



**PROPOSAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY CANADA
VENDOR INFORMATION AND AUTHORIZATION**

Vendor Name and Address

Legal Status (incorporated, registered, etc)

GST or HST Registration Number and/or Business Identification Number (Revenue Canada)

Name and Title of Person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor

Print Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Central Point of Contact

The Vendor has designated the following individual as a central point of contact for all matters pertaining to the proposed contract, including the provision of all information that may be requested:

Name and Title: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Each proposal must include a copy of this page properly completed and signed.



PART 1 – GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Requirement Summary

This project will provide a comparative review and analysis of how validity is defined and addressed across different methodological approaches for conducting program evaluation. By providing an up-to-date examination of the most recent theoretical and methodological research in this area, this project aims to: (1) provide evaluators with a current resource for helping to ensure that evaluations are conducted as rigorously as possible; and (2) contribute toward stronger quality assessments of the evidence emerging from the evaluation of crime prevention programs, thereby arming decision-makers and practitioners with enhanced knowledge on program efficiency and effectiveness.

2. Terms and Conditions of the resulting Contract

The general terms and conditions and clauses contained in Part 7 form part of this Request for Proposal document and any resulting contract, subject to any other express terms and conditions.

3. Period of Work

The period of the Contract will be from the date of Contract award to August 31, 2017

4. Contracting Authority

Barry McKenna

Contracting and Procurement
Public Safety Canada
269 Laurier Avenue West, 13th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9
Tel: 613-990-3981
Fax: 613-954-1871
Email: contracting@ps.gc.ca

The Contracting Authority is responsible for all matters of a contractual nature.

5. Inspection/Acceptance

All work to be performed and all deliverables to be submitted for the proposed Contract shall be subject to inspection by and acceptance of the Project Authority designated therein.

6. Intellectual Property

Public Safety Canada has determined that intellectual property arising from the performance of the Work under the resulting contract will belong to Canada on the following grounds:
the main purpose of the contract, or the deliverables contracted is to generate knowledge and information for public dissemination.

7. Improvement of Requirement During Solicitation Period

Should bidders consider that the specifications or Statement of Work contained in the bid solicitation could be improved technically or technologically, bidders are invited to make suggestion, in writing, to the Contracting Authority named in the bid solicitation. Bidders must clearly outline the suggested improvement as well as the reason for the suggestion. Suggestions that do not restrict the level of competition nor favour a particular bidder will be given consideration provided they are submitted to the



PART 1 – GENERAL INFORMATION

Contracting Authority at least seven (7) days before the bid closing date. Canada will have the right to accept or reject any or all suggestions.

8. Debriefings

After contract award, bidders may request a debriefing on the results of the bid solicitation process. Bidders should make the request to the Contracting Authority within 10 working days of receipt of the results of the bid solicitation process. The debriefing may be in writing, by telephone, or in person.

9. Security

There is no security requirement identified.



PART 2 – BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS AND CONDITIONS

1. Enquiries - solicitation stage

All enquiries or issues concerning this procurement must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority named in Part 1, item 5 as early as possible within the bidding period.

Enquiries and issues must be received by the Contracting Authority no later than five (5) business days prior to the bid closing date specified on the cover page of this RFP document to allow sufficient time to provide a response. Enquiries or issues received after that time may not be able to be answered prior to the bid closing date. To ensure consistency and quality of information provided to Bidders, the Contracting Authority will provide, simultaneously to all bidders to which this solicitation has been sent, any information with respect to significant enquiries received and the replies to such enquiries without revealing the sources of the enquiries.

It is the responsibility of the Bidder to obtain clarification of the requirements contained herein, if necessary, prior to submitting a bid.

A **request for a time extension** to the bid closing date will be considered provided it is received in writing by the PS Contracting Authority at least five (5) working days before the closing date shown on page 1 of this RFP document. The request, if granted, will be communicated by Buy and Sell at least three (3) working days before the closing, showing the revised closing date. The request, if rejected, will be directed to the originator at least three (3) working days before the closing date by the PS Contracting Authority.

2. Right to Negotiate or Cancel

Rights of Canada

Canada reserves the right to:

- (a) Reject any or all bids received in response to the bid solicitation;
- (b) Enter into negotiations with bidders on any or all aspects of their bids;
- (c) accept any bid in whole or in part without negotiations;
- (d) Cancel the bid solicitation at any time;
- (e) reissue the bid solicitation;
- (f) if no responsive bids are received and the requirement is not substantially modified, reissue the bid Solicitation by inviting only the bidders who bid to resubmit bids within a period designated by Canada; and,
- (g) Negotiate with the sole responsive Bidder to ensure best value to Canada.

3. Proposal Validity Period

Proposals submitted in response to this Request for Proposal will remain open for acceptance for a period of not less than one hundred and twenty (120) days from the closing date of the bid solicitation, unless otherwise indicated by Canada in such bid solicitation.

4. Terms and Conditions of Request for Proposal and Resulting Contract

The proposal must be signed by the Bidder or by an authorized representative of the Bidder. The signature indicates that the Bidder agrees to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions in their entirety as they appear in this RFP. No modification or other terms and conditions included in the bidder's proposal will be applicable to the resulting contract notwithstanding the fact that the Bidder's proposal may become part of the resulting contract. Provision of Signed Page 1 of this RFP may serve as an acceptance to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions in their entirety as they appear in this RFP.



PART 2 – BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS AND CONDITIONS

4.1 Standard Instructions, Clauses and Conditions

All instructions, clauses and conditions identified in the bid solicitation by number, date and title are set out in the Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions Manual issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC).

The Manual is available on the PWGSC Website: <http://sacc.pwgsc.gc.ca/sacc/index-e.jsp>

Bidders who submit a bid agree to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions of this bid solicitation and accept the clauses and conditions of the resulting contract.

The standard instructions and conditions 2003(2016/04/04) Standard Instructions – Goods or Services – Competitive Requirements are incorporated by reference into and form part of the bid solicitation.

However any reference to Public Works and Government Services Canada or its Minister contained in these terms and conditions shall be interpreted as reference to Public Safety Canada or its Minister.

Subsection 5.4 of 2003, Standard Instructions – Goods or Services – Competitive Requirements, is amended as follows:

Delete: sixty (60) days

Insert: one hundred twenty (120) days

5. Status and Availability of Resources

The Bidder's signature indicates that, should the Bidder be authorized to provide the services under any contract resulting from this solicitation, the persons proposed in its bid shall be available to commence performance of the Work required by the Project Authority and at the time specified herein or agreed to with the Project Authority.

If the Bidder has proposed any person in fulfilment of this requirement who is not an employee of the Bidder, the Bidder hereby certifies that it has the written permission from such person to propose the services of such person in relation to the Work to be performed in fulfilment of this requirement and to submit such person's résumé to the Contracting Authority.

The Project Authority reserves the right to interview any personnel resources proposed to be assigned to the contract and at no cost to the Department to confirm the knowledge and experience claimed.

6. Internal Approvals

6.1 Bidders should note that all Contract awards are subject to Canada's internal approvals process, which includes a requirement to approve funding in the amount. Notwithstanding that a Bidder may have been recommended for Contract award, issuance of any Contract will be contingent upon internal approval in accordance with Canada's policies. If such approval is not given, no Contract will be awarded.

6.2 The value of the subsequent contract will be based on the financial proposal as submitted by the successful vendor as per the terms and conditions of the RFP and subsequent contract. All financial proposals must be substantiated by estimated level of effort of resources, all inclusive rates, and detailed information regarding subcontracts, travel expenses and direct expenses.



PART 2 – BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS AND CONDITIONS

7. Procurement Ombudsman

The Office of the Procurement Ombudsman (OPO) was established by the Government of Canada to provide an independent avenue for suppliers to raise complaints regarding the award of contracts under \$25,000 for goods and under \$100,000 for services. You have the option of raising issues or concerns regarding the solicitation, or the award resulting from it, with the OPO by contacting them by telephone at 1-866-734-5169 or by e-mail at boa.opo@boa.opo.gc.ca. You can also obtain more information on the OPO services available to you at their website at www.opo-boa.gc.ca.



PART 3 – PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. Proposal Preparation Instructions:

Canada requests that Bidders provide their offer in separately bound sections as follows:

- Section I: Technical Offer, 4 hard copies AND 1 soft copies on CD, DVD or USB Flash Drive
- Section II: Financial Offer, 1 hard copy
- Section III: Certifications, 1 hard copy

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of the soft copy and the hard copy, the wording of the hard copy will have priority over the wording of the soft copy.

Prices must appear in the financial offer only. No prices must be indicated in any other section of the offer.

In April 2006, Canada issued a policy directing federal departments and agencies to take the necessary steps to incorporate environmental considerations into the procurement process Policy on Green Procurement (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ecologisation-greening/achats-procurement/politique-policy-eng.html>). To assist Canada in reaching its objectives, bidders should:

- 1) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper containing fibre certified as originating from a sustainably-managed forest and containing minimum 30% recycled content; and
- 2) use an environmentally-preferable format including black and white printing instead of colour printing, printing double sided/duplex, using staples or clips instead of cerlox, duotangs or binders.

1.1 Section I: Technical Bid

In their technical bid, bidders should demonstrate their understanding of the requirements contained in the bid solicitation and explain how they will meet these requirements. Bidders should demonstrate their capability and describe their approach in a thorough, concise and clear manner for carrying out the work.

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. In order to facilitate the evaluation of the bid, Canada requests that bidders address and present topics in the order of the evaluation criteria under the same headings. To avoid duplication, bidders may refer to different sections of their bids by identifying the specific paragraph and page number where the subject topic has already been addressed.

The technical proposal must exclude any reference to financial information relative to the costing of the proposal.

Failure to provide a technical proposal with the submission will result in non-compliance and will not be evaluated.

1.2 Section II: Financial Bid

Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with Part 5, Article 6. The total amount of Applicable Taxes must be shown separately.

Failure to provide a financial proposal with the submission will result in non-compliance and the bid



PART 3 – PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

will not be evaluated.

1.3 Section III: Certifications

Bidders must submit the certifications required under Part 6.

2. Submission of Proposals

Your proposal is to be addressed as follows and **must be received on or before 14:00 hours EDT, 2016-09-20 (September 20, 2016).** Please ensure that all envelopes/boxes, etc are marked **URGENT**.

Barry McKenna
Contracting and Procurement Section
Public Safety Canada
340 Laurier Avenue West, 1st Floor Mailroom
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0P9
Tel: 613-949-1048
Fax: 613-954-1871
Email: barry.mckenna@canada.ca

All by hand deliveries must be made to the mailroom located on the ground floor at 340 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa. If hand delivering, bidder must ensure that the proposal is time and date stamped to confirm adherence to the deadline. Entrance is on Gloucester at shipping door, behind the building

3. Evaluation Procedures:

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation Procedures and Criteria specified in Part 5.

- (a) Bids will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the bid solicitation including the technical and financial evaluation criteria. Failure to submit a financial and/or technical proposal with the bidder's submission shall result in the bid being deemed non-compliant and will not be evaluated.
- (b) An evaluation team will be composed of representatives of Canada.

The evaluation team reserves the right but is not obliged to perform any of the following:

- a) Seek clarification or verify any or all information provided by the Bidder with respect to this RFP;
- b) Contact any or all of the references supplied and to interview, at the sole costs of the Bidder, the Bidder and/or any or all of the resources proposed by the Bidder to fulfill the requirement, on 48 hours' notice, to verify and validate any information or data submitted by the Bidder.

Contractor Selection Method is outlined in Part 5, Article 5.



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

1. TITLE

Meta-Evaluation in Crime Prevention: A Cross-Method Review and Analysis of Quality Assessment Procedures

2. CONTEXT

The Government of Canada is committed to the reduction of crime and strengthening the safety of our communities through effective prevention measures, police services and correctional services. In the case of prevention, Public Safety Canada is responsible for administering the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS). The NCPS is aimed at reducing crime among at-risk population groups by funding evidence-based interventions and knowledge dissemination projects. The current NCPS priorities consist of addressing early risk factors among vulnerable children, youth and young adults likely to commit crimes, dealing with priority issues relating to crime (e.g., youth gangs, drug-related crimes), preventing repeat offences among high-risk groups, implementing measures to support exiting prostitution, and fostering crime prevention in Aboriginal communities.

In this context, several divisions responsible for supporting the NCPS within Public Safety Canada (research and evaluation, crime prevention policy, and programs) work in close collaboration to provide national leadership on effective and cost efficient ways to prevent and reduce crimes, via intervention on risk factors in the most vulnerable populations and in high-risk environments. In order to find effective ways to both prevent and reduce crime, crime prevention personnel continue to gather national and international evidence on “what works”, but also increasingly on “how programs are implemented and in which context(s) they are most effective” in order to guide program and policy decisions, and to contribute to acquiring scientific knowledge and experience in crime prevention. In this regard, a long-term objective is the development of a Canadian-specific scoring instrument for rating the quality of evaluations conducted on crime prevention programs. In order to do so, however, a firmer understanding is required of how different evaluation designs and methodologies can be assessed through an integrated scoring instrument.

In line with the focus on providing the best evidence for crime prevention policy-makers and practitioners on “what works, for whom, and in what circumstances”, the work outlined below will provide a comparative review and analysis of how validity is defined and addressed across different methodological approaches for conducting program evaluation. By providing an up-to-date examination of the most recent theoretical and methodological research in this area, this project aims to: (1) provide evaluators with a current resource for helping to ensure that evaluations are conducted as rigorously as possible; and (2) contribute toward stronger quality assessments of the evidence emerging from the evaluation of crime prevention programs, thereby arming decision-makers and practitioners with enhanced knowledge on program efficiency and effectiveness.



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Evaluation in Crime Prevention: The Importance of Quality Assessment

There is increasing awareness and recognition among researchers, policy-makers and practitioners that crime prevention programs should be evidence-based (Welsh, 2007a, 2007b; Sherman, Farrington, Welsh, & MacKenzie, 2006), that is, founded on strong, scientific evaluations that clearly demonstrate which strategies do and do not work to reduce future crime and victimization, as well as create positive changes in the attitudes, behaviours, social opportunities, and productivity of high-risk individuals (youth and adults) (Knutsson & Tilley, 2009). Therefore, assessment of the methodological quality of evaluation studies is essential, as variations in study quality (i.e., the validity of the design, methods, findings and general content) can affect conclusions and decisions based on the existing evidence about program effectiveness. Assessing the quality of a set of evaluation studies is known as *meta-evaluation* (i.e., “evaluation of evaluations”; Hedler & Gibram, 2009), which aims to ensure that decision makers and practitioners have trustworthy “off-the-shelf” guides of the available evidence regarding which interventions to implement (or not) for a given context and target group.

3.1.2 Criteria Assessed in Meta-Evaluation

Meta-evaluations center around the following four criteria (Hedler & Gibram, 2009; Joint Committee for Programme Evaluation, 1994): (1) utility (i.e., the extent to which the evaluation study will serve the various needs of stakeholders and clients); (2) feasibility (i.e., the degree to which the evaluation is practical and cost-effective); (3) propriety (i.e., the extent to which the evaluation respects ethical principles); and (4) validity (i.e., credibility of quantitative and qualitative procedures employed, as well as the technical accuracy of information provided about the program being evaluated. According to the influential typology of Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002; for recent advances and elaborations, see Chen, Donaldson, & Mark, 2011; Nkwake, 2015), the fourth and most complex criterion (validity) can be further subdivided into: (1) internal validity (i.e., the degree to which a study’s design, conduct, and analysis have minimized biases, thereby allowing attribution of results to the intervention rather than confounding influences); (2) external validity (i.e., the extent to which the results can be generalized outside of that study to different population and/or contexts); (3) construct validity (i.e., the degree to which a measuring instrument actually captures the theoretical construct of interest); and (4) statistical conclusion validity (i.e., the extent to which conclusions about the relationship among variables based on data analysis are correct or ‘reasonable’).

3.1.3 Existing Meta-Evaluation Instruments in Crime Prevention

In order to operationalize the various meta-evaluation criteria, a number of guidelines and rating scales have been developed across a wide variety of substantive fields (for reviews, see Farrington, Gottfredson, Sherman, & Welsh, 2002; Higgins & Green, 2011; Higgins et al., 2011; Lohr, 2004; Olivo et al., 2008; Wells & Littell, 2009; West et al., 2002; Sanderson, Tatt, & Higgins, 2007). The prevailing paradigm influencing the design of such measures is Post-positivism, which is linked to the Methods Branch of evaluation (Mertens, 2015; Mertens & Wilson, 2012) and emphasizes experimental, quantitative methodologies. In particular, the



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

classical randomized controlled trial (RCT) is regarded as the “gold standard” of evidence-based practice. In the context of crime prevention, three prominent sets of criteria are those presently used by the “Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development” (Mihalic & Elliott, 2015; <http://www.blueprintsprograms.com/criteria>); “CrimeSolutions.gov” (http://www.crimesolutions.gov/about_instrument.aspx) evidence-based program registries; and SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/04a_review_process.aspx).¹ Moreover, the Society of Prevention Research has recently updated its validity standards for appraising research evidence (Gottfredson et al., 2015). Furthermore, the Western Michigan University Evaluation Center has compiled more inclusive meta-evaluation checklists, which also address utility, feasibility, and propriety in addition to validity issues, as well as accommodate qualitative methodologies (<https://www.wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists>). However, given that these first three criteria are relatively straightforward, and that quantitative and qualitative methodologies are rapidly evolving, the current work concentrates on validity issues.

3.2 Tools for Meta-Evaluation Lag Behind Evaluation Methodology

Although such efforts (i.e., Blueprints, CrimeSolutions, SAMHSA, etc.) to consolidate and centralize information on program effectiveness have been invaluable, one limitation of the current quality assessment schemes is that they are primarily rooted in traditional quantitative (mainly experimental) approaches to evaluation, and have not been sufficiently responsive to shifts at the paradigm level. For example, after the dust had settled from the broader QUANT-QUAL “paradigm wars” (Gage, 1989; Guba, 1990a, 1990b; Guba & Lincoln, 2005), researchers began to argue for compatibilities and complementarities rather than an unproductive stand-off and dogmatic adherence to mono-method approaches (e.g., Howe, 1988). Presently, the mixed methods strategy – that is, using quantitative and qualitative methods in combination to improve understanding of a research problem, beyond what is possible with either approach alone (Creswell & Clark, 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009) – is advocated by a wide range of players, including major professional societies, public and private funding agencies and institutes (see Denzin, 2010, for a review). For example, a number of RCTs have adopted a qualitative component in order to identify problems at the feasibility or pilot stage, improve consent and recruitment processes, and shed further light on the findings (e.g., Catallo, Jack, Ciliska, & MacMillan, 2013; Plano Clark et al., 2013; Lewin, Glenton, & Oxman, 2009; O’Cathain et al., 2014a, 2014b; O’Cathain, Thomas, Drabble, Rudolph, & Hewison, 2013; Spillane et al., 2010). In addition, there have been advances in integrating theory-driven “realist” approaches into RCTs in order to better determine how contexts, mechanisms and individual differences influence the trial outcomes, thus providing value-added beyond conventional cross-group comparisons of outcomes in a simple “intervention on vs. intervention off” manner (e.g., Bonell, Fletcher, Morton, Loren, & Moore, 2012; Hawkins, 2014; Jamal et al., 2015).

¹ The Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy wound down its operations in the spring of 2015, and the Coalition’s leadership and core elements of the group’s work have been integrated into the Laura and John Arnold Foundation. The key content of the Coalition’s website will soon be migrated to <http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/initiative/evidence-based-policy-innovation/>, and will be regularly updated on that site.

PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

Moreover, in the case of interventions and settings not amenable to RCTs, advances in quasi-experimental approaches for minimizing bias and improving causal inference continue to be developed, such as propensity score matching (Imai & Ratkovic, 2014; Zhao, 2016), entropy balancing (Hainmueller, 2012), Heckman selection models (DeMaris, 2014; Schwiebert, 2015), instrumental variables estimation (Bollen, 2012; Imbens, 2014), and regression discontinuity designs (Berk, Barnes, Ahlman, & Kurtz, 2010; Imbens & Lemieux, 2008; Venkataramani, Bor, & Jena, 2016). Furthermore, theoretical and methodological approaches for assessing the construct validity of measuring instruments are continuously evolving (e.g., Bringmann & Eronen, 2016; Gajewski, Price, Coffland, Boyle, & Bott, 2013; Markus & Borsboom, 2013), and ongoing improvements to statistical analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) and causal inferences based on these (Wiedermann & von Eye, 2016) provide researchers with greater protection against threats to statistical conclusion validity (García-Pérez, 2012). With regard to qualitative methods, case-study based approaches such as qualitative comparative analysis (which can also be applied to quantitative data; Kane, Lewis, Williams, & Kahwati, 2014; Legewie, 2013; Schneider & Rohlfing, 2014), process tracing (Beach & Pedersen, 2013; Bennett & Checkel, 2014; Mahoney, 2012; Waldner, 2015), and the most significant change technique (Dart & Davies, 2003; Davies & Dart, 2005; Wilson, 2014) can be used to support causal claims about intervention effects, and are particularly useful in small sample scenarios.

In addition, it is being increasingly recognized that the validity of evaluation results rests not only on the validity of the methodology employed, but also on the quality of program implementation (Breitenstein et al., 2010; Duerden, & Witt, 2012; Durlak, 2013; Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Savignac & Dunbar, 2014). If a given program is not delivered with adequate “fidelity”, that is, faithfulness to the principles and protocols of the original, underlying program model (Carroll et al., 2007; Dawson & Stanko, 2013; Southam-Gerow & McLeod, 2013), then the results will not reflect the true impact of the program, no matter how sophisticated or rigorous the evaluation methodology. Formally, such a situation is referred to as a “Type III” error, that is, attributing changes (or lack thereof) to the original program model when in fact a modified intervention was implemented (Basch, Sliepecevic, Gold, Duncan, & Kolbe, 1985; Dawson & Stanko, 2013; Hasson, 2010). Therefore, implementations and its close relationship to methodological validity must be captured by quality assessment schemes.

3.3 Toward more Comprehensive Validity Assessment Schemes

Along with this growing multiplicity of available methodologies (i.e., different experimental and quasi-experimental designs crossed with various quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches to data collection, analysis and interpretation), as well as the enhanced focus on taking implementation issues and challenges into account, comes a commensurate level of complexity in quality assessment approaches. In other words, the wave of theoretical and methodological advances pose as a double-edged sword: although evaluators have more tools in their arsenals than ever before, existing guidelines and rating systems are mainly limited to the traditional quantitative case, and thus there could be a potential impasse on the horizon. Although complementary works on assessing the rigour of qualitative research (Bergman & Coxon, 2007; Gómez, 2009; Russell & Gregory, 2003; Walsh & Downe, 2006) and its use in evidence-based



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

policy and practice (Olson, Young, & Schultz, 2016; Snilstveit, Oliver, & Vojtkova, 2012; Veltri, Lim, & Miller, 2016) are increasing, there is still no current, comprehensive set of recommendations supporting quality assessments for the mixed methods case. In addition, relative to the traditional quantitative case, there is no consensus in the qualitative research community on what constitutes validity or quality (Garside, 2016). Moreover, with respect to the broader purpose of “evidence synthesis” across multiple studies (e.g., conducting systematic reviews and meta-analyses, classifying and ranking different interventions in terms of effectiveness, etc.), it remains unclear how to combine the results of evaluation studies that employ fundamentally different methodologies.

Therefore, additional efforts should be directed toward establishing an integrated, flexible set of quality assessment guidelines and instruments that supports collating evidence across studies employing different evaluation methods, in order to ensure that strong and unambiguous evidence of program effectiveness is ultimately presented to decision-makers and practitioners. The work described below is intended to begin charting the path toward meeting this goal.

4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this contract are three-fold; in particular, the work will provide:

1. An up-to-date review of the manner in which threats to validity are defined and addressed under a wide variety of different qualitative and quantitative methods.
2. An assessment of issues related to the synthesis of qualitative and quantitative evidence into overall judgments of effectiveness and program classification/ranking.
3. A determination of the feasibility of creating a comprehensive set of rating criteria and corresponding assessment instrument for study quality, in order to cover a wide range of possible evaluation methodologies.

5. SCOPE OF WORK

To meet these objectives, the Contractor must accomplish the following tasks:

5.1 Conduct an up-to-date, interdisciplinary (e.g., criminology and criminal justice, health, mental health, and education) review and synthesis of the theoretical and applied literature on identifying and tackling validity threats in evaluation studies.

This review will cover experimental and non-experimental situations, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed evaluation methodologies, as well as the relationship between program implementation, fidelity, and validity of evaluation findings.

The review will be developed based on a wide range of publications (i.e., peer-reviewed articles, books, governmental and non-governmental reports, guidance documents, manuals and tip sheets). A starting point for the review is the reference list at the end of this document.

5.2 Compare and discuss the most prominent, US-based program registries in the crime prevention domain (i.e., Blueprints, CrimeSolutions, SAMHSA), in terms of: (1) how they



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

are linked to the broader focus on evidence-based practice (EBP) in the US; and (2) the dominant methodological paradigms underlying the meta-evaluation rating criteria used.

5.3 Discuss issues related to the synthesis of qualitative and quantitative evidence into overall judgments of program effectiveness and classification ranking. The discussion will present current literature on qualitative evaluation methodologies, and address the level of confidence that one can place in the findings, in comparison to those obtained from quantitative methods. The discussion will also consider which particular qualitative and quantitative approaches yield findings most amenable to cross-method synthesis of evidence, and which approaches produce results that are incompatible (i.e., cannot be readily consolidated to yield an overall judgment of intervention effectiveness).

5.4 In close relation to the work described in 5.3, discuss the feasibility of, as well as present recommendations on, constructing a Canadian-specific, comprehensive, integrated rating system for evaluation studies, covering the experimental and non-experimental cases, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed evaluation methodologies, as well as implementation issues.

6. DELIVERABLES

The Contractor must submit the following deliverables:

- A work plan detailing key steps, methodological approach and deadlines; and
- An integrated research report on the results of the work described in 5.1-5.4.

The Contractor will submit a proposal/work plan describing the key steps, methodological approach and the due dates. Ten days after receipt of all feedback from the project authority, the Contractor will submit a final work plan. The work cannot begin until the technical authority/project authority has approved the final proposal/work plan.

The deliverables for this project will be integrated into a final, comprehensive, 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.



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

7. WORK PERIOD AND SCHEDULE

The period of work would occur from the date of contract award to August 31, 2017.

Deliverable	Due Date
7.1 Start Date	Date of contract award
7.2 Project kick-off meeting with the Technical Authority	Within three days of the contract award
7.3 Work plan: final work plan detailing the approach and methodology.	Within 10 days of receipt of comments on the proposed approach from the Project Authority.
7.4 Outline of Report	Within 2 weeks of the contract award
7.5 Draft Report on work described in 5.1-5.2	Within 24 weeks of the contract award
7.6 Final Report on work described in 5.1-5.2	March 31, 2017
7.5 Draft Report on work described in 5.3-5.4	June 30, 2017
7.6 Final Report on work described in 5.3-5.4	August 31, 2017

8. 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 Project 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.

9. WORK LOCATION

Report preparation (i.e., literature review and writing) will be done at the Contractor’s facilities.

10. LANGUAGE

The Contractor must provide services in both official languages in accordance with Canada’s Official Languages Act. Communication must be initiated in both official languages until

PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

Canada's client indicates his/her language of preference. All communications with members of the public and/or Canada's stakeholders must be in the official language of their choice. As a minimum, one identified resource in the contract must be able to function in both official languages (written and oral) in order to communicate with Departmental employees and stakeholders. Deliverables may be completed in one of the official languages and translation, if required, will be completed by Public Safety Canada.

11. REFERENCES

Basch, C.E., Sliepcevich, E.M., Gold, R.S., Duncan, D.F., & Kolbe, L.J. (1985). Avoiding Type III Errors in Health Education Program Evaluations: A Case Study. *Health Education & Behavior*, 12(3), 315-331.

Beach, D., & Pedersen, R.B. (2013). *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.

Bennett, A., & Checkel, J.T. (Eds.) (2014). *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bergman, M.M. & Coxon, A.P.M. (2007). The quality in qualitative methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), Art. 34.

Berk, R., Barnes, G., Ahlman, L., & Kurtz, E. (2010). When second best is good enough: a comparison between a true experiment and a regression discontinuity quasi-experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 6(2), 191-208.

Bollen, K.A. (2012). Instrumental Variables in Sociology and the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38, 37-72.

Bonell, C., Fletcher, A., Morton, M., Lorenc, T., & Moore, L. (2012). Realist randomised controlled trials: A new approach to evaluating complex public health interventions. *Social Science & Medicine*, 75(12), 2299–2306.

Breitenstein, S.M., Gross, D., Garvey, C., Hill, C., Fogg, L., & Resnick, B. (2010). Implementation Fidelity in Community-Based Interventions. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 33(2), 164–173.

Bringmann, L.F., & Eronen, M.I. (2016). Heating up the measurement debate: What psychologists can learn from the history of physics. *Theory & Psychology*, 26(1), 27–43.

Carroll, C., Patterson, M., Wood, S., Booth, A., Rick, J., & Balain, S. (2007). A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science*, 2(40).

Catallo, C., Jack, S.M., Ciliska, D., & MacMillan, H.L. (2013). Mixing a Grounded Theory Approach with a Randomized Controlled Trial Related to Intimate Partner Violence: What



PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

Challenges Arise for Mixed Methods Research? *Nursing Research and Practice*, 2013, Article ID 798213.

Chen, H.T., Donaldson, S.I., & Mark, M.M. (Eds.) (2011). *Advancing Validity in Outcome Evaluation: Theory and Practice*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Creswell, J.W., & Clark, V.L.P. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dart, J., & Davies, R. (2003). A Dialogical, Story-Based Evaluation Tool: The Most Significant Change Technique. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(2), 137-155.

Davies, R., & Dart, J. (2005). The ‘Most Significant Change’ (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use, Version 1.00. Copyright © R.J. Davies and J. Dart (2004).

Dawson, P., & Stanko, B. (2013). Implementation, Implementation, Implementation: Insights from Offender Management Evaluations. *Policing, Online First*. *Policing*, 7(3), 289-298.

DeMaris, A. (2014). Combating unmeasured confounding in cross-sectional studies: Evaluating instrumental-variable and Heckman selection models. *Psychological Methods*, 19(3), 380-397.

Duerden, M.D., & Witt, P.A. (2012). Assessing Program Implementation: What It Is, Why It's Important, and How to Do It. *Journal of Extension*, 50(1), Article 1FEA.

Durlak, J. (2013). *The Importance of Quality Implementation for Research, Practice, and Policy*. Office of The Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation: U.S. Department of Health & Human Services.

Gage, N.L. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A “historical” sketch of research on teaching since 1989. *Educational Researcher* 18, no. 7: 4–10.

Gajewski, B.J., Price, L.R., Coffland, V., Boyle, D.K., & Bott, M.J. (2013). Integrated analysis of content and construct validity of psychometric instruments. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(1), 57-78.

García-Pérez, M.A. (2012). Statistical Conclusion Validity: Some Common Threats and Simple Remedies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3(325).

Garside, R. (2016). Should we appraise the quality of qualitative research reports for systematic reviews, and if so, how? *Innovation*, 27(1), 67-79.

Gómez, C.C. (2009). Assessing the Quality of Qualitative Health Research: Criteria, Process and Writing. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(2), Article 17.

Gottfredson, D.C., Cook, T.D., Gardner, F.E.M., Gorman-Smith, D., Howe, G.W., Sandler, I.N., & Zafft, K.M. (2015). Standards of Evidence for Efficacy, Effectiveness, and Scale-up Research in Prevention Science: Next Generation. *Prevention Science*, 16, 893–926.

PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

- Guba, E. (1990a). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-30). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. (1990b). Carrying on the dialog. In E. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 368-378). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hainmueller, J. (2012). Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies. *Political Analysis*, 20(1), 25-46.
- Hasson, H. (2010). Systematic evaluation of implementation fidelity of complex interventions in health and social care. *Implementation Science*, 5(67).
- Hawkins, A.J. (2014). The case for experimental design in realist evaluation. *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, Special Issue: Evaluation, 14, 46-59.
- Hedler, H.C., & Gibram, N. (2009). The Contribution of Metaevaluation to Program Evaluation: Proposition of a Model. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 6(12).
- Higgins, J.T.P., Altman, D.G., Gøtzsche, P.C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A.D., Savovic, J., Schulz, K.F., Weeks, L., Sterne, J.A.; Cochrane Bias Methods Group; Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*, 343: d5928.
- Higgins J.P.T., & Green, S. (Eds.). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]*. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from <http://handbook.cochrane.org>.
- Howe, K. R. (1988). Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility thesis or dogmas die hard. *Educational Researcher*, 17(8), 10-16.
- Imai, K. and Ratkovic, M. (2014). Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(1), 243–263.
- Imbens, G.W. (2014). Instrumental Variables: An Econometrician's Perspective. *Statistical Science*, 29(3), 323-358.
- Imbens, G.W., & Lemieux, T. (2008). Regression discontinuity designs: A guide to practice. *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2), 615-635.

PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

Jadad, A.R., & Enkin, M.W. (2007). *Randomized Controlled Trials: Questions, Answers and Musings* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jamal, F., Fletcher, A., Shackleton, N., Elbourne, D., Viner, R., & Bonell, C. (2015). The three stages of building and testing midlevel theories in a realist RCT: a theoretical and methodological case-example. *Trials*, 16(466).

Joint Committee for Programme Evaluation (1994). *Programme evaluation standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kane, H., Lewis, M.A., Williams, P.A., & Kahwati, L.C. (2014). Using qualitative comparative analysis to understand and quantify translation and implementation. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 4(2), 201–208.

Legewie, N. (2013). An Introduction to Applied Data Analysis with Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 14(3), Article. 15.

Lewin, S., Glenton, C., & Oxman, A.D. (2009). Use of qualitative methods alongside randomised controlled trials of complex healthcare interventions: methodological study. *BMJ*, 339: b3496.

Lohr, K. (2004). Rating the strength of scientific evidence: relevance for quality improvement. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 16(1), 9–18.

Markus, K. A., & Borsboom, D. (2013). *Frontiers of Test Validity Theory: Measurement, Causation, and Meaning*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mahoney, J. (2012). The Logic of Process Tracing Tests in the Social Sciences. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 41(4) 570-597

Mertens, D.M. (2015). Philosophical Assumptions and Program Evaluation. *SpazioFilosofico*, 13.

Mertens, D.M., & Wilson, A.T. (2012). *Program evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mihalic, S.F., & Elliott, D.S. (2015). Evidence-based programs registry: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 48, 124–131.

Nkwake, A.M. (2015). *Credibility, Validity, and Assumptions in Program Evaluation Methodology*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

O’Cathain, A., Goode, J., Drabble, S.J., Thomas, K.J., Rudolph, A., & Hewison, J. (2014). Getting added value from using qualitative research with randomized controlled trials: a qualitative interview study. *Trials*, 15(215).

PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

O’Cathain, A., Thomas, K.J., Drabble, S.J., Rudolph, A., Goode, J., & Hewison, J.(2014). Maximising the value of combining qualitative research and randomised controlled trials in health research: the Qualitative Research in Trials (QUART) study – a mixed methods study. *Health Technology Assessment*, 18(38).

O’Cathain, A., Thomas, K.J., Drabble, S.J., Rudolph, A., & Hewison, J. (2013). What can qualitative research do for randomised controlled trials? A systematic mapping review. *BMJ Open*, 3(6): e002889

Olivo, S.A., Macedo, L.G., Gadotti, I.C., Fuentes, J., Stanton, T., & Magee, D.J. (2008). Scales to assess the quality of randomized controlled trials: a systematic review. *Physical Therapy*, 88(2), 156-175.

Olson, K., Young, R.A., & Schultz, I.Z. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of Qualitative Health Research for Evidence-Based Practice*. New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.

Plano Clark, V.L., Schumacher, K., West, C., Edrington, J., Dunn, L.B., Harzstark, A., Melisko, M., Rabow, M.W., Swift, P.S., & Miaskowski, C. (2013). Practices for Embedding an Interpretive Qualitative Approach Within a Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(3), 219-242.

Russell, C.K., & Gregory, D.M. (2003). EBN users' guide: Evaluation of qualitative research studies. *Evidence Based Nursing*, 6, 36-40

Sanderson, S., Tatt, I.D., & Higgins, J.P.T. (2007). Tools for assessing quality and susceptibility to bias in observational studies in epidemiology: a systematic review and annotated bibliography. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 36, 666–676.

Savignac, J., & Dunbar, L. (2014). *Guide on the Implementation of Evidence-Based Programs: What Do We Know So Far?* Research Report: 2014-01. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), Public Safety Canada.

Schneider, C.Q., & Rohlfing, I. (2014). Case Studies Nested in Fuzzy-set QCA on Sufficiency: Formalizing Case Selection and Causal Inference. *Sociological Methods & Research*, Online first.

Schwiebert, J. (2015). Estimation and interpretation of a Heckman selection model with endogenous covariates. *Empirical Economics*, 49(2), 675-703.

Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Southam-Gerow, M.A., & McLeod, B.D. (2013). Advances in Applying Treatment Integrity Research for Dissemination and Implementation Science: Introduction to Special Issue. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 20, 1–13.

PART 4 – STATEMENT OF WORK

Snilstveit, B., Oliver, S., & Vojtkova, M. (2012). Narrative approaches to systematic review and synthesis of evidence for international development policy and practice. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 4(3), 409-429.

Spillane, J.P., Pareja, A.S., Dorner, L., Barnes, C., May, H., Huff, J., & Camburn, E. (2010). Mixing methods in randomized controlled trials (RCTs): Validation, contextualization, triangulation, and control. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 22, 5–28

Tabachnick, B.G., and Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Teddlie, C., & A. Tashakkori (2009). *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349-357.

Venkataramani, A.S., Bor, J., & Jena, A.B. (2016). Regression discontinuity designs in healthcare research. *BMJ*, 352: i1216.

Waldner, D. (2015). Process Tracing and Qualitative Causal Inference. *Security Studies*, 24(2), 239-250.

Walsh, D., & Downe, S. (2006). Appraising the quality of qualitative research. *Midwifery*, 22(2), 108-119.

Wiedermann, W., & von Eye, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Statistics and Causality: Methods for Applied Empirical Research* (pp. 47-64). New York, NY: Wiley.

Wilson, V. (2014). Research Methods: The Most Significant Change Technique. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 9(3).

West, S., King, V., Carey, T.S., Lohr, K.M., McKoy, N., Sutton, S.F., & Lux, L. (2002). Systems to Rate the Strength of Scientific Evidence. Evidence. Report/Technology Assessment No. 47 (Prepared by the Research Triangle Institute–University of North Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-97-0011). AHRQ Publication No. 02-E016. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Zhao, Q. (2016). Covariate Balancing Propensity Score by Tailored Loss Functions. arXiv:1601.05890 [stat.ME].



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Evaluation Procedures

- (a) Bids will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the bid solicitation including the technical and financial evaluation criteria.
- (b) An evaluation team which may be composed of representatives of Canada and subject matter experts from the private sector will evaluate the bids.

2 Experience:

Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the requirements, or reusing the same wording as the RFP, will not be considered "demonstrated" for the purposes of this evaluation. **The Bidder should provide complete details as to where, when, month and year, and how, through which activities / responsibilities, the stated qualifications / experience were obtained.** Experience gained during formal education shall not be considered work experience. All requirements for work experience shall be obtained in a legitimate work environment as opposed to an educational setting. Co-op terms are considered work experience provided they are related to the required services.

When completing the resource grids the specific information which demonstrates the requested criteria should be in the grid. The reference to the page and project number should also be provided so that the evaluator can verify this information. It is not acceptable that the grids contain all the project information from the résumé, only the specific answer should be provided.

Bidders are advised that the month(s) of experience listed for a project in which the timeframe overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once PER RESOURCE. For example: Project #1 timeframe is July 2001 to December 2001; Project #2 timeframe is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months.

Bidders are also advised that the experience is as of the closing date of the Request for Proposal. For example, if a given requirement states "The proposed resource must have a minimum of three (3) years' experience, within the last six (6) years, working with Java", then the six (6) years are accounted for as of the closing date of the RFP.

3 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

The bid must meet the mandatory technical criteria specified below. The Bidder must provide the necessary documentation to support compliance with this requirement.

Any bid which fails to meet the mandatory technical criteria will be declared non-responsive. Each mandatory technical criterion will be addressed separately.

The Bidder must *provide sufficient detail to clearly demonstrate how* they meet each mandatory requirement below. Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data and information to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the requirements, or reusing the same wording as the RFP, will not be considered "demonstrated" for the purpose of this evaluation.

It is expected that this project will require a multidisciplinary team, including both senior and junior members (i.e., research assistants). The Bidder must designate one of the senior team



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

members as the Principal Investigator, who will assume overall responsibility for the entire project, including coordination of research team members and communication with the Technical Authority.

The Bidder must detail the role of EACH resource.

3.1. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

It is suggested that the structure of the first part of the proposal follow the mandatory requirements, that is, use each mandatory requirement as a header and then explain 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.

Mandatory Technical Criteria			
Number	Mandatory Technical Criterion	Cross Reference to Proposal	
MT1	The Bidder must submit a signed proposal as per the “Acceptance of Terms and Conditions” clause, Part 2, Article 4 of the Request for Proposal.	MEETS <input type="checkbox"/>	DOESN'T MEET <input type="checkbox"/>
MT2	The Bidder must provide a detailed résumé for EACH of its' proposed senior team members , which clearly describes relevant descriptions of the resource's work experience, academic qualifications, professional certifications and publications. The Bidder should bold-face or highlight the relevant areas in each resource's résumé.	MEETS <input type="checkbox"/>	DOESN'T MEET <input type="checkbox"/>
MT3	The Bidder must demonstrate that the Principal Investigator has a minimum of eight (8) years of experience conducting program evaluations in the crime prevention domain. Note that to satisfy this criterion (MT3), it is not sufficient to simply state that the Principal Investigator has the relevant experience/expertise, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations. The response to this criterion must explain in detail how the relevant 8+ years of experience were obtained.	MEETS <input type="checkbox"/>	DOESN'T MEET <input type="checkbox"/>
MT4	The Bidder must demonstrate that the Principal Investigator has experience writing evaluation reports. Note that to satisfy this criterion (MT4) the Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed Principal Investigator has been the lead author on a minimum of three (3) publications based on evaluations in the crime prevention domain. To demonstrate compliance with MT4, the Bidder must provide a list of bibliographical citations (at least 3) of the Principal Investigator's publications.	MEETS <input type="checkbox"/>	DOESN'T MEET <input type="checkbox"/>



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

Mandatory Technical Criteria			
	<p>Each publication must be accompanied by a brief (75-100 word) description of the subject matter, which explains why the publication is relevant to the criterion (i.e., it must be shown to deal with crime prevention).</p>		

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

4 Point Rated Technical Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with specific evaluation criteria detailed in this section.

The Bidder should provide all relevant details for each point-rated requirement:

- project/ work description overview;
- relevance of the project/work to each point rated requirement;
- your roles and responsibilities, including your tasks;
- duration in time (e.g. months; years) and dates;
- name and description of client organization; and
- name and phone number of client.

The Bidder must *provide sufficient detail to clearly demonstrate* how they meet each point-rated requirement below. Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the requirements, or reusing the same wording as the RFP, will not be considered “demonstrated” for the purpose of this evaluation.



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Proposal / Resume Ref.	Points received
R1	<p>The Bidder must outline, in sufficient detail, the research approach and specific tasks proposed to complete all aspects of the project. This should include a description of the proposed methodology and its advantages.</p> <p>To respond to this criterion, the Bidder must submit a technical proposal describing the methodological approach and timelines for conducting the project, including a detailed breakdown of the steps and days required for completing all aspects of the work requested.</p>	30	<p>30 points – Methodology and approach are well-defined¹</p> <p>20 points – Methodology and approach are adequately defined²</p> <p>10 points – Methodology and approach are superficially defined³</p> <p>0 points – Methodology and approach are not defined⁴</p>		
R2	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that a senior member of the project team was responsible for conducting quantitative analysis required by a program evaluation.</p> <p><i>Note also that to satisfy this criterion (R2), it is not sufficient to simply state that the senior team</i></p>	25	<p>5 points per project up to a maximum of 20 points</p> <p>1 project = 5 points 2 projects = 10 points 3 projects = 15 points 4 projects = 20 points</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>5 points – a senior member of the project team has performed</p>		

¹ Here, “Well-defined” means that the Bidder has integrated all of the objectives and methods described in the Statement of Work into a comprehensive methodological approach, and completely and clearly explained how all elements of the proposed methodology satisfies the objectives of the research.

² Here, “Adequately defined” means that the Bidder has integrated all of the objectives and methods described in the Statement of Work into a comprehensive methodological approach, but has not made completely clear how all the elements of the proposed methodology satisfy the objectives of the research.

³ Here, “Superficially defined” means that the Bidder has simply listed the objectives and methods described in the Statement of Work as the proposed methodological approach, and has provided very little elaboration on how the elements of the proposed methodology satisfy the objectives of the research.

⁴ Here, “Not defined” means that the Bidder has not included the objectives and methods described in the Statement of Work in the proposal, and has provided no elaboration on how the elements of the proposed methodology satisfy the objectives of the research.



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Proposal / Resume Ref.	Points received
	<p><i>member has the experience, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations.</i></p> <p><i>The response to this criterion must:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>include the project title;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>describe the research project and its duration (including dates);</i></p> <p>(c) <i>identify which resource member was involved, the duration of their involvement (including dates), and the extent of their roles and responsibilities; and explain clearly the quantitative techniques that were applied .</i></p>		<p>quantitative analysis in program evaluation in the crime prevention domain.</p>		
R3	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that a senior member of the project team was responsible for conducting qualitative analysis required by a program evaluation.</p> <p><i>Note also that to satisfy this criterion (R3), it is not sufficient to simply state that the senior team member has the experience, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations. The response to this criterion must:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>include the project title;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>describe the research project and its duration (including dates);</i></p> <p>(c) <i>identify which</i></p>	25	<p>5 points per project up to a maximum of 20 points</p> <p>1 project = 5 points 2 projects = 10 points 3 projects = 15 points 4 projects = 20 points</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>5 points – a senior member of the project team has performed qualitative analysis in program evaluation in the crime prevention domain.</p>		



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Proposal / Resume Ref.	Points received
	<p><i>resource member was involved, the duration of their involvement (including dates), and the extent of their roles and responsibilities; and explain clearly the qualitative techniques that were applied .</i></p>				
R4	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that a senior member of the project team has conducted meta-evaluation (i.e., evaluations of the quality of evaluation studies).</p> <p><i>Note also that to satisfy this criterion (R4), it is not sufficient to simply state that the senior team member has the experience, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations. The response to this criterion must:</i></p> <p>(d) <i>include the project title;</i></p> <p>(e) <i>describe the research project and its duration (including dates);</i></p> <p>(f) <i>identify which resource member was involved, the duration of their involvement (including dates), and the extent of their roles and responsibilities; and explain clearly the instruments and procedures used in the meta-evaluation.</i></p>	40	<p>10 points per project up to a maximum of 30 points</p> <p>1 project = 10 points 2 projects = 20 points 3 projects = 30 points</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>10 points—a senior team member has conducted a meta-evaluation study involved the application of a scoring instrument for rating the quality of program evaluation studies.</p>		



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Point Rated Criteria	Max Pts	Scoring	Demonstrated Experience	Proposal / Resume Ref.
	MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE	120			
	MINIMUM POINTS REQUIRED	70			

NOTE: Any proposal that fails to achieve the minimum points required will be considered non-compliant and will not receive further consideration.

5. Contractor Selection Method Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit 70% and Price 30%

5.1 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 in Article 1.2 for the point rated technical criteria. [

5.2 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.

5.3 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) : **PSi = LP / Pi x 30**. Pi is the evaluated price (P) of each responsive bid (i).

5.4 A technical merit score (TMS), determined as follows, will be allocated to each responsive bid (i): **TMSi = OSi x 70**. OSi 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.

5.5 The combined rating (CR) of technical merit and price of each responsive bid (i) will be determined as follows: **CRi = PSi + TMSi**

5.6 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.

5.7 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.



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

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.

6. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

6.1 Overview

The Bidder's financial proposal must be submitted in Canadian Funds, GST/HST excluded, FOB Destination, customs duties and excise tax included.

The total amount of Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax is to be shown separately, if applicable. The price of bids will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, Goods and Services Tax (GST) excluded FOB destination, Customs duties and Excise taxes included.

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

6.2 Definitions

Firm Lot Price:

This is a basis of payment that applies when the total amount payable to the contractor for all or, as applicable, a portion of the contractual obligations, is the firm price agreed upon by the contracting authority and the contractor. As part of the financial proposal, the Contractor must still provide a clear and detailed breakdown of all cost elements, professional fees, travel and direct expenses to support the quoted price.

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.

6.3 The Bidder must complete this pricing schedule and include it in its financial bid

The financial proposal must provide the total fixed price for completing the work as well as a detailed breakdown of that price. Details must be provided for each sub criteria. The financial proposal should address each of the following, as applicable in detail:



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

6.3.1 Table 1- Professional Services per diem Rates

Professional Services			
Resource Name	Estimated Level of Effort	Firm per diem rate*	Total (Level of effort) x (per diem rate)
Total Professional Services			

* **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:

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

6.3.2 Table 2 – Other Direct Expenses

Other expenses	Amount	Mark-up	TOTAL
Direct Expenses: Materials, supplies, and other direct expenses incurred during the performance of the Work at actual cost with a Mark-up		_____ %	

6.3.3 Table 3 - Subcontracts

Subcontracts	Amount	Mark-up	Total
Subcontracts: at actual cost with mark-up. List any subcontracts proposed for any portion of the Contract describing the work to be performed and a cost breakdown with a Mark-up		_____ %	

6.3.4 Table 4 - Total

TOTAL (sum tables 1 – 3)	\$
Firm Lot Price	



PART 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 6.4 Payment Schedule.** The bidder may provide a proposed milestone payment schedule based on the deliverables identified in the Statement of Work. This payment schedule will be subject to negotiation at the time of contract award. The basis determining the amount of each milestone payment should be clear.

Bidders should note the basis of payment is defined in Part 7 – Resulting Contract Clauses



PART 6 - CERTIFICATIONS

Part 6 Certifications

Bidders must provide the required certifications to be awarded a contract. Canada will declare a bid non-responsive if the required certifications are not completed and submitted as requested.

Compliance with the certifications bidders provide to Canada is subject to verification by Canada during the bid evaluation period (before award of a contract) and after award of a contract. The Contracting Authority will have the right to ask for additional information to verify the bidders' compliance with the certifications before award of a contract. The bid will be declared non-responsive if any certification made by the Bidder is untrue, whether made knowingly or unknowingly. Failure to comply with the certifications or to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority for additional information will also render the bid non-responsive.

1. Certifications Required with Bid

The certification included in Article 1.1 to Part 6, Certifications, must be duly completed and submitted by the Bidder as part of its bid. Should this not be part of the Bidder's proposal, the Contracting Authority reserves the right to request the certification prior to evaluations. Failure to provide the certification within the prescribed timeframe may result in disqualification.

1.1. CERTIFICATION 1 – ACCEPTANCES OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

I, the undersigned, as the Bidder and/or an authorized representative of the Bidder, hereby certify that by signing the proposal submitted in response to **RFP 201701265** that I agree to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions in their entirety as they appear in this RFP. No modifications or other terms and conditions included in our Proposal will be applicable to the resulting contract notwithstanding the fact that our proposal may become part of the resulting contract.

Name (block letters): _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Telephone number: () _____

Fax number: () _____

Date: _____

2. Certifications Precedent to Contract Award

The certifications included below, should be completed and submitted with the bid, but may be submitted afterwards. If any of these required certifications is not completed or submitted as requested, the Contracting Authority will so inform the Bidder and provide the Bidder with a time frame within which to meet the requirement. Failure to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority and meet the requirement within that time period will render the bid non-responsive.



PART 6 - CERTIFICATIONS

2.1 CERTIFICATION 2

CERTIFICATION OF EDUCATION / EXPERIENCE:

"The bidder hereby certifies that all the information provided in the résumés and supporting material submitted with the bid, particularly as this information pertains to education, achievements, experience and work history, has been verified by the bidder to be true and accurate. Furthermore, the bidder warrants that the individuals proposed by the bidder for the requirement are capable of satisfactorily performing the work described herein."

Name of Bidder

Name of duly authorized representative of Bidder

Signature of duly authorized representative of Bidder

Date

2.2 CERTIFICATION 3- Certification of Availability and Status of Personnel

2.2.1 Availability of Personnel:

The Bidder certifies that, should it be authorized to provide services under any contract resulting from this solicitation, the persons proposed in its proposal shall be available to commence performance of the Work as required by the Project Authority and at the time specified herein or agreed to with the Project Authority.

If the Bidder has proposed any person in fulfillment of this requirement who is not an employee of the Bidder, the Bidder must submit one copy of the following certification for each non-employee proposed.

(signature)

(Name and Title)

(Date)

2.2.2 This section is to be completed only if bidder is proposing any person in fulfillment of this requirement who is not an employee of the bidder.

One copy of this certification must be submitted for each non-employee proposed.

AVAILABILITY AND STATUS OF PERSONNEL

"I, _____(name of proposed candidate), certify that I consent to my résumé being submitted on behalf of _____ (name of firm) in response to the Request for Proposal _____(RFP number)."

Signature of Proposed Personnel

Date



PART 6 - CERTIFICATIONS

2.3 CERTIFICATION 4- Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Bid Certification

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that the Bidder, and any of the Bidder's members if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, is not named on the Federal Contractors Program (FCP) for employment equity "[FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid](http://publiservice.gc.ca/services/fcp-pcf/index_f.htm)" list (http://publiservice.gc.ca/services/fcp-pcf/index_f.htm) available from [Human Resources and Skills Development Canada \(HRSDC\) - Labour's](#) website.

Canada will have the right to declare a bid non-responsive if the Bidder, or any member of the Bidder if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, appears on the "[FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid](#)" list at the time of contract award.

2.4 CERTIFICATION 5– CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Canada may have engaged the assistance of private sector contractors in the preparation of this solicitation. Responses to this solicitation from any such contractor or with respect to which any such Bidder or any of its subcontractors, employees, agents or representatives are in any manner directly involved will be deemed to be in conflict of interest (real or perceived) and will not be considered. The Bidder represents and certifies that is has not received, nor requested, any information or advice from any such contractor or from any other company or individual in any way involved in the preparation of this solicitation or in the definition of the technical requirement. The Bidder further warrants and certifies that there is no conflict of interest as stated above.

Signature

Date

2.5 CERTIFICATION 6 – FORMER PUBLIC SERVANT

Former Public Servant Certification

Contracts with former public servants (FPS) in receipt of a pension or of a lump sum payment must bear the closest public scrutiny and reflect fairness in spending public funds. In order to comply with Treasury Board policies and directives on contracts with FPS, bidders must provide the information required below.

Definitions

For the purposes of this clause,

"former public servant" means a former member of a department as defined in the *Financial Administration Act, R.S. , 1985, c. F-11*, a former member of the Canadian Armed Forces or a former member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and includes:

- a) an individual;
- b) an individual who has incorporated;
- c) a partnership made up of former public servants; or
- d) a sole proprietorship or entity where the affected individual has a controlling or major interest in the entity.

"Lump sum payment period" means the period measured in weeks of salary, for which payment has been made to facilitate the transition to retirement or to other employment as a result of the implementation of various programs to reduce the Public Service.



PART 6 - CERTIFICATIONS

"Pension" means a pension payable pursuant to the *Public Service Superannuation Act, R.S., 1985, c. P-36* as indexed pursuant to the *Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, R.S., 1985, c. S-24*.

Former Public Servant in Receipt of a Pension

Is the Bidder a FPS in receipt of a pension as defined above? **YES () NO ()**

If so, the Bidder must provide the following information:

- a) name of former public servant,; and
- b) date of termination of employment or retirement from the Public Service.

Work Force Reduction Program

Is the Bidder a FPS who received a lump sum payment pursuant to the terms of a work force reduction program? **YES () NO ()**

If so, the Bidder must provide the following information:

- a) name of former public servant,;
- b) conditions of the lump sum payment incentive,;
- c) date of termination of employment,;
- d) amount of lump sum payment,;
- e) rate of pay on which lump sum payment is based,;
- f) period of lump sum payment including start date, end date and number of weeks,; and
- g) number and amount (professional fees) of other contracts subject to the restrictions of a work force reduction program.

For all contracts awarded during the lump sum payment period, the total amount of fee that may be paid to a FPS who received a lump sum payment is \$5,000, including Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax.

STATEMENT:

I, the undersigned, as a director of the Bidder, hereby certify that the information provided on this form and in the attached proposal are accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name (block letters): _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Telephone number: () _____

Fax number: () _____

Date: _____

The above-named individual will serve as intermediary with Public Service Canada



PART 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

The following clauses and conditions apply to and form part of any contract resulting from the bid solicitation.

1. Statement of Work

The Contractor must perform the Work in accordance with the Statement of Work at Annex "A" and the bidder's technical proposal in response to RFP 201701265.

2. Standard Clauses and Conditions

All clauses and conditions identified in the Contract by number, date and title are set out in the *Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions* Manual issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC). The Manual is available on the PWGSC Website:

<http://sacc.pwgsc.gc.ca/sacc/index-e.jsp>.

2.1 General Conditions

2035 – (2016-04-04), General Conditions - Higher Complexity – Services

However any reference to Public Works and Government Services Canada or its Minister contained in these terms and conditions shall be interpreted as reference to Public Safety Canada or its Minister

2.2 Supplemental General Conditions

4007 – (2010-08-16) - Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information

3. Security Requirement

This document is UNCLASSIFIED, however;

3.1 The Contractor shall treat as confidential, during as well as after the performance of the services contracted for, any information of the affairs of Canada of a confidential nature to which its servants or agents become privy; and

3.2 Contract personnel requiring casual access to the installation site do not require a security clearance but may be required to be escorted at all times.

4. Term of Contract

4.1 Period of Contract

The Work is to be performed from **contract award to August 31, 2017.**



PART 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

5. Authorities

5.1 Contracting Authority

The Contracting Authority for the Contract is:
To be identified at Contract award

The Contracting Authority is responsible for the management of the Contract and any changes to the Contract must be authorized in writing by the Contracting Authority. The Contractor must not perform work in excess of or outside the scope of the Contract based on verbal or written requests or instructions from anybody other than the Contracting Authority.

5.2 Technical Authority

The Technical Authority for the Contract is:

To be identified at Contract award.

Name of Technical Authority
Title
Department
Branch / Directorate
Address
Telephone:
Facsimile:
E-mail address:

The Technical Authority is the representative of the department or agency for whom the Work is being carried out under the Contract and is responsible for all matters concerning the technical content of the Work under the Contract. Technical matters may be discussed with the Project Authority; however, the Project Authority has no authority to authorize changes to the scope of the Work. Changes to the scope of the Work can only be made through a contract amendment issued by the Contracting Authority.

5.3 Contractor's Representative

To be determined.

Name of Contractor's Representative
Title
Telephone:
Facsimile:
E-mail address:

6. Payment

6.1 Firm Lot Price (SACC Manual Clause C0207C)

In consideration of the Contractor satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the Contract , the Contractor will be paid a firm lot price of \$_____ (*insert the amount at contract award*) . Customs duty are _____ (*insert " included ", " excluded" or " subject to exemption"*) and Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax is extra, if applicable. ”



PART 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

Canada will not pay the Contractor for any design changes, modifications or interpretations of the Work unless they have been approved, in writing, by the Contracting Authority before their incorporation into the Work.

6.2 Method of Payment

6.2.1 Payment Schedule *To be determined at contract award*

Canada will pay the Contractor for work performed during the Contract covered by the invoice in accordance with the payment provisions of the Contract if:

- (a) an accurate and complete invoice and any other documents required by the Contract have been submitted in accordance with the invoicing instructions provided in the Contract;
- (b) all such documents have been verified by Canada;
- (c) the Work performed has been accepted by Canada.

7. Payment Period

- 7.1. Canada's standard payment period is thirty (30) days. The payment period is measured from the date an invoice in acceptable form and content is received in accordance with the Contract or the date the Work is delivered in acceptable condition as required in the Contract, whichever is later. A payment is considered overdue on the 31st day following that date and interest will be paid automatically in accordance with the section entitled Interest on Overdue Accounts of the general conditions.
- 7.2. If the content of the invoice and its substantiating documentation are not in accordance with the Contract or the Work is not in acceptable condition, Canada will notify the Contractor within fifteen (15) days of receipt. The 30-day payment period begins upon receipt of the revised invoice or the replacement or corrected Work. Failure by Canada to notify the Contractor within fifteen (15) days will only result in the date specified in subsection 1 of the clause to apply for the sole purpose of calculating interest on overdue accounts.

8. SACC Manual Clauses

A9117C	(2007-11-30)	T1204 - Direct Request by Customer Department
C6000C	(2007-05-25)	Limitation of Price
C2900D	(2000-12-01)	Tax Withholding of 15 percent

9. Invoicing Instructions

- 9.1 The Contractor must submit invoices in accordance with the information required in Section 12 of, 2035 General Conditions - Services.
- 9.2 Additional Invoicing Instructions.
- 9.3 An invoice for a single payment cannot be submitted until all Work identified on the invoice is completed.
- 9.4 Each invoice must be supported by:



PART 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

- (a) a copy of time sheets to support the time claimed;
- (b) a copy of the release document and any other documents as specified in the Contract;

9.5 Invoices must be distributed as follows:

- (a) The original and one (1) copy must be forwarded to the following address for certification and payment:

Attn: Project Authority (to be identified at contract award)
Public Safety Canada
Invoice_processing@ps-sp.gc.ca

10. Certifications

Compliance with the certifications provided by the Contractor in its bid is a condition of the Contract and subject to verification by Canada during the entire contract period. If the Contractor does not comply with any certification or it is determined that any certification made by the Contractor in its bid is untrue, whether made knowingly or unknowingly, Canada has the right, pursuant to the default provision of the Contract, to terminate the Contract for default.

11. Applicable Laws

The Contract must be interpreted and governed, and the relations between the parties determined, by the laws in force in _____. (Insert the name of the province or territory as specified by the Bidder in its bid, if applicable.)

12. Priority of Documents

If there is a discrepancy between the wordings of any documents that appear on the list, the wording of the document that first appears on the list has priority over the wording of any document that subsequently appears on the list.

- (a) the Articles of Agreement;
- (b) the Supplemental General Conditions 4007 (2010-08-16) – Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information)
- (c) the General Conditions 2035 – (2016-04-04), General Conditions - Higher Complexity – Services
- (d) Annex “A”, Statement of Work;
- (e) Annex “B”, Basis of Payment
- (f) the Contractor’s bid dated _____ (insert date of bid), as amended _____ (insert date(s) of amendment(s) if applicable) in response to RFP 201701265.

13. Work Permit and Licenses

The Contractor must obtain and maintain all permits, licenses and certificates of approval required for the Work to be performed under any applicable federal, provincial or municipal legislation.

The Contractor is responsible for any charges imposed by such legislation or regulations. Upon request, the Contractor will provide a copy of any such permit, license, or certificate to Canada.

14. Conflict of Interest

In order to provide impartial and objective advice to Canada and to avoid any real or apparent conflict of interest, the Contractor represents and warrants that any proposed individual(s) assigned to perform any



PART 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

work under the contract must not be in a situation of conflict of interest that would render it unable to provide impartial assistance or advice to Canada, or affect or otherwise impair its objectivity in performing the work.

15. Conflict of Interest- Other Work

The Contractor, during and after the period of performance of the Contract agrees that:

- a) it must not bid for any contract to be let as a result of a solicitation where any work performed by the Contractor under this Contract creates a real or apparent conflict of interest or unfair advantage over other potential suppliers for any resulting contract(s), and must not participate as a subcontractor or consultant in the preparation of any other Bidder's tender or proposal for such a resulting contract; and
- b) it must not bid for any contract where the Contractor, in its work performed under this Contract, is required to assist Canada in evaluating the bids or in overseeing performance of a resulting contract, and must not participate as a subcontractor or consultant in the preparation of any other Bidder's tender or proposal for such a resulting contract; and
- c) if its work under the subject Contract involved access to information that would for any reason create a real or apparent conflict of interest or unfair advantage over other potential suppliers for any resulting contract(s), the Contractor must not bid for any of that resulting contract(s) or participate as a subcontractor or consultant in the preparation of any other Bidder's tender or proposal for any resulting contract;

Canada will disqualify any bid from the Contractor (or any entity that either controls or is controlled by the Contractor or, together with the Contractor, is under the common control of a third party, as well as such third party) for contracts as described in this clause, in respect to which Canada determines, at its sole discretion, that the bidder's involvement in this Contract, whether direct or indirect, has resulted in a real or apparent conflict of interest or unfair advantage over other suppliers for the work subject to the solicitation.

16. Non-Permanent Resident

Non-Permanent Resident

The Contractor is responsible for compliance with the immigration requirements applicable to non-permanent residents entering Canada to work on a temporary basis in fulfillment of this Contract. The Contractor will be responsible for all costs incurred as a result of noncompliance with immigration requirements.

Non-Permanent Resident (Foreign Contractor)

The Contractor must ensure that non-permanent residents intending to work in Canada on a temporary basis in fulfillment of the Contract, who are neither Canadian citizens nor United States nationals, receive all appropriate documents and instructions relating to Canadian immigration requirements and secure all required employment authorizations prior to their arrival at the Canadian port of entry.

The Contractor must ensure that United States nationals having such intentions receive all appropriate documents and instructions in that regard prior to their arrival at the Canadian port of entry. Such documents may be obtained at the appropriate Canadian Embassy/Consulate in the Contractor's country. The Contractor will be responsible for all costs incurred as a result of noncompliance with immigration requirements.

17. International Sanctions *[if applicable]*



PART 7 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

Not applicable

18. Canada Facilities, Equipment, Documentation & Personnel

18.1. Access to the following Canada facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel may be required during the Contract period in order to perform the work:

- a. Client department's premises;
- b. Client department's computer systems;
- c. Documentation; and
- d. Personnel for consultation.

18.2 Canada's facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel are not automatically at the disposal of the Contractor. The Contractor is responsible for timely identification of the need for access to the referenced facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel.

18.3 Subject to the approval of the Project Authority, arrangements will be made for the Contractor to access the required facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel at the Client department's earliest convenience.

19. Insurance

The Contractor is responsible to decide if insurance coverage is necessary to fulfill its obligation under the Contract and to ensure compliance with any applicable law. Any insurance acquired or maintained by the Contractor will be at its own expense and for its own benefit and protection. It will not release the Contractor from or reduce its liability under the Contract.



ANNEX A – STATEMENT OF WORK

TO BE INSERTED UPON CONTRACT AWARD



ANNEX B – BASIS OF PAYMENT

The Contractor will be paid in accordance with the following Basis of Payment for Work performed pursuant to the Contract.

(to be filled in at contract award):

Canadian Customs Duty and GST/HST extra.

All deliverables are F.O.B. Destination, and Canadian Customs Duty included, where applicable.

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:

$$Days_worked = \frac{Hours_Worked}{7.5_hours_per_day}$$

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.

The estimated GST or HST is included in the total estimated cost. 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.