



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 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
Gatineau
Quebec
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

This document contains a security requirement.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Services Procurement-Instruments Management
Division/Approvisionnement de services-Gestion des
instruments
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
11C1, Place du Portage III
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet DFATD RECEIPT AUDITS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 08893-150160/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 08893-150160	Date 2015-12-04
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZQ-010-29641	
File No. - N° de dossier 010zq.08893-150160	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2015-12-17	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pilon, Robert	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 010zq
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-7509 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-2229
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



**RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government Services
Canada/ Réception des soumissions travaux Publics et Services
gouvernementaux Canada
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage
, Phase III
Core 0B2/Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A OS5

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
DEMANDE DE PROPOSITION**

**Proposal To: Public Works and Government Services
Canada**

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in
Right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and
conditions set out herein, referred to herein or
attached hereto, the goods, services, and
construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set
out thereof.

**Proposition aux: Travaux Publics et Services
Gouvernementaux Canada**

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté
la Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par
référence dans la présente et aux annexes
ci-jointes, les biens, services et construction énumérés ici sur toute
feuille ci-annexées, au(x) prix indiqué(s)

**Instructions – See herein
Instructions – Voir aux présentes**

Comments - Commentaires

**This document contains a Security
Requirement**

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

**Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution
PWGSC PASS SA Authority
Acquisitions Branch (ZQ-Division)
Portage III, 11C1
11, Laurier Street
Gatineau, Quebec K1A OS5**

Title – Sujet Recipient / Contribution Agreement Audit and Support Services	
Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 08893-150160	Date December 4, 2015
Client Reference No. – N° référence du client 08893-150160	
GETS Reference No. – N° de reference de SEAG	
File No. – N° de dossier 08893-150160/A	Amendment No. 1
Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin at – à 02 :00 PM on – December 17, 2015	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time - EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Inquiries to : - Adresser toutes questions à: Robert Pilon	Buyer Id – Id de l'acheteur 010ZQ
Telephone No. – N° de téléphone : 819 – 956-7509	FAX No. – N° de FAX 819-997-2229
Destination – of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination – des biens, services et construction : See Herein	

Delivery required - Livraison exigée See Herein	Delivered Offered – Livraison proposée
Vendor/firm Name and address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Facsimile No. – N° de télécopieur Telephone No. – N° de téléphone	
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



REASON FOR AMENDMENT:

1-To make changes to the front page

2- To respond to questions that have been asked:

1.1-To correct the bid receiving address on the front page of the RFP;

DELETE IN ITS ENTIRETY:

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government Services Canada/ Réception des soumissions travaux Publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
11 Laurier St/ 11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0A1/Noyau 0A1
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

INSERT :

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government Services Canada/ Réception des soumissions travaux Publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
11 Laurier St/ 11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2/Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

1.2-To change the time zone

DELETE IN ITS ENTIRETY:

Daylight Saving Time - DST

INSERT:

Eastern Standard Time - EST

2-To respond to questions that have been asked;

Question # 1: For the experience requirements in response to RT6, RT7 and RT8, can the experience have been acquired more than ten (10) years prior to bid closing?

Answer # 1: RT6, RT7 and RT8 will not change.

Question # 2: Would the Crown consider a change in the RFP closing date to January 7, 2016?

Answer # 2: The RFP closing date will not change.

Question # 3: Can the same projects be presented for RT1 and RT2?

Answer # 3: Yes



Question # 4: Q2. Section 11.1 of the RFP, "Passport" (page 60 of 76) states the Contractor's named personnel must have valid passports for 2 years. We have two questions regarding this requirement. Does the two year time frame refer to

the passport must be valid for the prior two years at the time of the RFP submission date or contract award, or the passport must be valid for the next two years at the time of the RFP submission date, or the passport must have two years remaining before expiry at the time of the task authorization, or other interpretation?

Answer # 4: The passport must be valid for the next two years at the time of contract award.

Questions 4a: Do you require passport information to be submitted as a component of the CV for the resources?

Answer # 4a: No, but if we ask for a specific resource to do a mandate, the resource cannot say that his/her passport is not valid.

Question #5a: Prior to each of sections RT6, RT7 and RT8, the RFP states that "Each proposed individual under Rated Technical Requirement RT6 to RT8 MUST achieve a minimum percentage of 60% overall of the maximum score for each Rated Technical Requirement", but at the beginning of sections RT7 and RT8 the RFP also states that "Scores will be totaled for each qualified resource up to the maximum of this category (in order of presentation) and then divided by the number of proposed qualified resources to arrive at an average score for the proposed category".

Would the Crown please confirm that:

a) "category" is defined as "Project Manager/Leader" (RT7) and "Senior Auditors" (RT8) such that averages will be calculated by proposed resource category as a whole (RT7 or RT8) and not for each sub-category (e.g. RT7 a), RT7 b), etc.); and

Answer # 5a: The Crown confirms that averages will be calculated by proposed resource category as a whole.

Question # 5b: a passing mark of 60% is required for the resource category as a whole (i.e. "Project Manager/Leader" (RT7) and "Senior Auditors" (RT8)), based on the calculated average points across the individuals proposed within a resource category and not per each individual resource proposed

Answer # 5b: The passing mark of 60% for RT7, RT8 is required for the resource category a whole.

Question # 6: Section 6.5 of the Statement of Work included in the RFP requires contractors to travel where projects are implemented, unless the country travel advice and advisories site indicates: AVOID ALL TRAVEL. Accordingly, would the Crown consider modifying the requirements of RT2 to include countries with advisories which state "exercise a high degree of caution" in the definition of "high risk area"?

Answer # 6: No, the requirement will not change.

Question # 7: MT1 references Annex A, Statement of Work, subsection 5.1, There seems an error in the numbering of section 5 in Annex A. What should be 5.1 is numbered 5.8. There is no 5.1 in Annex A. Correct?

Answer # 7: No MT1, should read Annex A, Statement of Work, subsection 5.8.

Question # 8: RT2 indicated that the bidder should demonstrate experience in providing services related to auditing in a high risk area. To our knowledge, the <http://travel.gc.ca> website provides current travel warning ratings. How does one validate that the travel warning for a mandate conducted in the past had a high risk rating?

Answer # 8: A listing will be provided soon most likely in the next RFP amendment.



Question # 9: RT6d) which refers to the Partner/Managing Director's experience stipulates that 10 points are allocated per audit experience where the proposed resource has gone to a country where we work in International Development and on-site experience to complete the audit. Are points also allocated in instances where there was no travel on-site?

Answer # 9: No points will be allocated where there was no travel on-site.

Question # 10: Section 6 of Annex A, Statement of Work – Section 6.2. The last sentence mentions that when travel overseas is required, the personnel responsible of this task and required to travel must at least be qualified as Project Manager/Leader and/or be approved by the Project Authority. Can you elaborate on the criteria that will be used to approve resources other than the Project Manager/Leader in instances where travel overseas is required for the mandate? It is not economically feasible nor is it conducive to ensuring continuity in the audit team to always send the same resource to conduct overseas audits.

Answer # 10: DFATD expects that audit overseas will be conducted by at least one Project Manager / Leader or Partner Managing Director. If the firm decides to send a senior auditor or auditor, the resource(s) submitted will need to be pre-approved by DFATD. The pre-approval will be granted based on the experience (overseas mandates). DFATD would like to reiterate that audits overseas should not be perceived as an incentive to travel.

Question # 11: Section 6 of Annex A, Statement of Work – Section 6.5. This section mentions that the contractor will be required to travel where the projects are implemented, unless the country travel advisories site indicates: AVOID ALL TRAVEL. However, in various sections of the RFP (ex: RT2), we are required to demonstrate experience conducting audits overseas in high risk areas. This is contradictory. Would it be possible to elaborate as to why this requirement is included in the RFP? Would it be possible to remove this requirement?

Answer # 11: This requirement is included because it is DFATD mandate to conduct audits in all areas of world including high risk areas.

Question # 12a: RT4 requests “a) three (3) financial capacity-building activity reports for contribution agreement, completed in the last 10 years prior to date of bid closing”. Is the Crown requesting that the bidder submit three (3) FCBA Reports in addition to summary requirement b) of RT4?

Answer # 12a: Yes

Question #12b: If the FCBA reports are required to be submitted, can the recommendations section of the b) Summary make reference to the FCBA Report to reduce duplication?

Answer # 12b: DFATD would expect to receive a summary. If the information requested is not in the report and no summary is given, the assessment will be done on the documentation provided.

Question #12c: If the FCBA reports are not required to be submitted, would the Crown consider increasing the page limit for the summary from two (2) pages to four (4) pages to accommodate all the recommendations from the FCBA mandates?

Answer # 12c: N/A

Question # 13a: RT5 requests “a) three (3) examples of audit report on contract and/or contribution agreement, completed in the last 10 years, prior to date of bid closing”. Is the Crown requesting that the bidder submit three (3) Audit Reports in addition to summary requirement b) of RT5?

Answer # 13a: Yes



Question # 13b: If the audit reports are required to be submitted, can the recommendations section of the b) Summary make reference to the audit report to reduce duplication?

Answer # 13b: DFATD would expect to receive a summary. If the information requested is not in the report and no summary is given, the assessment will be done on the documentation provided.

Question # 13c: If the audit reports are not required to be submitted, would the Crown consider increasing the page limit for the summary from two (2) pages to five (5) pages to accommodate all the recommendations from the audit reports?

Answer # 13c: N/A

Question #14: RT6d, RT7f and RT8f request “*experiences in countries where we [DFATD] work in International Development*”. If an auditor visits more than one country for one audit (one project), can each country visit be listed as a separate audit experience?

Answer # 14: DFATD would like to clarify: same organization cannot be counted twice in different country and the same country cannot be counted twice. See clarifications below

Example: Two organizations audited in Honduras only 10 points will be awarded

Same organization audited in two separates countries (Organization A in Ethiopia and Organization A in Kenya) only 10 points will be awarded.

Question # 15: We would like to request that the basis of selection be changed from ‘the lowest evaluated price’ to “lowest cost per point”. We are requesting this change due to the fact that a “lowest cost compliant” basis of selection methodology makes good procurement sense when procuring commodities (i.e. goods) as there are few ways of differentiating between goods, apart from price. For professional services however, there are vast differences between Suppliers and the quality of services provided. With a “lowest cost compliant” basis of selection, departments’ service requirements are procured in the same manner as commodities rather than as professional services demanding **high qualified firms and individuals** with a broad and varied range of expertise and experience – in other words, it doesn’t allow for a meaningful differentiation between professional services suppliers and the quality of services they offer. Additionally, the lowest cost per point basis of selection approach is consistent with other RFPs issues for similar work within the department.

Answer # 15: The contractor selection methodology will not change.

Question # 16: RT1, RT2, RT3, RT4 and RT5 have the requirement that experience is gained “in the last 10 years prior to date of bid closing”. The approach and methodologies used to perform Contribution Audits has evolved significantly over the past few years and therefore, experience gained 10 years ago may no longer be or may be less relevant than experience gained in the past 5 years. Would the Crown consider changing the time frame to “in the last 5 years prior to date of bid closing” for the rated criteria noted above? This will help ensure that Bidders not only have experience but recent and relevant experience.

Answer # 16: No, the requirement will not change.



Question # 17: We understand that certain resources must be on-site to perform the audit. This is evaluated through rated requirements RT7f and RT8c for both the Project Manager/Leader and the Senior Auditor. However, RT6d, relates to the Partner/Managing Director level and reads “10 points per audit experience where the proposed resource has gone to a country where we work in International Development and on-site experience to complete the audit”. The requirement to have “gone to a country” and have “on-site experience” is at odds with the role description for the Partner/Managing Director under PASS. The role of the Partner/Managing Director is to exercise project sign-off authority and oversee and assure the quality of the work of the team. With today's technology, this type of work can be done remotely using various communication tools and does not require the Partner/Managing Director to be “on-site”. As this criteria is not inherent to the role of the Partner, and is covered-off by the Project Manager/Leader and Senior Auditor we ask that it be removed.

Answer # 17: This requirement will not change.

Question # 18: Given the number of rated requirements in the RFP and the time of year, would the Crown consider extending the solicitation to January 8th to allow bidders the time to develop concise and thorough responses that fully reflect the Crown's specific requirements as defined within the RFP?

Answer # 18: The RFP closing date will not change, see answer to question #2.

Thank you,

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.