



**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
ATB Place North Tower  
10025 Jasper Avenue  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6  
Bid Fax: (780) 497-3510

**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**

See attached Addendum No. 01a to correct reference errors(English only)

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Northern Contaminated Site Program  
ATB Place North Tower  
10025 Jasper Avenue  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> CAM E Site Supervision	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EW699-162239/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 006
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> AANDC EW699-162239	<b>Date</b> 2016-04-27
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$NCS-013-10727	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> NCS-5-38320 (013)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-05-09</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Mountain Daylight Saving Time MDT	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Wiebe, Amanda	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> ncs013
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (204) 510-9736 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

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

---

**Amendment No. 06 is raised to modify solicitation EW699-162239 and address questions from industry received as a result of the bidders conference held April 21, 2016 as follows:**

Questions and Answers:

**Question 1:** Page 11, section 1.2 Potential Additional Work, left column of the table. The heading is Experience of proposed individuals and Senior Lead/Principal and Senior Professional/Project Manager are listed, however the criteria in 1), and 2) below it relate more to corporate experience.

- a) Could you clarify if you want individual or corporate experience or both related to the additional services?
- b) Are you looking for the experience of one Senior Lead/Principal and one Senior Professional/Project Manager for each potential additional service listed, or are you looking for the experience of the overall project Senior Lead/Principal and Senior Professional/Project Manager for each of these services?

**Answer 1:** Please refer to Updated Evaluation Table

**Question 2:** Page 13, Section 2.2 Project Summaries, will Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) consider replacing the requirement to provide client reference letters by client contact information for each project?

**Answer 2:** No, this remains a requirement for the evaluation

**Question 3:** As it relates to the evaluation criteria for the technical bid section 1.0. Could you please provide guidance on how you would like us to approach the tasks under 1.1. There is confusion on whether PWGSC wants us to provide the consultants knowledge, methodology, challenges and logistical issues with the task from the contractor's perspective or the DRs perspective.

**Answer 3:** Please refer to Updated Evaluation Table

**Question 4:** Will PWGSC be issuing an extension to the solicitation closing date?

**Answer 4:** No extension is being granted at this time

**Question 5:** Who is the engineer of record for this work?

**Answer 5:** Stantec

**Question 6:** Will Stantec be on contract during the execution of the work?

**Answer 6:** There's no intention to have Stantec (engineer of record) onsite during remediation activities

**Question 7:** What is the authority of the DR on site in terms of means and methods change and decision making on site?

**Answer 7:** The DR has full authority for implementing required changes once approved by the Crown in writing with respect to site conditions. The DR shall quantify and report all variances in site conditions that are expected to result in design changes to the Crown ASAP. The Crown will affect the required design changes with the Engineer of Record (Stantec) and provide the updated and approved design to the DR/Contractor for implementation on site.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EW699-162239/A  
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
AANDC EW699-162239

Amd. No. - N° de la modif  
Amd 006  
File No. - N° du dossier  
NCS-5-38320

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
ncs013  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**Question 8:** Please confirm that the Contractor's charter base is Kugaaruk, NU and that DR staff will be transported from Kugaaruk to site.

**Answer 8:** Confirmed. The consultant is responsible for transportation and all associated costs to Kugaaruk.

**Question 9:** 1.2 PAW work Clarification - Pleases provide clarity on differences between Project management vs. Management vs. Site supervision approach. Are client references required for each?

**Answer 9:** PAW Evaluation Criteria Has Been removed

**Question 10:** Is it the responsibility of the DR to apply for the Water license and Land Use Permit?

**Answer 10:** the consultant is not responsible for application for land use permit and water license. The consultant is responsible for supervision, reporting and confirmation that the contractor is meeting the license and permit requirements.

**Question 11:** Could PWGSC please provide clarity on the references to management, project management and site supervision? There are differences in how the consultant would manage its contract between itself and the PWGSC, how it would manage their team in the context of the work being asked, and also the site supervision and management of the contractor and the activities and roles of the DR.

**Answer 11:** Please refer to Updated Evaluation Table

**1. Refer to page 27 to 48 ANNEX “D” – Technical, Management and Inuit Benefits Criteria Evaluation**

**DELETE:**

In its entirety

**INSERT:**

**ANNEX “D” – Technical, Management and Inuit Benefits Criteria Evaluation**

Note: – changes have been made to section 1.1 Construction Contract Supervision, and section 1.2 Potential Additional Work has been removed

<b>1.0 Technical – Mandatory and Point Rated Criteria</b>			
<p>The bidders will be evaluated on their understanding of the Scope of Work, as outlined in Section 5 of the Statement of Work and how that scope will be implemented for the CAM-E project. Bidders are encouraged to refer to remediation construction specifications for further project specific information.</p> <p>As indicated under Part 3, Section 3.1 on the RFP, Technical Bid, “The technical bid should address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. Simply repeating the statement contained in the bid solicitation is not sufficient.”</p>			
<b>Task</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>Weight Factor</b>
<b>1.1 Construction Contract Supervision (refer to section 5 of the SOW)</b>			
1.1.1 Mobilization/De mobilization	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.2 Landfill construction, operation and closure (non-hazardous and Tier II)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.3 Building Demolition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5

1.1.4 Barrel/Tank Remediation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.5 Contaminated Soil Remediation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.6 Hazardous Waste Abatement and Disposal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.7 Borrow Source Development/ Closure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.8 Health and Safety	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.9 Quality Assurance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5
1.1.10 On-site/Off-site Reporting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task</li> <li>3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task</li> </ol>	10	1.5

1.1.11 Cost and Schedule Tracking and Verification	1. Consultant portrayed their knowledge of the required Contractor Task 2. Consultant clearly described their methodology for supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required Contractor Task 3. Consultant listed potential problems and mitigative measures related to the supervision, reporting and confirmation of the required contractor task	10	3
Total Points Available for Construction Contract Supervision		180 Pass Mark: (50%) or 90 Points	
<b>1.2 Clear Concise and Complete Proposal</b>			
1.2.1 Proposal is well organized, respondent to all portions of RFP and well written.		10	0.5
<b>2.0 MANAGEMENT – POINT RATED</b>			
<b>2.1 Company/Joint Venture/Consortium Qualifications and Experience</b>			
Provide details on the qualifications on the company/joint venture/consortium, historical background demonstrating experience specifically related to similar Statement of Work activities at remote northern locations. Discussion should include:  <b>Experience with Similar Projects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• overall recent (&lt; 7 years) and relevant corporate experience in the provision of Prime Consultant Services for remediation project as described in the SOW;</li> <li>• the firm’s specific depth and breadth of relevant experience in completing the Prime Consultant tasks including associated:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• experience in working with the Inuit;</li> <li>• experience in working with various levels of government;</li> <li>• experience in working in northern remote locations;</li> <li>• experience working in locations north of 60.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Methodology in approaching project management activities associated with the Prime Consultant Services contract including but not limited to the management of schedules, budget, scope, resources and quality control.</li> </ul>		10	1.5
<b>2.2 Project Summaries and Client References</b>			

<p>Provide evidence of up to three (3) similar remediation projects where similar Prime Consulting Services to those required within this SOW were provided. Clearly identify the project team, their roles, the project objectives, scope of services, budget, completion date and deliverables. Clearly identify key members of the proposed project team in these projects.</p> <p>As well, provide client letters of reference for each of the projects identified that are signed and dated by the Client.</p> <p>*Note that all references may be contacted to confirm the information provided in the proposal.</p>	10	1.5
<p><b>2.3 Qualifications of Key Individuals</b> <i>(Provided resumes, up to 2 pages in length, for the following positions. Resumes included experience on similar projects, experience working in remote Northern environments and experience in the proposed project role.)</i></p>		
<p><b>2.3.1 Project Manager</b> Demonstrated experience managing consulting services outlined within this SOW on remediation projects similar in scale and scope to the proposed project. - Include experience related to financial and schedule control, liaison with client.</p>	10	1.5
<p><b>2.3.2 Back-up Project Manager</b> Demonstrated experience managing consulting services outlined within this SOW on remediation projects similar in scale and scope to the proposed project. - Include experience related to financial and schedule control, liaison with client.</p>	10	0.5
<p><b>2.3.3 Resident Engineer</b> Identified Resident Engineer with recent (&lt;10 years ago) and relevant (northern site [north of 60] resident engineering) experience</p>	10	1.5
<p><b>2.3.4 Resident Engineer Cross-shift</b> Identified Resident Engineer with recent (&lt;10 years ago) and relevant (northern site [north of 60] resident engineering) experience</p>	10	1.5
<p><b>Organization Chart</b></p>		
<p><b>2.3.5</b> Submit a detailed Organization Chart of the Project Team illustrating PWGSC Project Authority, Consultant Project Manager, Resident Engineer, Consultant's Staff and sub-contractors, relationships of each and integration of the various components.</p>	10	1
<p><b>3.0 INUIT BENEFITS CRITERIA – Point Rated</b></p>		
<p>The requirements of the <u>Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA)</u> apply to this procurement. Canada reserves the right to confirm validity of all declarations / guarantees.</p>		
<p><b>3.1 HEAD OFFICE:</b> Bidders are requested to demonstrate the existence of head offices, staffed administrative offices or other staffed facilities in the Nunavut settlement Area</p>	5	1

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
 EW699-162239/A  
 Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
 AANDC EW699-162239

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
 Amd 006  
 File No. - N° du dossier  
 NCS-5-38320

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
 ncs013  
 CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

<p><b>3.2 Training:</b> Bidders will be evaluated on their undertaking of a commitment with respect to delivery of on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs for Inuit people from the area of the contract at no additional cost under this project. "Training and Apprenticeship" is considered delivered when the receiving individuals have acquired certifiable work skills. This is typically achieved through an independent third party certification process.</p>	15	1
<p><b>3.3 Inuit Labour:</b> Bidders will be evaluated on their firm guarantee to use Inuit employment from the area of the contract in carrying out the work. The percentages identified below relate specifically to on-site labour hours regardless of whether they are Consultant staff and/or Consultant's Sub-contractor staff. Percentages should be supported by list of specific positions that may or will be staffed by Inuit personnel. Inuit employment will be confirmed during activities based on supporting documentation provided by the Consultant and review of statistics records on Inuit labour on site</p> <p>0 - 25% - of total labour hours      0 - 5 points      26 - 50% - of total labour hours      6- 10 points      51 - 75% - of total labour hours      11 – 15 points      76 - 100% - of total labour hours      16 – 20 points</p> <p><b><u>Guarantee of Inuit Employee Content:</u></b>  <b>Bidders complete this section if a guarantee is being provided.</b></p> <p><b>Total Estimated Inuit Person Hours For This Project: _____(A)</b>  <b>Total Estimated Person Hours For This Project: _____(B)</b></p> <p><b>A/B = _____%</b></p> <p>*** Penalties and Incentives Conditions will apply to this criterion.</p>	20	1

<p>3.4</p>	<p><b>Sub-contractors/Suppliers:</b> Bidder will be evaluated on their firm guarantee to use Inuit Sub-Contractors for services or the procurement of supplies and equipment from the area of the contract associated with the project. Ranges are based on expenditures for equipment associated, supplies and/or services as a <b>percentage of the total estimated cost for the contract</b> not the number of businesses used.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>0 - 25% - of total cost</td> <td>0 - 5 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26 - 50% - of total cost</td> <td>6- 10 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51 - 75% - of total cost</td> <td>11 – 15 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>76 - 100% - of total cost</td> <td>16 – 20 points</td> </tr> </table> <p>Note: if the Consultant is an Inuit owned business, the total dollar value of the Inuit contracting shall also include the consultant’s share of the contract</p> <p><b><u>Guarantee of Inuit Sub-Contracting / Supplier Costs:</u></b>  <b>Bidders complete this section if a guarantee is being provided.</b></p> <p><b>Total Est. Cost for Supplies/Materials/Equipment/Services from Inuit companies for this project: _____(A)</b></p> <p><b>Total Est. Cost for Supplies/Materials/Equipment/Services procured for this project: _____(B)</b></p> <p><b>A/B = _____%</b></p> <p>*** Penalties and Incentives Conditions will apply to this criterion.</p>	0 - 25% - of total cost	0 - 5 points	26 - 50% - of total cost	6- 10 points	51 - 75% - of total cost	11 – 15 points	76 - 100% - of total cost	16 – 20 points	<p>20</p>	<p>1</p>
0 - 25% - of total cost	0 - 5 points										
26 - 50% - of total cost	6- 10 points										
51 - 75% - of total cost	11 – 15 points										
76 - 100% - of total cost	16 – 20 points										

## TECHNICAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

### Technical and Management Evaluation (1&2)

1. Technical Point Rated			
Criterion	Weight Factor	Rating	Weighting Factor
<b>1.1 Construction Contract Supervision</b>			
1.1.1 Mobilization / Demobilization	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.2 Landfill construction, operation and closure (nonhazardous and Tier II)	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.3 Building Demolition	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.4 Barrel/Tank Remediation	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.5 Contaminated Soil Remediation	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.6 Hazardous Waste Abatement and Disposal	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.7 Borrow Source Development/ Closure	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.8 Health and Safety	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.9 Quality Assurance	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.10 On-site/Off-site Reporting	1.5	0-10	0-15
1.1.11 Cost and Schedule Tracking and Verification	3	0-10	0-30
<b>Total Points Available under Section 1.1: Minimum Pass Mark for this Section (1.1): 50% or 90 points</b>			<b>180</b>
<b>1.2 Clear Concise and Complete Proposal</b>			
1.2.1 Proposal is well organized, respondent to all portions of RFP and well written.	0.5	0-10	0-5
<b>Total Points Available under the Technical Proposal Evaluation</b>			<b>185</b>
2. Management Point Rated			
2.1 Company/Joint Venture/Consortium Qualifications and Experience	1.5	0-10	0-15
2.2 Project Summaries and Client References	1.5	0-10	0-15

<b>2.3 Qualifications of Key Individuals</b>			
2.3.1 Project Manager	1.5	0-10	0-15
2.3.2 Back-up Project Manager	0.5	0-10	0-5
2.3.3 Resident Engineer	1.5	0-10	0-15
2.3.4 Resident Engineer Cross-shift	1.5	0-10	0-15
2.3.5 Organization Chart	1	0-10	0-10
<b>Total Points Available under Management Proposal Evaluation:</b>			<b>90</b>
<b>Minimum Acceptable Points: Technical and Management Proposal (70% Pass Mark or 192.5 points)</b>			<b>275</b>

To be considered further, bidders must achieve a minimum pass mark under section 1.1, and an overall technical rating of 192.5 (70%) of 275 points available as specified above under sections 1 and 2. No further consideration will be given to bidders not achieving the pass marks identified.

#### **Inuit Benefits Plan (3)**

Points assigned to bidders Inuit Benefits Plan provided will be added to the bidders overall technical score. Points assigned will not be used to calculate the bidders' minimum technical and management scores above.

<b>3. INUIT BENEFITS PLAN</b>	
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Rating</b>
3.1 Offices	0-5
3.2 Training	0-15
3.3 Inuit Labour	0-20
3.4 Sub-contracting/Suppliers	0-20
<b>Inuit Benefits Criterion Rating (No minimum Pass mark)</b>	<b>0-60</b>

**Total Available Technical Score**

Rating	Possible Range
Technical / Management Rating (1&2)	0-275
Inuit Benefits Plan Rating (3)	0-60
<b>Total Technical Points Available</b>	<b>335</b>

**Generic Evaluation Table (To be used in the evaluation of bidders Technical and Management proposals only)**

PWGSC Evaluation Board members will individually evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Bidder's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) using the generic evaluation table below. At the time of evaluating proposals, the PWGSC Evaluation Board may award an odd number for evaluation criterion once consensus has been reached.

	<b>INADEQUATE</b>	<b>WEAK</b>	<b>ADEQUATE</b>	<b>FULLY SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>STRONG</b>
<b>0 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>6 points</b>	<b>8 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements.	Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understanding in some areas of the requirements.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements.
	Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be corrected	No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses
	Proponent do not possess qualifications and experience	Proponent lacks qualifications and experience	Proponent has an acceptable level of qualifications and experience	Proponent is qualified and experienced	Proponent is highly qualified and experienced
	Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements	Team does not cover all components or overall experience is weak	Team covers most components and will likely meet requirements	Team covers all components - some members have worked successfully together	Strong team - has worked successfully together on comparable projects
	Sample projects not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Leads in sample projects directly related to this requirement

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
 EW699-162239/A  
 Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
 AANDC EW699-162239

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
 Amd 006  
 File No. - N° du dossier  
 NCS-5-38320

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
 ncs013  
 CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, should ensure adequate results	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results
--	---	--	---	--	---

**CONTRACTOR SELECTION: TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SCORING TABLE**

<b>Contractor Selection - Assessed Best Value = Merit + Cost</b>		
<b>Merit:</b> Bidder's Overall Total Points Achieved/Total Points Available X 60%	___ of 60	
<b>Cost:</b> Lowest Total Evaluated Financial Bid Price/Bidder's Total Evaluated Financial Bid Price X 40%	___ of 40	
<b>Assessed Best Value Total Score</b>	<b>___ of 100</b>	

<b>Overall Technical Points (Merit)</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>1) Technical Criteria</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>2) Management Criteria</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>3) Inuit Benefits Criteria</b>	<b>60</b>

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**