

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:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question #1

In Section 2.2.3 - Submission of Offers, it states it is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure that the Offer is received on time. Will you respond to read receipt requests or may we call to ensure you have received our emailed proposal?

Answer #1

You may email or call the Standing Offer Authority to confirm receipt, Kim Fletcher 604-616-4341 kim.fletcher@aandc-aadnc.gc.ca Please do not send submissions/offers to this address.

Question #2

The instructions in 3.1 Offer Preparation Instructions clearly state that the email submission should consist of 3 attachments, with the Technical offer in .pdf format. In Stream 2, R2 document summaries on page 33, the instructions state to submit the document summaries in Word format. Is Word format converted to .pdf as part of the Technical offer acceptable or should we attach a separate Word document to the email package?

Answer #2

Document Summaries may be submitted in .pdf format.

Question #3

For Stream 2 M2 Document Summaries. The section states that Bidders must provide document summaries. If our firm is proposing multiple resources in a Stream 2 proposal, do we require a set of document summaries for each resource or one set from the company (the bidder)?

Answer #3

One set for the Bidder (the company).

Question #4

For Stream 1 M3 Research Planning and Assessment Task, the section states that Bidders must provide a Research Plan. If our firm is proposing multiple resources in a Stream 1 proposal, do we require separate Research Plans for each resource or one from the company (the bidder)?

Answer #4

One submission for the Bidder (the company).

Question #5

If our company submits two separate bids for Stream 1 and Stream 2 and we include multiple resources on each bid, may we include the same resource for Stream 1 and 2?

Answer #5

Yes

Question #6

Is scoring for resources averaged for the “bidder” if multiple resources are submitted?

Answer #6

There is no point-scored evaluation of resources. All point rated criteria are evaluating the Bidder.

Question #7

Stream 1 – R2 Resource Project Summaries

Research for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is listed under “Partially Relevant Subject Matter.” The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was a result of the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement. Research planning and file identification undertaken for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was precisely the same process as any research undertaken for Indian Day School litigation for the Litigation and Management Resolution Branch. Regarding subject matter, it is challenging to see how one would consider the TRC’s subject matter, Indian Residential Schools, as markedly different than LMRB’s subject matter, Indian Day Schools. Furthermore, the research planning and file identification for the TRC was complex in it’s inclusion of dozens of record groups – similar to research planning and file identification for higher level, more complex claims at LMRB.

Similarly, research to support a Specific Claim is listed under “Partially Relevant Subject Matter.” Again, it is hard to understand how the subject matter is markedly different from a gap analysis commissioned on a Specific Claim by LMRB, which would receive a higher score under the description of the rated criteria. The subject matter is the same.

The logic behind the assignment of certain project-types as “partially relevant” is unclear. Would it not make more sense to judge a project’s relevance to LMRB based on how it meets with LMRB’s Statement of Work?

Answer #7

LMRB has an ongoing need for the determination and planning of research requirements arising in litigation. Litigation is the subject matter considered most relevant by LMRB.