHEDULE

The period of work is from the contract start date until March 2018. Following contract award, an initial orientation meeting (teleconference) will be held with the SG, to provide any feedback on the proposal and ensure a common understanding of how the SG will function.

For **Phase 1** (see section 5.1), the Contractor must submit the following deliverables:

- A review of the current research literature on criminal trajectories (i.e., transitions from youth to adult crime) and the various risk factors contributing to these trajectories, with a particular focus on Canadian studies and cohort databases;
- A general workplan focused on addressing the major research gaps identified in the literature review.

The results of the literature review will be presented in a succinct research report, which will take into account the feedback of the Project Authority. The final report must include an abstract (approximately 100 words); a structured executive summary (3-4 pages); and a main report (maximum 40 pages, including references but excluding annexes, and appendices). Annexes and appendices can be used to present supporting methodological and analytical documentation not central to communicating the main findings. The general research workplan can be presented as an Annex or Appendix to the main report.

In **Phase 2**, TAs will be developed based on the general workplan developed in **Phase 1**. Once the TAs are finalized, it is anticipated that in order to maximize efficiency, the Contractor will coordinate the work of the various SG members such that many aspects of the project are (to the extent possible) developed concurrently (e.g., additional literature reviews, development of analytical plans, and data analysis). Timelines for the preparation of particular deliverables will be specified in the TAs.

6.1 Phase 1

Deliverable	Due Date
6.11 Start Date	Date of contract award
6.12 Project kick-off meeting with the Technical Authority	Within five days of the contract award
6.13 Outline of literature review	Within 10 days of receipt of comments on the proposed approach from the Technical Authority.
6.14 Draft of literature review	Within 12 weeks of the contract award
6.15 Final literature review	Within 16 weeks of the contract award



**ANNEX A
STATEMENT OF WORK**

6.16	Draft of general research workplan	Within 16 weeks of the contract award
6.17	Final general research workplan	Within 18 weeks of the contract award

6.2 Phase 2

Development of TAs begins 20 weeks after contract award.

7. REPORTING AND COMMUNICATION.

In addition to the timely submission of all deliverables and fulfilment of obligations specified within the contract, it is the responsibility of the Contractor to facilitate and maintain regular communication with the Technical Authority. Communication is defined as all reasonable effort to inform all parties of plans, decisions, proposed approaches, implementation, and results of work, to ensure that the project is progressing well and in accordance with expectations. Communication may include: phone calls, electronic mail, faxes, mailings, and meetings. In addition, the Contractor is to immediately notify the Department of any issues, problems, or areas of concern in relation to any work completed under the contract, as they arise.

8. WORK LOCATION.

Report preparation (e.g., literature review, data analysis, and writing) will be done at the Contractor's and/or hired project team members' offices. Note that throughout the duration of the project, the Contractor is responsible for any travel (e.g., meetings) required to execute the work.

9. LANGUAGE

All deliverables are to be submitted in English.

10. REFERENCES

Cohen, M.A, & Piquero, A.R. (2009). New Evidence on the Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 25, 25-49.

Cohen, M.A, Piquero, A.R., & Jennings, W.G. (2010a). Estimating the Costs of Bad Outcomes for At-Risk Youth and the Benefits of Early Childhood Interventions to Reduce Them. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 21(4), 391-434.

Cohen, M.A, Piquero, A.R., & Jennings, W.G. (2010b). Studying the Costs of Crime across Offender Trajectories. *Criminology & Public Policy* 9:279-305.

Craig, W., Petrunka, K., & Khan, S. (2011). Better Beginnings, Better Futures Study: Delinquency Trajectories. Research Report 2011-03. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), Public Safety Canada.

Day, D.M., Nielsen, J.D., Ward, A.K., Rosenthal, J.S., Sun, Y., Bevc, I., & Duchesne, T. (2012a). Criminal Trajectories of two subsamples of adjudicated ontario youths. Research Report 2012-1. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), Public Safety Canada.

Day, D. M., Nielsen, J.D., Ward, A. K., Sun, Y., Rosenthal, J. S., Duchesne, T., Bevc, I., & Rossman, L. (2012b). Long-term follow-up of criminal activity with adjudicated youth in Ontario: Identifying offence trajectories and predictors/correlates of trajectory group membership. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 54(4), 377-413.



ANNEX A
STATEMENT OF WORK

- Doherty, E.E., & Ensminger, M.E. (2014). Do the adult criminal careers of African Americans fit the “facts”? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(6), 517–526.
- Farrington, D. P. (2003). Developmental and life course criminology: Key theoretical and empirical issues—The 2002 Sutherland award address. *Criminology*, 41, 221-255.
- Farrington, D.P. (2005, Ed.). *Integrated developmental and life-course theories of offending*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Farrington, D.P. (2007). Childhood risk factors and risk-focused prevention. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of criminology* (pp. 602-640). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fontaine, N. M. G., Lacourse, É., Vitaro, F. & Tremblay, R. E. (2014). Links between trajectories of self-reported violent and non-violent offending and official offending during adolescence and adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 24(4), 277-290.
- Giles, C.M.H. (2011). *The criminal careers of chronic offenders in Vancouver, British Columbia*. Doctorial Dissertation. Vancouver, BC: Simon Fraser University.
- Gilman A.B., Hill K.G., Kim, B.K.E., Nevell, A., Hawkins, J.D., & Farrington D.P. (2014). Understanding the relationship between self-reported offending and official criminal charges across early adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 24(4), 229–240.
- Hoeve, M., Slot, N.W., van der Laan, P.H., & Loeber, R. (2012, Eds.) *Persisters and Desisters in Crime from Adolescence into Adulthood: Explanation, Prevention, and Punishment*. Surrey, England: Ashgate.
- Huizinga, D., Weiher, A.W., Espiritu, R.C., & Esbensen, F. (2003). Delinquency and crime: Some highlights from the Denver Youth Survey. In T.P. Thornberry and M. Krohn (Eds.), *Taking stock: An overview of findings from contemporary longitudinal studies* (p. 47-92). NY, New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Koegl, C.J. (2011). *High-risk antisocial children: Predicting future criminal and health outcomes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge.
- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D.P. (2012, Eds.). *From Juvenile Delinquency to Adult Crime: Criminal Careers, Justice Policy and Prevention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loeber, R., Farrington, D. Stouthamer-Loeber, M, Moffitt, T.E, & Caspi, A. (1998). The development of male offending: Key findings from the first decade of the Pittsburgh Youth Study. *Studies in Crime and Crime Prevention*, 7, 141-172.
- MacLeod, J.F., Grove, P., & Farrington, D. (2012). *Explaining Criminal Careers: Implications for Justice Policy*. Oxord, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Piquero, A.R., Farrington, D.P., & Blumstein, A. (2003). The Criminal Career Paradigm. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 359-506
- Piquero, A.R., Farrington, D.P., & Blumstein, A. (2007). *Key Issues in Criminal Career Research: New Analyses of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Soothill, K., Fitzpatrick, C., & Francis, B. (2009). *Understanding Criminal Careers*. Portland, ORE: Millan.
- Thornberry, T.P., Lizotte, A.J., Krohn, M.D., Smith, C.A., & Porter, P.K. (2003). Causes and consequences of delinquency: Findings from the Rochester Youth Development Study. In T.P. Thornberry and M.D. Krohn (Eds.), *Taking stock: An overview of findings from contemporary longitudinal studies* (p. 11-46). NY, New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.



ANNEX A
STATEMENT OF WORK

Thornberry, T.P., & Krohn, M.D. (2003, Eds.). Taking stock of delinquency: An overview of findings from contemporary longitudinal studies. New York, NY: Kluwer.

Wanklyn, S. G., Ward, A. K., Cormier, N. S., Day, D. M., & Newman, J. (2012). Can we distinguish juvenile violent sex offenders, violent nonsex offenders, and versatile violent sex offenders based on childhood risk factors? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 2128-2143.

Ward, A. K., Day, D. M., Bevc, I., Sun, Y., Rosenthal, J. S., & Duchesne, T. (2010). Criminal trajectories and risk factors in a Canadian sample of offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 1278-1300.

Yessine, A. K., & Bonta, J. (2009). The offending trajectories of youthful Aboriginal offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 51, 435-472.

Yessine, A. K., & Bonta, J. (2012). The Offending Trajectories of Youth Probationers from Early Adolescence to Middle Adulthood: Relation to Dual Taxonomies. Research Report 2012-4. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), Public Safety Canada.



EVALUATION CRITERIA and SELECTION METHODOLOGY

It is expected that this project will require a multidisciplinary team, including both senior and junior members (i.e., research assistants). It is assumed that the senior team members will comprise the expert panel, of which one member will be designated as the Principal Investigator, who will assume overall responsibility for the entire project, including coordination of research team members and communication with the Project Authority.

The Bidder will submit a proposal specifying each proposed member of the expert study panel and their supporting qualifications, in accordance with the evaluation criteria below.

1. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

It is suggested that the structure of the first part of the proposal follow the mandatory requirements, that is, a clearly identified section for each mandatory requirement that explains explicitly how the senior members of the project team meet the stated mandatory requirement. Note that it is not sufficient to just state that the criterion is met, or simply point to a CV for a list of achievements and work history; rather, the responses must explain in detail how the criterion is met.

PROPOSALS NOT MEETING THE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS BELOW WILL BE GIVEN NO FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

Item	Evaluation Criteria	Bidder's Response (Specify Below- "Meets Requirement" or "Does Not Meet Requirement")	
		MEETS	DOESN'T MEET
M1	The Bidder must sign the first page of this Request for Proposal indicating their acceptance of all terms and conditions set out herein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M2	The Bidder must demonstrate that the Principal Investigator has a minimum of 10 years of research experience conducting quantitative research related to young offenders and/or youth at risk of offending. Note that to meet this criterion, it is not sufficient to simply refer to the Principal Investigator's curriculum vitae. The Bidder should explain in detail how, where, and when the experience was obtained.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M3	The Bidder should demonstrate that two senior members of the project team each have access to a Canadian database containing information on offenders, spanning both adolescent (i.e., somewhere in the range of 12-17 years) and adult (i.e., 18 years and above) years. Note that to meet this criterion, the same Canadian database cannot be identified for multiple project team members (i.e., any specific database listed will only be counted once). A general description of the databases and their contents must be provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M4	The Bidder must supply a full and up to date curriculum vitae for all senior members of the project team.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



2 RATED REQUIREMENTS

The proposal will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the rated evaluation criteria described below. It is suggested that each criterion be addressed in depth. Items not addressed will be given a score of zero. It is suggested that the structure of the second part of proposal follow the rated requirements, and explain explicitly how the senior project team members meet the rated requirements.

NOTE THAT THE SAME PROJECT TEAM MEMBER CANNOT BE USED TO MEET MULTIPLE RATED CRITERIA, AS AT LEAST 4 SENIOR PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS ARE REQUIRED.

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Demonstrated Experience	Proposal / Resume Ref.
R1	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that the Principal Investigator has a track record of peer-reviewed publications based on quantitative research related to young offenders and/or youth at risk of offending.</p> <p>Note that to meet this criterion, it is not sufficient to simply provide a bibliographic list of publications. Each publication must be accompanied by a brief explanation of why it meets the criterion (e.g., short paragraph describing the study purpose, nature of the sample, and analytical methods used).</p>	20	<p>Points will be awarded as follows:</p> <p>20 points – the Principal Investigator has peer-reviewed career publications based on research in the area of criminology – 5 points per work to a maximum of 20 points.</p>		
R2	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that three senior members (excluding the Principal Investigator) of the project team each have peer-reviewed publications based on quantitative longitudinal analysis of data on young offenders and/or youth at risk of offending.</p> <p>Note that to meet this criterion, it is not sufficient to simply provide a bibliographic list of publications. Each publication must be accompanied by a brief explanation of why it meets the criterion (e.g., short paragraph describing the study purpose, nature of the sample, and analytical methods used).</p>	60	<p>Points will be awarded as follows:</p> <p>60 points – three senior members of the project team each have peer-reviewed publications based on quantitative longitudinal analysis of data on young offenders and/or youth at risk of offending</p> <p>For each of the three senior project team members – 5 points per work to a maximum of 20 points.</p>		
R3	The Bidder should		Points will be awarded as		



ANNEX B

EVALUATION CRITERIA and SELECTION METHODOLOGY

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Demonstrated Experience	Proposal / Resume Ref.
	<p>demonstrate that one senior member of the project team has peer-reviewed publications based on quantitative longitudinal analysis on the links between juvenile and adult offending.</p> <p>Note that to meet this criterion, it is not sufficient to simply provide a bibliographic list of publications. Each publication must be accompanied by a brief explanation of why it meets the criterion (e.g., short paragraph describing the study purpose, nature of the sample, and analytical methods used).</p>	20	<p>follows:</p> <p>20 points – a senior member of the project team has peer-reviewed career publications based on quantitative longitudinal analysis on the links between juvenile and adult offending – 5 points per work to a maximum of 20 points.</p>		
R4	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate that one senior member of the project team has peer-reviewed publications based on quantitative longitudinal analysis on the relationship between risk factors and juvenile offending.</p> <p>Note that to meet this criterion, it is not sufficient to simply provide a bibliographic list of publications. Each publication must be accompanied by a brief explanation of why it meets the criterion (e.g., short paragraph describing the study purpose, nature of the sample, and analytical methods used).</p>	20	<p>Points will be awarded as follows:</p> <p>20 points – a senior member of the project team has peer-reviewed career publications based on quantitative longitudinal analysis on the relationship between risk factors and juvenile offending. – 5 points per work to a maximum of 20 points.</p>		
R1-R4	Total Points Available	120			
	Minimum Points Required	72			

For each of the remaining rated criteria (R5 – R8), Points will be awarded as follows:

0 = unsatisfactory response, rated area is not addressed. Bidder receives 0% of the available points for this rated criterion;

1 = unsatisfactory response, rated area is minimally addressed. Bidder receives 20% of the available points for this rated criterion;



ANNEX B

EVALUATION CRITERIA and SELECTION METHODOLOGY

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Demonstrated Experience	Proposal / Resume Ref.
<p>2 = unsatisfactory response, rated area is partially addressed. Bidder receives 40% of the available points for this rated criterion;</p> <p>3 = rated area is satisfactorily addressed. Bidder receives 60% of the available points for this rated criterion;</p> <p>4 = rated area is well addressed. Bidder receives 80% of the available points for this rated criterion; or</p> <p>5 = outstanding response, rated area is dealt with in depth, requirement is exceeded, response is exceptional. Bidder receives 100% of the available points for this rated criterion.</p>					
R5	The Bidder should clearly describe the envisioned roles and responsibilities of each senior team member in the project.	80			
R6	The Bidder should explain the complementarity of the roles proposed for the various senior team members.	10			
R7	The Bidder should describe the measures used to ensure the commitment and collaboration of the senior team members over the duration of the contract	15			
R8	The Bidder should clearly describe the approach and methodology that will be used to develop the literature review and general research workplan described in Phase 1 (paragraph 5.1) of the Project.	50			
R5-R8	Maximum Points Available	155			
	Minimum Points Required	93			

	Point Rated Criteria (R1-R8)	Max Pts	Scoring	Demonstrated Experience	Proposal / Resume Ref.
	MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE	275			
	MINIMUM POINTS REQUIRED	190			

NOTE: Any proposal that fails to achieve the minimum points stated as required for rated criteria R1-R4, or for rated criteria R5 – R8, or for all of the criteria will be considered non-compliant and will not receive further consideration.



EVALUATION CRITERIA and SELECTION METHODOLOGY

3. SELECTION METHODOLOGY

Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit 70% and Price 30%

- 3.1 To be declared responsive, a bid must:
 - (a) comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation;
 - (b) meet all the mandatory evaluation criteria; and
 - (c) obtain the required minimum number of points specified for the point rated technical criteria. [
- 3.2 Bids not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) will be declared non-responsive. Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest number of points nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted.
- 3.3 The lowest evaluated price (LP) of all responsive bids will be identified and a pricing score (PS), determined as follows, will be allocated to each responsive bid (i) : $PS_i = LP / P_i \times 30$. P_i is the evaluated price (P) of each responsive bid (i).
- 3.4 A technical merit score (TMS), determined as follows, will be allocated to each responsive bid (i): $TMS_i = OS_i \times 70$. OS_i is the overall score (OS) obtained by each responsive bid (i) for all the point rated technical criteria specified in Article 1.2, determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available.
- 3.5 The combined rating (CR) of technical merit and price of each responsive bid (i) will be determined as follows: $CR_i = PS_i + TMS_i$
- 3.6 The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract. In the event two or more responsive bids have the same highest combined rating of technical merit and price, the responsive bid that obtained the highest overall score for all the point rated technical criteria detailed in Article 1.2 will be recommended for award of a contract.
- 3.7 The table below illustrates an example where the selection of the contractor is determined by a 70/30 ratio of the technical merit and price, respectively.

Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)			
Bidder	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Overall Technical Score	88	82	92
Bid Evaluated Price	C\$60,000	C\$55,000	C\$50,000
Calculations	Technical Merit Points	Price Points	Total Score
Bidder 1	$88 / 100 \times 70 = 61.6$	$50,000 / 60,000 \times 30 = 24.99$	86.59
Bidder 2	$82 / 100 \times 70 = 57.4$	$50,000^* / 55,000 \times 30 = 27.27$	84.67
Bidder 3	$92 / 100 \times 70 = 64.4$	$50,000^* / 50,000 \times 30 = 30$	94.4

* represents the lowest evaluated price
 In this example above, Bidder 3 is the Bidder that has obtained the highest combined rating of Technical Merit and Price.



ANNEX C
FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

1. The Bidder must complete this pricing schedule and include it in its financial bid. Prices must only appear in the Financial Bid and in no other part of the bid.

2. Per Diem Rates

Table 1

The bidder is to enter the per diem rates that will be used throughout the performance of the Contract. These rates will form the basis for the development of Task Authorization costs. The bidder must enter the names and rates for each of the senior team members. For team members required to support the work the Bidder is to identify the each of the labour categories that will be employed and the per diem rate that will apply to the category.

Professional Services		
Senior Team Members		
Resource Name		Firm per diem rate*
Principal Investigator		
Senior team member 1		
Senior team member 2		
	Total Senior Members' per diems	
Support Categories		
Junior Researcher		
Statistical analysts		
	Total Support categories per Diems	

* **Per Diem rates** are firm and all inclusive of overhead, profit and expenses such as travel and time to the NCR facilities.

Please note the following:

Definition of a Day/Proration: A day is defined as 7.5 hours exclusive of meal breaks. Payment will be for days actually worked with no provision for annual leave, statutory holidays and sick leave. Time worked ("Days_worked", in the formula below) which is less than a day will be prorated to reflect actual time worked in accordance with the following formula:

$$\text{Days Worked} = \frac{\text{hours worked}}{7.5}$$

3. Phase 1 Pricing

The bidder is to complete table 2 for Phase 1 (Statement of Work Item 5.1) using the rates defined in table 1 above

Table 2

Professional Services			
Senior Team Members	Estimated Level of Effort (days)	Firm per diem rate*	Total (days * per diem)
Principal Investigator			
Senior team member 1			
Senior team member 2			
Support Categories			
Junior			



**ANNEX C
FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

Researcher			
Statistical analysts			
Total Services Price (Evaluated Price):			

The total services price will be the firm lot price that the Contractor will be paid for Phase 1. No additional amounts will be paid by Public Safety for any other expenses (such as travel or administrative support incurred by the Contractor).

If Public Safety specifically requires travel to the NCR the National Capital Region, the Contractor will be reimbursed its authorized travel and living expenses reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the Work, at cost, without any allowance for profit and/or administrative overhead, in accordance with the meal, private vehicle and incidental expenses provided in Appendices B,C and D of the Treasury Board Travel Directive (http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/hrpubs/TBM_113/td-dv_e.asp), and with the other provisions of the directive referring to "travellers", rather than those referring to "employees".

All travel must have the prior authorization of the Technical Authority.

The contractor must satisfactorily fulfill all of its contractual obligations relative to the work to which this basis of payment applies, without additional payment whether or not the actual cost incurred exceeds the firm lot price.

Good and Services Tax (GST) / Harmonized Sales Tax (HST)

All prices and amounts of money in the Contract are exclusive of Goods and Services Tax (GST) or Harmonized Sales Tax (HST), as applicable, unless otherwise indicated. The GST or HST, whichever is applicable, is extra to the price and will be paid by Canada.

GST or HST, to the extent applicable, will be incorporated into all invoices and progress claims and shown as a separate item on invoices and progress claims. All items that are zero-rated, exempt or to which the GST or HST does not apply, are to be identified as such on all invoices. The Contractor agrees to remit to Canada Revenue Agency any amounts of GST and HST paid or due.

NOTE: Prices must only appear in the Financial Bid and in no other part of the bid.



ANNEX D BASIS of PAYMENT

The Contractor will be paid as specified below, for Work performed in accordance with the Contract. Customs duties are included and Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax is extra, if applicable.

1. Phase 1

For the work performed in Phase 1 the Contractor will be paid the firm lot price quoted by the Contractor.

2. Task Authorizations

The Basis of Payment for work performed under a Task Authorization will be one of the following:

2.1 Firm Price

The Contractor shall be paid the firm price of \$_____ for work and services performed pursuant to Task Authorization (TA)_____ of this Contract.

2.2 Ceiling Price

a) The Contractor shall be paid its costs reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the work performed pursuant to this Task Authorization except that in no event shall the total price for this TA's work (including labour and material costs) exceed \$_____.

b) The Contractor will be paid only for actual time worked at the firm per diem rates in accordance with Annex B. All per diem rates quoted are "all inclusive" (and therefore include the cost of labour, fringe benefits, General & Administrative expenses, overhead, profit, and the like), excepting only GST/HST if applicable and pre-authorized Travel and Living Expenses as detailed in Annex B.

c) The ceiling price is subject to downward adjustment so as not to exceed the actual costs reasonably incurred in the performance of the Work and computed in accordance with the Basis of Payment.

2.3 Limitation of Expenditure

a) The Contractor shall be paid its costs reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the work performed pursuant to Task Authorization _____.

b) The Contractor will be paid only for actual time worked at the firm per diem rates in accordance with Annex B of the Contract. All per diem rates quoted are firm "all inclusive" (and therefore include the cost of labour, fringe benefits, General & Administrative expenses, overhead, profit, and the like), GST/HST extra, if applicable and pre-authorized Travel and Living Expenses as detailed in Annex B.

Canada's total liability under this Contract for TA _____ shall not exceed \$_____, GST/HST included.

All deliverables are FOB Destination and Canadian Customs Duty included, where Applicable.

No increase in the total liability of Canada or in the price of Work resulting from any design changes, modifications or interpretations of specifications, made by the Contractor, will be authorized or paid to the Contractor unless such changes, modifications or interpretations of the SOW, made by the Contractor, have been approved, in writing, by the Contracting Authority, prior to their incorporation into the Work.