

Solicitation No. 1000184651

To All Offerors:

Please be advised that the Department has been asked for clarification relative to Solicitation 1000184651 and we would like to submit the following information to all prospective offerors to assist in the formulation of bid packages:

AMENDMENTS:

1. From Stream 1 - Proposed Resource, R.1.3 and associated Stream 1 – Table M1 Proposed Resource remove the following:

“Professional work experience conducting Research Analysis Activities using primary and secondary sources held by Library and Archives Canada and other Federal government records.

And replace with:

Professional work experience conducting Research Analysis Activities identifying primary and secondary sources held by Library and Archives Canada and other Federal government records.

2. From Stream 1 – M1 Proposed Resource and associated Stream 1 – Table M1 Proposed Resource remove the following:

“Undergraduate degree in the humanities or social sciences in a relevant discipline (including not limited to history, native studies, political science, anthropology or sociology) or law”

And replace with:

“Post-secondary degree in the humanities or social sciences in a relevant discipline (including not limited to history, native studies, political science, anthropology or sociology) or law”

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question #1:

Part 7, regarding security clearance -If the bidder already has reliability status as a corporation, is it sufficient for named resources and sub-consultants without security screening at the level of reliability to sign the certification at page 51 with the proposal submission?

Answer #1

As indicated on the Certification, the form is to be signed by a Duly Authorized Representative of the Firm/Contractor.

Question #2

The “Standardized Client Project Authority Reference Questions” [Stream 1, M2] notes that DIAND reserves the right to contact the named client project authorities indicated under Mandatory Requirement

M2. For Stream 2, it appears that Mandatory Requirement M2 is the document summary exercise. Does that mean then that DIAND would not contact named client project authorities listed in R1.1 or R1.2 in the case of a bidder who was solely applying for Stream 2?

Answer #2

Yes. The Standardized Client Project Authority Reference Questions are meant to accompany Stream 1, M2.

Question #3

If the bidder's experience in Section R.1.2 of table M1 is exactly the same as the experience in section R.1.1, do you still want the same information copied into R.1.2, or can we just refer the reader to Section R1.1 for this information?

Answer #3

It is up to the bidder to determine what information to provide in table M1 to demonstrate they meet mandatory criteria M1.

Question #4

Can the bidder use the experience of the resource(s) for its two project summaries in the following scenarios:

- a) The bidder is a new company, formed for this bid.
- b) The bidder is a former sub-contractor of a research company, who is bidding independently for the first time.

Answer #4

The Project Summaries are evaluating the experience of the Bidder, not the individual resources.

Question #5

Further to your amendment to Stream 1 Point-Rated Criterion R.2, if the purpose of the project summaries is to evaluate the bidder, and not the resources, and if the bidder is a company who is putting forward resources, then who is being scored in Table M1 – the bidder or the resource(s) put forward by the bidder?

Answer #5

Table M1 is evaluating the Proposed Resource(s)

Question #6

If a bidder forms a new company for the purpose of the bid, and if the bid has one resource, can the bidder use the resource's experience for the project summaries.

Answer #6

The Project Summaries are evaluating the experience of the Bidder.

Question #7

The rated requirements for R1 refer to the Bidder's Experience and the work experience of the Bidder. Are the Bidder's resource(s) being evaluated as the Bidder's Experience? If so how are multiple resources being evaluated for the technical score? Separately or together?

Answer #7

No, bidder's resources are not being evaluated as Bidder's Experience in R1.

Question #8

If the Bidder's Experience for the purposes of evaluating R1 is the experience of resources put forward by the Bidder, then can the Bidder use the experience of the resources for the R2 Project Summaries, even if the Bidder was not involved in the projects? If not, what is the difference between the term "Bidder" as used in the R1 table, e.g. 'experience of the Bidder' and the term "Bidder" as used in the amended R2 table title 'Bidder Project Summaries'

Answer #8

No, the bidder cannot use experience of the resources for the R2 project summaries if the Bidder was not involved in the projects. The term Bidder is used in the same context in both instances, as the entity submitting the Offer, whether that be a person, business, or joint-partnership.

Question #9

For Stream 1, Table R1 is labelled as the "Bidder's" experience not the "Resource's" experience. Does that mean that a Bidder with two or more resources will count the resources' experience together to get the Bidder's experience score out of 25.

For example: A bidder has two resources, one with 1 year experience and one with 2 years' experience under R1.1. Would the bidder get to combine their experience to get 3 year' experience and 10 points out of 15 under R1.1?

Answer #9

The Resource's experience is not being evaluated in R1.

Question #10

Do we need to submit proof of education for each resource? If so, do you have requirements for specific documentation such as copies of a degree or transcripts?

Answer #10

Proof of education is not requested at this time. Please refer to 5.2.3, Additional Certifications Precedent to Issuance of a Standing Offer, 5.2.3.2 Education and Experience

Question #11

For Stream #1, the template M1 Proposed Resource Table uses the following language:

"R.1.3 Professional work experience conducted using primary and secondary sources held by Library and Archives Canada and other Federal government records."

The description of the Point-Rated evaluation criteria to be applied in R1.3 uses the following language:

Full time professional research experience **identifying** relevant primary and secondary sources, (files, reels, electronic sources and specific materials) held by Library and Archives Canada (LAC), and other Federal government records.”

Can you please clarify if the bidders are requested to show experience of “using” these records or of “identifying” these records.

Answer #11

Bidders are requested to show experience **identifying** these records. Please refer to Amendment 1 above.

Question #12

In the table to present the education qualification, could you provide an example of how you want “Dates/Duration (in years/months)” presented?

Answer #12

There is no specific format indicated. It is up to the bidder to ensure they clearly demonstrate the date of graduation and duration of education.

Question #13

The table [Stream 1 - Table M1 – Proposed Resource] does not clearly indicate where we should provide the name of the institution where we obtained our degree. Do we need to provide this information, and if so, where?

Answer #13

This should be indicated under Description of Associated Education.

Question #14

If we have a graduate degree should we include that degree in the table?

If we have a graduate degree, do we need to provide information about our undergraduate education, or is the graduate degree sufficient to meet the educational criteria?

Answer #14

Please refer to Amendment 2 above. It is up to the bidder to demonstrate how they meet the requirement of a post-secondary degree in the humanities, social sciences or law.

Question #15

How are months of work experience calculated? Is the number of calendar months where a particular threshold of days worked is met? Is it the total number of Full Time Days divided by a particular number, or another method?

Answer #15

Months of full time professional work experience is defined as months in which the bidder worked a minimum of fifteen 8-hour days in a month.

Question #16

If a "Bidder" ranked #1 is an individual [single resource] and the "Bidder" ranked #2 is four individuals [four proposed resources], does the individual with "Bidder" #1 receive 8.37% of the overall work and each of the four individual [resources] with "Bidder" #2 share 8.37% of the overall work?

Answer #16

Yes

Question #17

If a "Bidder" submits one resource for Stream 1 and one resource for Stream 2, will the "Bidder" win one Stream 1 Standing Offer and one Stream 2 Standing Offer if the resources rank high enough in each category?

Answer #17

Please refer to Evaluation Methodology 4.1.7