

RFP Q&A #1 to #19

1000194561 – French Technical Editing

Question #1

Health Canada and Public Health Agency of Canada have recently awarded several Standing Offers for editing services of this nature. Is there a specific reason why qualified SOA holders aren't being approached with this requirement?

Answer #1

Please provide the standing offer (SO) number's you are referring too, if you are referring to the "Translation, Editing and Revision Services" SO with the following numbers for example (4600001402, 4600001403, 4600001404 etc). Then the reason we didn't use these SO is because the overall \$ amount of this request is over the maximum allowable maximum \$ amount of the SO's in question. We do encourage all vendors who are a part of any SO to provide a bid since it is an open RFP to all vendors.

Question #2

For M2, M5 and R3: What is the maximum number of samples required to be compliant and obtain maximum points? Our understanding is that 18 samples are required (6 per proposed resource). This logic assumes that the samples presented at M5 and R3 can also be presented at M2. Please confirm.

Answer #2

Documents submitted for M2 can also be used for M5 and R3. Minimum of 18 documents, maximum of 28 should be submitted.

Question #3

what is the expected annual volume of work? Please provide an estimate in good faith as this is an important factor in the preparation of the proposal.

Answer #3

Level of effort in hours is approximately 580 hours per fiscal year

Question #4

At R3: Page 10 indicates a max. of 30 points and page 11 shows a maximum of 45 points. Please confirm that it is 45 points. In addition, the allocation of points suggests that it will be a pass/fail evaluation for each sample. Is this correct, meaning that the evaluation of samples will not be subjective?

Answer #4

Yes, this should be 45 points. Samples will only be evaluated based on whether they demonstrate

French editing and review of technical/scientific documents focused on health sciences. Please refer to RFP Amendment #1

Question #5

Is there an incumbent (who has worked on this project in the past)?

Answer #5

Yes there is but the incumbent's contract is ending March 31, 2018.

Question #6

How does PHAC define an "urgent" requirement?

- a. Under what circumstances would this rate be charged by the Contractor?
- b. What is the % of the requirement that would fall in this category? Please provide an estimate in good faith.
- c. Will services be required outside of normal working hours? If so, how often (please estimate)?

Answer #6

Urgent request would be document required with same day turnaround, or significantly shorter timelines than normal

- a) Rush fees would incur for same day turnaround, and off-hours work that is requested
 - b) Less than 15% of requirements fall under "urgent" category
 - c) Services will always be required during normal working hours
-

Question #7

R3 requires Bidders to provide the English version of the text. Does this mean that all examples must be for comparative editing (French compared to the English) as opposed to source language editing (editing of a French text on its own)? Is this correct? If it would be ok to provide examples of source language editing projects, please explain how this would be scored.

Answer 7

Examples of comparative editing is what we are looking for not source language editing

Question #8

Would PHAC accept to extend the closing date by one week or for a few days

Answer #8

We have extended the solicitation closing date and time to February 9, 2018 @2pm. Please refer to RFP amendment #1

Question #9

Is a supplier currently, or in the past 12 months, been providing services under contract identical or similar to those identified in this RFP's Scope of Work? If so, please identify the supplier.

Answer #9

Yes there is but the incumbent's contract is ending March 31, 2018. The company contracted is Consult Ink.

Question #10

The RFP document refers to a "contract period" (plus two optional one-year extension periods), but I do not believe the length or dates of the original contract period are identified. Can you please clarify?

Answer #10

Please refer to RFP Amendment #1

Question #11

What is the maximum dollar value assigned to the contract resulting from this RFP, for both the original contract period and optional extension periods?

Answer #11

Please refer to RFP Amendment #1

Question #12

If the three resources proposed by the bidder are part of the bidder's organization, can the bidder's projects listed and provided in M2 overlap with the resource projects identified in M5 and rated in R3 (provided the resources undertook those projects on behalf of the bidder)? Or are you looking for the submission to contain 19 distinct sample projects, 10 representing the bidder and an additional/distinct 9 representing the resources (3 projects x 3 resources)?

Answer #12

Documents submitted for M2 can also be used for M5 and R3. Minimum of 18 documents, maximum of 28 should be submitted.

Question #13

Please confirm that there is no requirement, either mandatory or rated, to provide written project summaries to demonstrate the relevancy to the RFP Scope of Work, for either the bidder (M2) or resources (M5 and R3). Simply attaching the project samples themselves is sufficient.

Answer #13

Just providing the documents for M2 and M5 as written is sufficient to pass. R3's grid has changed please refer to RFP amendment #1.

Question #14

M1 requires the bidder to demonstrate that it has a minimum of 5 years' experience. M3 requires the bidder to demonstrate that each of its three resources demonstrate that they have a minimum of 5 years' experience and include detailed resumes. But why is there no equivalent Rated element that would assess and rate bidder/resource experience beyond the mandatory minimum

Answer #14

Please refer to RFP amendment #1 specifically with the addition of rated #4.

Question #15

Since you are requiring the bidder to provide 10 actual project samples under M2, why is there no equivalent/co-related element in the Rated requirements that would assess and rate the quality and complexity of these projects in relation to the RFP's Scope of Work?

Answer #15

This will be left as is. We are assessing the documents submitted by the resources in M5. As long as the documents provided meet the requirements in M2, they will pass.

Question #16

The allocation of points for R3 appears to suggest that the points are obtained merely by provided the requested samples and their English equivalents (a quantitative exercise), and not via any assessment on the quality of the work itself or its degree of relevance to the RFP's Scope of Work (qualitative assessment). Where are you actually assessing and rating the bidder's/resources' comparative ability to carry out RFP's Scope of Work at the highest levels, vs. other bidders?

Answer #16

Please refer to RFP amendment #1

Question #17

This RFP and subsequent contract is for French Technical Editing Services. Why in R3 would you provide higher points (5 points each) for simply including a copy of the original English text than for the bidder's actual French technical editing work itself (3 points each)? Surely all that attaching a copy of the original English text demonstrates is that the bidder maintains a reasonable historical filing system for past projects, and nothing related to the actual quality or relevance of the French technical editing work that is the subject of the RFP and subsequent contract?

Answer #17

Please refer to RFP amendment #1

Question #18

Section 2.1.2 states: "Only technical bids that meet the mandatory technical criteria and the minimum score required in the point-rated technical criteria will be further evaluated against the mandatory financial criteria on the basis of the Bidder's Financial Bid." Section 2.2.2 states: "Minimum overall score: There is no minimum pass mark required." This is highly unusual, why was a minimum score not established for the Rated Requirements?

Answer #18

Please refer to RFP amendment #1

Question #19

In the initial heading of R3 Proposed Resources - Editing Samples, "Maximum Points Possible" is stated at 30. In the resource tables below this, it states that "Total Points Possible R3" = 45 points. Please clarify.

Answer #19

Please refer to Answer #4 and Amendment #1 to the RFP.