

Solicitation No. 1000193523**To All Offerors:**

Please be advised that the Department has been asked for clarification relative to Solicitation 1000193523 and we would like to submit the following information to all prospective offerors to assist in the formulation of bid packages:

AMENDMENT ONE

1)

4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria is amended as follows:

RT4 "Northern and Inuit-Owned Businesses is deleted and replaced with the following:

		Maximum Number of Points
RT4	<p><u>Northern and Inuit-Owned Businesses and Engagement in the contract:</u></p> <p><u>Points will be awarded for clearly demonstrating that the bidder:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is A Certified Inuit-Owned Business as registered with Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.; and/or • Has Office(s) and/or employee(s) located in Nunavut; and/or • Will engage Inuit professional services in the completion of the contract. <p>(5 points for each)</p>	15

2)

The date of the solicitation closing is amended to: October 20, 2017

3)

4.1.2 Financial Evaluation

The Pricing Schedule is deleted and replaced with the following:

Pricing Schedule			
Resource Category	Per Diem (a)	X estimated number of days (b)	Total (a x b)
Senior Resource		60	
Intermediate Resource		15	
Junior Resource		5	
Total Evaluated Price			
Applicable tax (not to be included in total evaluated price)			

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:**Q.1**

On page 14 of the RFP, under RT4, could you please clarify what is meant by "Engagement of Inuit professional services"? In particular, if we are not a Northern or Inuit-owned business but could demonstrate examples of having engaged Inuit professional services, would these experiences be considered for point rating under RT4?

A.1

Please see Amendment One which has now changed the requirement.

Q.2

Is the timeline presented in the Outputs/Deliverables of the Annex A flexible? In other words, instead of finishing at the end of this fiscal year, could the mandate end during the next fiscal year?

A.2

The work should be completed within the current fiscal year. Consideration for extension(s) may be considered for delays out of the bidders control.

Q.3

According to phase 1 and phase 2 of the Review Process, pages 27 and 28 of the RFP, 80 days are estimated for the realization of this mandate. We have noticed, however, that in section 4.1.2 Financial Evaluation the pricing schedule is constructed in such a way that each resource's Per Diem is multiplied by 80 days. Do we then understand correctly that there is a total of 240 days divided between three resources, thus having each 80 days?

A.3

Please see Amendment One - #3 above.

Q.4

There appears to be a requirement that all proposed resources have effective security clearances at the time of bid submission. Would the Crown accept that the security clearances are in progress at the time of bid submission?

A.4

As per the Security Requirement 1.1 the requirement is at the date of bid closing.

Q.5

The RFP requests 3 resources. One resource for each of three levels: senior, intermediate and junior.

Would it be possible for bidder to submit more than one resource at each level?

A.5

The bidder may propose as many resources as they wish, however, the estimated level of effort may not be exceeded. Additionally, each resource category may only have one per diem.

Q.6

Will references be required?

A.6

Bidders will be evaluated on the criteria listed under 4.1.1 and 4.1.1.2.

Q.7

Section 6.7.2, provides an opportunity for Canada to include an amount for limitation of expenditure. This field is left blank in Item 1.. Is there a dollar value for limitation of expenditure?

A.7

Section 6.7.2 is part of the "resulting contract clauses" and only completed upon award of the contract.

Q.8

Mandatory requirement M2 makes reference to unpublished reports over 30 pages. Will Canada require samples of technical reports?

A.8

The bidder is required to demonstrate that the Senior Resource has substantial experience in program auditing and evaluation. However the bidder wishes to substantiate this requirement is at their discretion.

Q.9

Would you confirm which five-year period the review would be for (e.g. FY 2011/12 up to the end of the 2016/17 FY)?

A.9

The review will cover the fiscal periods 2011/12 until 2016/17.

Q.10

Is there currently an accountability framework, an evaluation plan/framework in the NGMP Treasury Board submission or other documentation of NGMP?

A.10

NGMP's Treasury Board submission should contain an accountability framework as this a general requirement however, I am not aware if an evaluation plan/framework was included/developed.

Q.11

Is the NGMP Secretariat the contract authority for the work, and will there be an evaluation sub-committee to guide the review project, and with whom the Consultant can interact with during the course of the project?

A.11

The Manager of NGMP will be the Project Authority and point of contact with the Secretariat during the course of the contract. .The Contracting Authority is identified in the RFP, under 6.5.1.

Q.12

Have there been any earlier reviews of the overall program or its projects or evaluation/review type data collected. If yes, are these available?

A.12

There have been no previous reviews of the program.

Q.13

In order to structure the report for the intended audience(s) of the report, who are the intended audience(s) of the final report?

A.13

The intended audiences for all reports are the NGMP Steering Committee, the Nunavut Implementation Panel and Senior Management within INAC.

Q.14

Will there be NGMP staff available to help:

- a. Compile and assemble data and reports?
- b. Arrange meetings and provide logistical support for key informant interviews, meetings, etc.?

A.14

NGMP staff will be available to assist in the provision of any necessary documentation held by the Secretariat or the Department. Staff will also assist in completing any logistics required to carry out meetings, briefings etc.. It is the expectation of the Secretariat that any data collection required for the completion of the contract will be undertaken by the successful bidder. In addition NGMP staff will be available to assist in the identification of key informants, this will include the provision of contact information. However it is the expectation of the Secretariat that the successful bidder will be responsible for co-ordinating the time, date and place of any required interviews.

Q.15

If there is no review or evaluation framework in place to guide this review (see Question 2 above), is the expectation that one be created as part of the Issues Scoping report?

A.15

Based upon the information collected it will be the responsibility of the successful bidder to determine what elements are required/necessary to successfully complete each phase of the project.

Q.16

Are the briefings reports for Phases 1 and 2 expected to be in prose text or more bullet form high level briefings format, the latter more appropriate for briefing and confirming findings and gap identification. Also, the latter would provide cost efficiencies.

A.16

As stated in "Annex A" Statement of Work, Outputs/Deliverables, for each phase there will be a report required in MS Word. These reports would be in prose form. The presentation/briefings required for each phase can be in MS PowerPoint, using bullet form as appropriate.