



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions
- TPSGC**

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT

MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

**Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Airframes / Aero Engines R&O Division / Division de
la réparation de la révision des cellules et des moteurs
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
8C1, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TWIN OTTER R&O		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8485-163203/A		Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8485-163203		Date 2016-12-09
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$BF-126-26008		
File No. - N° de dossier 126bf.W8485-163203	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-12-15		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: White, John		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 126bf
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 420-1749 ()		FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-9110
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:		

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8485-163203
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8485-163203A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
007
File No. - N° du dossier
W8485-163203

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
126bf
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- A) Delete: Annex I version 2
Insert: Annex I version 3
- B) At Sub-Section 4.2.1 - Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price.

Delete: d. Obtain the required minimum number of 213 points (75 percent) overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 283 points.

Insert: d. Obtain the required minimum number of 216 points (75 percent) overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 288 points.

All other conditions remain unchanged

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION PLAN
FOR THE CC138 TWIN OTTER AIRCRAFT
IN-SERVICE SUPPORT PROGRAM**

1.1 Evaluation Plan Overview

The purpose of this Evaluation Plan is to document the overall evaluation methodology and processes that will be followed by evaluators while assessing the Bidder's proposal for award of the CC138 Twin Otter In-Service Support Contract.

1.2 – Evaluation Objectives

The specific objectives of this Evaluation Plan are to facilitate the evaluation of the Bidder's Proposal in a consistent, unbiased, fair, transparent and structured approach that will lead to a well supported recommendation for contract award.

2 EVALUATION CONCEPT

2.1. Evaluation Team:

Prior to the RFP closing date, the evaluation team will review the RFP to familiarize themselves with the requirements and the evaluation criteria. The evaluation team will consist of members from the Government of Canada.

2.2 Bid Receipt:

Bids received prior to the RFP closing date and time will be evaluated. All bids received after the closing date and time will be determined to be non-responsive and will not be evaluated.

2.2.1 All responsive Technical proposals will be distributed by PWGSC to the Technical Evaluation team members. Financial proposals will only be disclosed to the Financial Evaluation Team after the Technical Evaluation team has completed the technical evaluation process and provided an evaluation report to the Contracting Authority.

2.3. Technical Evaluation:

2.3.1 The technical evaluation team will review the Bidder's technical proposal to determine if the Mandatory technical requirements (M1-M4) identified in appendix 2 Table 3.1 - Mandatory Technical Criteria Requirements Matrix, have been met. If any one of these mandatory requirements has not been met, the technical proposal will be found non-compliant and no further evaluation of the proposal will take place.

2.3.2 The technical evaluation team will conduct the evaluation for the Point Rated technical requirements for each proposal that has met the mandatory requirements as identified in appendix 3 Table 3.2 - Point Rated Technical Criteria Requirements Matrix.

2.3.3 In order to be compliant, a bid must have a minimum score of 60% in each individually rated factor and achieving an overall result of 75% or better when all rated requirements are combined (M5). There is a total of 288 points available hence 216 points are required to meet this overall 75% rated requirement pass mark.

2.3.5 The results of the entire evaluation process will be recorded in an Evaluation Summary detailed at Appendix 1. This summary will list the compliant and non-compliant proposals for submission to the Contracting Authority.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Contractor Selection Method

3.1.1 The bidder's submission will be evaluated as stated in the Request for Proposal Solicitation # W8485-163203A, Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection.

APPENDIX 1 - Technical and Logistics Evaluation Summary

TECHNICAL AND LOGISTICS EVALUATION SCORING REPORT

RANK: _____

NAME: _____

BIDDER: _____

PART 1 - MANDATORY CRITERIA

MET / NOT MET

PART 2 - RATED REQUIREMENTS FACTOR CATEGORIES AND SCORES

a. Aircraft Maintenance, Engineering and Corporate Experience:

_____ POINTS (min 44/73)

b. Program Management:

_____ POINTS (min 45/75)

| c. Personnel:

_____ POINTS (min 48/80)

d. Material Management:

_____ POINTS (min 21/35)

e. R&O Support:

_____ POINTS (min 15/25)

| Total Points Received

_____ POINTS (min 216 / 288)

Print: _____

Print: _____

Signature: _____

Witness: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Note: In order to be compliant, a bid must obtain the required minimum of 60 percent of the points for each section of the technical evaluation criteria that are subject to point rating and obtain the required minimum of 75 percent of the overall points for the technical evaluation criteria that are subject to point rating.

SYNOPSIS OF FINDINGS

PART 1 - MANDATORY CRITERIA

PART 2 - RATED REQUIREMENTS FACTOR CATEGORIES AND SCORES

Print: _____

Print: _____

Signature: _____

Witness: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2 - Technical and Logistics Evaluation Scoring Matrix

Table 3.1 – Mandatory Technical Criteria Requirements Matrix						
Mandatory Requirements (Technical)		RFP Reference	Met	Not Met	Proposal Reference	Comments
M1	TC Accredited Maintenance Organization (AMO) certificate for “DeHavilland DHC-6” series aeroplanes, must be provided at bid submission.	Tech SOW 3.1.1				
M2	TC approved Design Approval Organization (ADO) certification in accordance with TC Airworthiness Manual Chapter 505, must be provided at bid submission	Tech SOW 3.1.2				
M3	The Bidder must hold a current Transport Canada Accredited Training Organization (ATO) certification or have a written agreement with a certified Transport Canada Training Organisation. This documentation must be provided at bid submission.	Tech SOW 3.1.3				
M4	The Bidder must provide documented proof, that a quality system appropriate to the scope of the work to be performed is in place. It is not necessary to be ISO 9001 compliant, but it is recommended that the quality system be based on ISO 9001:2008 "Quality management systems - Requirements."	Tech SOW 3.1.5				
M5	The bidder must achieve a minimum score of 60% in each rated factor (Table 3.2) and achieve an overall result of 75% or better when all rated requirements are combined.					
Met Mandatory Requirements						
Failure to meet any of the Mandatory Requirements as stated above will result in the Bidder being declared non-compliant.						

Appendix 3 - Technical and Logistics Evaluation Scoring Matrix

Table 3.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria Requirements Matrix

Point Rated Criteria Requirements

The Bidder must obtain the required minimum points for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating and obtain the required minimum of 75 percent overall of the points for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating.

The five (5) factors selected for assessment are as follows:

- a. Aircraft Maintenance, Engineering and Corporate Experience (min 44 points / max 73 points)
(min 45 points / max 75 points)
- b. Program Management (min 48 points / max 80 points)
- c. Personnel (min 21 points / max 35 points)
- d. Material Management (min 15 points / max 25 points)
- e. R&O Support

EXP Aircraft Maintenance, Engineering and Corporate Experience

1 Experience in aircraft engineering/ maintenance							
a)	Years of experience in aircraft engineering.	Excellent – (25)	Very good – (20)	Satisfactory – (15)	Poor – (10)	Very Poor – (5)	Not addressed – (0)
Bidder will detail its years of experience in the aircraft engineering field per type of engineering activity: maintenance support, design, supplemental type approvals, aircraft modifications, etc.							
	Evaluation Guideline	ADO has 15+ years of aircraft engineering experience	ADO has 11-14 years with aircraft engineering experience	ADO has 7-10 years of aircraft engineering experience	ADO has 3-6 years of aircraft engineering experience	ADO has less than 3 years of aircraft engineering experience	No information provided by the bidder
	SCORE						
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS						

Appendix 3
To Annex I

b)	Years of experience as accredited TC Aircraft Maintenance Organization	Excellent – (25)	Very good – (20)	Satisfactory – (15)	Poor – (10)	Very Poor – (5)	Not addressed – (0)
	Bidder will detail its years of experience as a TC accredited maintenance organization. Note: Experience is not cumulative between contractors/subcontractors. Experience is calculated as the maximum individual amount of any one company or its subcontractors.						
	Evaluation Guideline	AMO has 15+ years of experience as a TC accredited aircraft maintenance organization	AMO has 11-14 years of experience as a TC accredited aircraft maintenance organization	AMO has 7-10 years of experience as a TC accredited aircraft maintenance organization	AMO has 3-6 years of experience as a TC accredited aircraft maintenance organization	AMO has less than 3 years of experience as a TC accredited aircraft maintenance organization	No information provided by the bidder
	SCORE						
c)	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS						
	Amount of experience in aircraft maintenance for the DHC-6 series aeroplane	Excellent – (18)	Very good – (12)	Satisfactory – (6)	Poor – (0)		
	Bidder will detail its years of experience as an accredited maintenance organization for the DHC-6 series aeroplane. Note: Experience is not cumulative between contractors/subcontractors. Experience is calculated as the maximum individual amount of any one company or its subcontractors.						
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has 5+ years' experience as an accredited aircraft maintenance organization for the DHC-6 series aeroplane.	Bidder has 3-4 years' experience as an accredited aircraft maintenance organization for the DHC-6 series aeroplane.	Bidder has 1-2 years' experience as an accredited aircraft maintenance organization for the DHC-6 series aeroplane.	Bidder has less than 1 years' experience as an accredited aircraft maintenance organization for the DHC-6 series aeroplane.		
	SCORE						
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS						

Appendix 3
To Annex I

d)	Letters of reference	3 References - (5)	2 References - (3)	1 Reference - (1)	Not Addressed - (0)	
Bidders should provide 3 Letters of Reference from current/previous customers detailing their level of satisfaction with the Aircraft Maintenance and Engineering received.						
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided 3 references that confirm the bidder has carried out the requirements for Aircraft Maintenance Services to the customer's satisfaction.	Bidder has provided 2 references that confirm the bidder has carried out the requirements for Aircraft Maintenance Services to the customer's satisfaction.	Bidder has provided 1 reference that confirm the bidder has carried out the requirements for Aircraft Maintenance Services to the customer's satisfaction.	Bidder has provided 0 references	
	SCORE					
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					
BIDDER'S SCORE FOR EXPERIENCE						
		MAXIMUM SCORE		73	MINIMUM SCORE	
					44	
PASS OR FAIL						
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT						
PM	Program Management Plan					
1	Rating	Excellent – (25)	Very good – (20)	Satisfactory – (15)	Poor – (10)	Very Poor – (5)
The Bidder should describe how they plan to perform the Management Services in support of this contract. Management Services include the processes of planning, organizing and co-ordinating all activities and services related to maintenance, engineering, supply and financial as described within CDRL/DID CC138-006.						
	Evaluation guidelines	The proposal meets all and exceeds most of the requirements. The Bidder has provided a detailed draft management plan addressing all the requirements defined in the DID. There are no uncertainties that will significantly impact accomplishment of the requirements.	The proposal meets all and has exceeded some of the requirements. The Bidder has provided a detailed draft management plan addressing the majority of the requirements defined in the DID. There is low probability that uncertainties will significantly impact accomplishment of the requirement.	The proposal meets the requirements. The Bidder has provided a draft management plan addressing some of the key requirements defined in the DID. There is a moderate probability that uncertainties will significantly impact accomplishment of the requirement.	The proposal fails to meet some of the requirements. The Bidder has provided only a high level draft management plan addressing only a few requirements defined in the DID. There is a high probability that uncertainties will significantly impact accomplishment of the requirement.	The proposal fails to meet most of the requirements. The Bidder has provided a draft management plan that doesn't properly address the requirements defined in the DID. There is a very high probability that uncertainties will significantly impact accomplishment of the requirement.
	SCORE					
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					
Not addressed – (0)						
Not addressed						

Revision: 3

A3-3/12

8 Dec 2016

Appendix 3
To Annex I

2	Project Management						
Rating	Excellent – (15-13)	Very good – (12-10)	Satisfactory – (9-7)	Poor – (6-1)	Not addressed – (0)		
The bidder shall provide a description of their ability to conduct options analysis, develop solutions and implement modifications for customer specific requirements. Bidder shall provide details of 3 Projects managed in the last 5 years, including a description of each project, complexity, level of resources required, project management tools used for planning and controlling activities, and how airworthiness regulations compliance was achieved. (Examples of compliance plans, analysis reports and test plans developed by the Bidder shall be provided). Each project is worth 5 pts and will be independently reviewed and assessed. (totals summed up for max of 15pts)							
Evaluation guidelines	Bidder's processes are mature, developed and they have provided an abundance of supporting documents and are such that the level of risk to the program is deemed negligible. Bidder has clearly demonstrated that DND's program requirements will be expertly managed.	Bidder's processes are well developed, proven effective and they have provided adequate supporting documentation and are such that the level of risk to the program is deemed minimal. Bidder has clearly demonstrated that DND's program requirements will be effectively managed.	Bidder's processes are adequately developed and they have provided these processes for evaluation and are such that the level of risk to the program is deemed acceptable. Bidder has clearly demonstrated that DND's program requirements will be satisfactorily managed.	Bidder's processes are in development and the evaluation has deemed the risk to the program to be high but manageable. Bidder has clearly demonstrated that DND's program requirements will be adequately managed.	Not addressed		
SCORE							
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS							
3	Transition Plan						
Rating	Excellent – (15)	Very good – (12)	Satisfactory – (9)	Poor – (6)	Very poor – (3)	Not addressed – (0)	
The Bidder to provide a plan that clearly address how all transition plan activities in the DID CC138-006 will be executed and implemented to allow for a seamless transfer of work from past contractor to new contractor.							
Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has submitted a plan that addresses all of the requirements defined in the DID CC138-006. There are no uncertainties that all requirements will be achieved within 3 months after contract award.	Bidder has submitted a plan that addresses all of the requirements defined in the DID CC138-006. There is a low probability of uncertainty that all requirements will be achieved within 3 months after contract award.	Bidder has submitted a plan that addresses all of the requirements defined in the DID CC138-006. There is a moderate probability of uncertainties that all requirements will be achieved within 3 months after contract award.	Bidder has submitted a plan that addresses most of the requirements defined in the DID CC138-006. There is a high probability of uncertainties that could significantly impact the capability to complete transition within 3 months after contract award.	Bidder has submitted a plan that addresses some of the requirements defined in the DID CC138-006. There is a very high probability of uncertainties that will significantly impact the capability to complete transition within 3 months after contract award.	Not addressed	
SCORE							
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS							

Revision: 3

A3-4/12

8 Dec 2016

Appendix 3
To Annex I

4 <u>Material Management Processes</u>					
Rating	Excellent – (20)	Very good – (16)	Satisfactory – (12)	Poor – (8)	Not addressed – (0)
The Bidder must describe the material management processes to include configuration control and configuration management (modification status), visibility of CF material, scrap recovery, and contingencies for heightened states of readiness, etc.					
Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided a description as required, with documented evidence that procedures are already a part of the company's standard practices.	Bidder provided a description as required, with documented evidence that procedures are drafted and ready to be implemented.	Bidder provided a description that addresses some of the material management processes. Evaluators have assessed that the risk to service performance is acceptable.	Bidder has failed to address many of the material management processes. Evaluators have documented flaws to support their assessment that risk to the service is high but manageable.	Not addressed
SCORE					
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					
BIDDER'S SCORE FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT					
			MAXIMUM SCORE	MINIMUM SCORE	BIDDER'S SCORE
			75	45	
HR	Personnel				
1	<u>Qualified Design Engineers (DE)</u>				
a)	Rating	Excellent – (5)	Very good – (4)	Satisfactory – (3)	Poor – (2)
The bidder is to identify by name all Structures engineering personnel, their qualifications and their Transport Canada airworthiness delegations as well as years of experience. Note: 2 points will be given for the first DE and 1 points will be given for substitutes, up to a maximum of 5 points.					
Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (4 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (3 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (2 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (1 DE)	Not addressed
SCORE					
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					

Appendix 3
To Annex I

b)	Rating	Excellent – (5)	Very good – (4)	Satisfactory – (3)	Poor – (2)	Not addressed – (0)
	The bidder is to identify by name all Electrical Systems engineering personnel, their qualifications and their Transport Canada airworthiness delegations. Note: 2 points will be given for the first DE and 1 points will be given for substitutes, up to a maximum of 5 points.					
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (4 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (3 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (2 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (1 DE)	Not addressed
	SCORE					
c)	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					
	Rating	Excellent – (5)	Very good – (4)	Satisfactory – (3)	Poor – (2)	Not addressed – (0)
	The bidder is to identify by name all Mechanical Systems engineering personnel, their qualifications and their Transport Canada airworthiness delegations. Note: 2 points will be given for the first DE and 1 points will be given for substitutes, up to a maximum of 5 points.					
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (4 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (3 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (2 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (1 DE)	Not addressed
	SCORE					
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					

Appendix 3
To Annex I

d)	Rating	Excellent – (5)	Very good – (4)	Satisfactory – (3)	Poor – (2)	Not addressed – (0)
	The bidder is to identify by name all Avionics Systems engineering personnel, their qualifications and their Transport Canada airworthiness delegations. Note: 2 points will be given for the first DE and 1 points will be given for substitutes, up to a maximum of 5 points.					
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (4 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (3 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (2 DE)	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of the engineering requested in above that could be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. (1 DE)	Not addressed
	SCORE					
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					
2	Qualified Aircraft Maintenance Engineers					
	Rating	Excellent – (25)	Very good – (20)	Satisfactory – (15)	Poor – (10)	Very poor – (5) Not addressed – (0)
	The bidder is to identify by name all authorized technicians, their qualifications, a description of their endorsements and scope, and how they will meet the maintenance requirements of 1 aircraft TLIR completed within 4 mths, while conducting all remaining contracted activities. The bidder to describe its ability to surge to 2 aircraft on-site for 2 mths if/when tasked by DND.					
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of personnel that will be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. The bidder has the ability to surge for a large period (1 mth +) without degradation of service to the program.	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of personnel that will be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. The bidder has the ability to surge for a large period (1 mth +) of time with limited degradation of service to the program.	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of personnel that will be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. The bidder has the ability to surge for a limited time (< 1 mth) without degradation of service to the program.	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of personnel that will be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. The bidder has the ability to surge for a limited time (< 1 mth) with limited degradation of service to the program.	Bidder has provided all names, quals and authorization of personnel that will be used to support the requirements specified within the Tech SOW. The bidder does not have the ability to surge.
	SCORE					
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					

[illegible]

Appendix 3
To Annex I

5 Personnel Staffing						
	Rating	Excellent – (10)	Very good – (8)	Satisfactory – (6)	Poor – (4)	Very poor – (2)
	The bidder should describe in detail their human resource staffing requirements for third line maintenance, engineering and component Repair and Overhaul as well as all other direct and indirect activities.					
	Evaluation guidelines	All HR available and qualified on contract award	Staffing plan to ensure all HR will be hired and qualified within 3 months after contract award	Staffing plan to ensure that all HR will be hired and qualified within 3- 6 months after contract award	Staffing plan to ensure that all HR will be hired and qualified within 6-12 months after contract award	Staffing expected to take longer than 12 months to complete after contract award
	SCORE					
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS						
BIDDER'S SCORE FOR PERSONNEL						
				MAXIMUM SCORE	MINIMUM SCORE	BIDDER'S SCORE
				80	48	PASS OR FAIL
Material Management						
Inventory Management Software Experience						
MM 1	Rating	Excellent – (5)	Very good – (4)	Satisfactory – (3)	Poor – (1)	Not addressed – (0)
	The bidder to provide a description of the company's inventory management software and the amount of time that system has been in use by the company.					
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has demonstrated extensive experience with their current inventory management software for the aerospace industry, with greater than 5 years of ongoing use.	Bidder has demonstrated significant experience with their current inventory management software for the aerospace industry, with 4 years of ongoing use.	Bidder has demonstrated experience with their current inventory management software for the aerospace industry, with 3 years of ongoing use.	Bidder has demonstrated some inventory management software experience for the aerospace industry, with less than 3 years of ongoing use.	Not addressed
	SCORE					
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS						

Appendix 3
To Annex I

2	Material Management Transfer				
	Rating	Excellent – (10)	Satisfactory – (6)	Poor – (3)	Not addressed – (0)
	The Bidder to provide a description of the material transfer process, including but not limited to receipt, inventory handover, support arrangements, etc.				
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder has described the processes, identifying required human resources, IM/IT resources, facility resources, schedules, timelines and priorities, to handle the inventory handover and transfer of sub-contract work. The impact to the in-service support is negligible.	Bidder has described the processes, identifying required human resources, IM/IT resources, facility resources, schedules, timelines and priorities, to handle the inventory handover and transfer of sub-contract work. The impact to the in-service support is manageable.	Bidder has described the processes, identifying required human resources, IM/IT resources, facility resources, schedules, timelines and priorities, to handle the inventory handover and transfer of sub-contract work. The impact to the in-service support is unacceptable.	Not addressed
	SCORE				
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS				
3	High Priority Requests				
	Rating	Excellent – (10)	Satisfactory – (6)	Poor – (3)	Not addressed – (0)
	The bidder to provide their process for High Priority Requests (HPR), and the procedures for monitoring the effectiveness of the material management system. Schedule response is evaluated on sourcing and providing a quote for the requested part.				
	Evaluation guidelines	The Bidder has fully addressed the HPR requirements and has demonstrated the ability to respond to HPR requests within 1 working day.	The Bidder has somewhat addressed the HPR requirements and has demonstrated the ability to respond to HPR requests within 2 working days.	The Bidder has failed to address some of the HPR requirements and has demonstrated the ability to respond to HPR requests within 3 working days.	Not addressed
	SCORE				
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS				

Appendix 3
To Annex I

4	Stocktaking							
	Rating	Excellent – (10)	Very good – (8)	Satisfactory – (5)	Poor – (3)	Not addressed – (0)		
	The bidder is to provide their internal inventory management process to include physical inventory count, stocktaking procedures, a stocktaking schedule, CHI reporting, stock records, and reconciliation processes IAW the Logistics SOW.							
	Evaluation guidelines	Bidder provided a detailed plan exceeding requirements, with documented evidence that procedures exceed DND requirements as well as best accounting practices and a schedule for accomplishing the required stocktakings.	Bidder provided a detailed plan meeting requirements, with documented evidence that procedures meet DND requirements as well as best accounting practices and a schedule for accomplishing the required stocktakings.	Bidder provided a plan as requested, with documented evidence that procedures may meet most of DND requirements as well as best accounting practices and a schedule for accomplishing the required stocktakings.	Bidder's plan fails to meet some of DND requirements <u>or</u> the schedule for accomplishing the required stocktakings does not meet DND requirements.	Not addressed		
	SCORE							
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS							
BIDDER'S SCORE FOR MATERIAL MANAGEMENT								
RO	R&O Support							
1	Subcontractor							
	Percentage of component list Sub-contracted	Excellent – (15)	Very good – (12)	Satisfactory – (9)	Poor – (6)	Very poor – (3)	Poor – (0)	
	The bidder is to identify (percentage) of the components on the SNAPS list that will be sub-contracted out. Identification of proposed sub-contractors including a description of credentials, qualifications, assigned work and number of years in business.							
	Evaluation guidelines	0-29% of Component R&O Subcontracted out	30-44% of Component R&O Subcontracted out	45-59% of Component R&O Subcontracted out	60-74% of Component R&O Subcontracted out	75-89% of Component R&O Subcontracted out	90-100% of Component R&O Subcontracted out	
	SCORE							
	PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS							

Appendix 3
To Annex I

2 Avionics Software and Firmware Reporting Management					
Rating	Excellent – (10)	Satisfactory – (6)	Poor – (3)	Not addressed – (0)	
The Bidder to provide a detailed description of the avionics software and firmware status reporting program.					
Evaluation guidelines	A clear and detailed plan covering all the aspects mentioned in ES task 12 of the technical SOW and demonstrates a reasonable expectation that a comprehensive review of applicability can be conducted.	A detailed plan covering most of the aspects mentioned in ES task 12 of the technical SOW and demonstrates an expectation that a detailed review of applicability can be conducted.	A plan covering some of the aspects mentioned in ES task 12 of the technical SOW and demonstrates that a review of applicability can possibly be conducted.	Not addressed	
SCORE					
PROPOSAL REFERENCE AND COMMENTS					
BIDDER'S SCORE FOR R&O SUPPORT					
			MAXIMUM SCORE	MINIMUM SCORE	BIDDER'S SCORE
			25	15	PASS OR FAIL