



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

LETTER OF INTEREST

LETTRE D'INTÉRÊT

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Communication Procurement Directorate/Direction de
l'approvisionnement en communication

360 Albert St. / 360, rue Albert

12th Floor / 12ième étage

Ottawa

Ontario

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Audio Visual Production Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-190376/A	Date 2018-06-04
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-19-0376	GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG PW-\$\$CX-024-74930
File No. - N° de dossier cx024.EN578-190376	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-06-29	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Lavigne (cx024), Pierre	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur cx024
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 990-3140 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (613) 991-5870
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA PORTAGE III 6B1 11 LAURIER ST Gatineau Quebec K1A0S5 Canada	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée See Herein	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

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) - EN578- 190376/A

Responses must be submitted by 2:00pm Eastern Daylight Savings Time on
June 29, 2018

TITLE: AUDIO-VISUAL PRODUCTION SERVICES

1. PURPOSE AND NATURE OF THE REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI)

The Communications Procurement Directorate (CDP), part of the Commercial and Alternative Acquisitions Management Sector (CAAMS) of Acquisition Branch at Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) **is requesting industry feedback** regarding the renewal of Supply Arrangements for Audio-Visual Production Services.

There are currently Supply Arrangements (SAs) in place for Audio-Visual Production Services that will end on December 31, 2018. In order to renew these services, PSPC is planning to solicit and issue a new Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA).

By using a list of specific questions (see Section 8 of the RFI), the objectives of this RFI are to:

- Modernize procurement practices so that they are simpler, less administratively burdensome, deploy modern comptrollership, and include practices that support our economic policy goals, including green and social procurement.
- Solicit industry knowledge and expertise with regard to best practices that would increase the likelihood of a successful outcome for this project.
- Determine if industry is capable of e-procurement and e-bidding.
- Gather information to assist in the development of a Request for Supply Arrangement.

NATURE OF REQUEST FOR INDUSTRY COMMENTS

This RFI is neither a call for tender nor a Request for Proposal (RFP). No agreement or contract will be entered into based on this RFI. The issuance of this RFI is not to be considered in any way a commitment by the Government of Canada, nor as authority to potential respondents to undertake any work that could be charged to Canada. This RFI is not to be considered as a commitment to issue a subsequent solicitation or award contract(s) for the work described herein.

NATURE AND FORMAT OF RESPONSES REQUESTED

Respondents are encouraged to identify, in the information they share with Canada, any information that they feel is proprietary, third party or personal information. Please note that Canada may be obligated by law (e.g. in response to a request under the Access of Information and Privacy Act) to consider disclosing proprietary or commercially-sensitive information provided by respondent (for more information: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/a-1/>).

Participation in this RFI is encouraged, but is not mandatory. There will be no supplier list created as a result of this RFI. Similarly, participation in this RFI is not required for the participation in any potential subsequent solicitation.

The RFI closing date is **by 2:00 pm Eastern Daylight Savings time on June 29, 2018**. Information received before that date will be reviewed and considered when developing the Request for Supply Arrangement.

RESPONSE COSTS

Respondents will not be reimbursed for any cost incurred by participating in this RFI.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Video productions services includes the manipulation of footage or an existing video in which the final deliverable is a live action video or an animated video. Manipulation of videos could consists of editing, voice-overs, music, open/closed captioning, animation/graphics, etc.

Video productions could have the following purpose: informational, educational, promotional marketing, outreach, recruiting, documentary, success stories, training and pedagogical programs.

In the majority of cases, the Contractor will be required to produce a complete production, however there will be times when only parts of a production will be requested. For example: only a camera shoot or adaptation of an existing video into another language (versioning). As well, the video may need to be produced and delivered on a variety of media.

3. INDUSTRY INFORMATION SESSIONS

PSPC will be hosting two information sessions to seek Industry feedback about the proposed procurement approach for Audio Visual Production Services.

It is anticipated that the information sessions will be held at 360 Albert Street in Ottawa on:

- July 10, 2018 at 9:00am to 12:00pm (DST) in French; and
- July 10 2018 at 1:00pm to 4:00pm (DST) in English.

Suppliers interested in participating in the information sessions must register by providing the names, e-mail addresses and phone numbers (for a maximum of two proposed attendees) before the registration deadline of June 21, 2018, by sending an email to: TPSGC.padgamiace-appbmpace.PWGSC@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca

4. POTENTIAL WORK SCOPE AND CONSTRAINTS

If a follow-on solicitation occurs, it would be posted on BuyandSell.gc.ca in the form of a Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA).

5. LEGISLATION, TRADE AGREEMENTS AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES

The following is some of the legislation, trade agreements and government policies that could impact any follow-on solicitation(s):

- a) [Comprehensive Land Claim Agreements \(CLCAs\)](#)
- b) [Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Businesses \(PSABs\)](#)
- c) [Contract Security Program](#)
- d) [Policy on Government Security](#)
- e) [The Privacy Act](#)
- f) [Directive on Official Languages for Communications and Services](#)
- g) [National Joint Council Travel Directive](#)
- h) [Policy on the Management of Information Technology](#)

6. ENQUIRIES

Respondents with questions regarding this RFI may direct their enquiries to:

Name: Pierre Lavigne
Title: Supply Specialist
**Communication Procurement Directorate
Acquisitions Branch
Public Services and Procurement Canada**
Address: 360 Albert Street, 12th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: (613) 990-3140
Facsimile: (613) 991-5870
E-mail: TPSGC.padgamiace-appbmpace.PWGSC@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca

Because this is not a bid solicitation, Canada may publish additional questions for the purposes of gaining additional information. Canada asks Respondents to visit Buyandsell.gc.ca regularly to check for changes, if any.

7. SUBMISSION OF RESPONSES

Time and Place for Submission of Responses: Suppliers interested in providing information to the specific questions listed in Section 8 should send the responses directly to the contact identified in Section 6 Enquiries, by the time and date indicated on page 1 of this RFI. Responses can be submitted by mail, by fax or by email.

8. QUESTIONS

1. Is the evaluation criteria and basis of selection found in Annex A of this RFI appropriate for the Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA)? Is there anything in the RFSA criteria that would prevent your firm from submitting an arrangement?
2. Is the proposed evaluation criteria found in Annex B of this RFI appropriate for future Requests for Proposals using the new Supply Arrangement (SARFP)? How could we make the criteria less subjective? Should we add or remove criteria?
3. Should we include a stream for suppliers who have a Security Clearance?
4. The current SA allows for competition between 5 suppliers for each SARFP. The process includes the following: the client chooses 2 suppliers of their choice, 2 suppliers are chosen based on the rotation list and 1 supplier is chosen at random by the system for a total of 5 suppliers invited to submit a bid. Should we increase or decrease the number of suppliers invited to submit a bid? Should we change the process?
5. Could you please provide any recommendations which would result in Supply Arrangements being more efficient?
6. Communication Procurement Directorate (CPD) who issues the supply arrangements is a cost recovery service. Clients are invoiced 3% on the value of the contract. What would be the impact if suppliers were required to collect the fee of 3% on the total value of the contract to remit to CPD when sending in their quarterly order report?
7. Which environmental initiatives have been implemented by your organization, and which ones are you planning to implement in the near future (recycling/reusing initiatives, green travel, etc.?) What document could you provide us to demonstrate your firms' efforts on environmental issues? Please explain and specify.

8. In regards to environmental standards, what would you suggest we include as a criteria in the solicitation process?
9. Does your organization/ industry have or conform to recognize to environmental standards such as ENERGY STAR, or others? Please explain and specify.
10. PSPC is interested in forming a separate stream for aboriginally owned companies, to utilize when a requirement is deemed to have the [Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business](#) applied. Please advise us if your firm would be qualified and interested in this.
11. What other socio economic groupings or identifiers could be considered for additional streams or evaluation criteria under a future Request for Supply Arrangement?
12. Are there restrictions or system issues that would prevent your firm from accepting Requests for Proposals electronically? If yes, please explain thoroughly.
13. Are there restrictions or system issues that would prevent your firm from submitting offers electronically or for example through systems such as e-post Connect? If yes, please explain thoroughly.
14. CPD is interested in forming a Communication Community of Practice for creative communication commodities. What would be some topics of interest and best forum to have the dialogue?
15. Is there any other information or recommendations that should be considered, that are not identified above?

9. REFERENCES

- [Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business - Booklet](#) (from Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada)
- [Eligibility for Aboriginal Procurement Set Aside](#)
- [Aboriginal Business Directory](#)

Annex A – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection

1. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

- a. Offers will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the Request for Supply Arrangement including all of the criteria stipulated herein.
- b. An evaluation team composed of representatives of Canada will evaluate the arrangements.

1.1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

1.1.1 MANDATORY TECHNICAL CRITERIA

M.1 IDENTIFICATION OF THE FIRM

The Supplier MUST identify the owners and management of the firm and the legal incorporated name as well as the organizational structure.

M.2 INTERNET SITE

Suppliers MUST have an Internet site that is accessible by Client Departments and Agencies. The purpose of this Internet site is to provide information on the services available and the Supplier's qualifications to provide those services. Therefore, in order to meet this mandatory requirement, the Supplier MUST have an Internet site and provide the active Internet address.

M.3 EXPERIENCE OF THE FIRM (The video production samples will be rated under R.1)

The Supplier MUST demonstrate its experience by submitting one (1) USB key demo of at least four (4) different video production samples produced and completed within the last ten (10) years from the closing date of this RFSA.

The total running time of all of the samples combined MUST not exceed twenty (20) minutes in length. Should the running time of the submitted samples exceed twenty (20) minutes in length, only the first twenty (20) minutes will be evaluated.

The productions MUST have been completed entirely by the Supplier under a contract with the public sector or private industry.

The samples MUST be submitted in their original language.

The minimum dollar value of at least one (1) of the sample projects must be \$25,000.00. For the purposes of the evaluation of mandatory criterion M.3, "sample projects" is defined as a contract for the provision of video production services.

1. One (1) of the video production samples MUST demonstrate the Supplier's ability to produce a video based audio-visual production.

2. One (1) of the video production samples MUST demonstrate the Supplier's ability to produce an audio-visual production that was tailored and posted to the Internet or adapted for Internet use.
3. At least one (1) of the video production samples MUST demonstrate the Supplier's ability to work in both official languages (English and French). To demonstrate the Supplier's ability to work in both official languages (English and French) the submitted sample MUST be either of the following:
 - A. a production where both the English and French are equally and substantively represented in the same production; or
 - B. a unilingual production (in its original language) that demonstrates the official language not demonstrated in the other submitted samples.

Productions that have voice-overs, are fully narrated, are fully animated, are purely text based, or are subtitled/closed captioned are not acceptable to demonstrate the Supplier's ability to work in both official languages.

ARRANGEMENTS NOT MEETING ALL OF THE MANDATORY TECHNICAL CRITERIA WILL BE GIVEN NO FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

1.1.2 POINT RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA

Arrangements must obtain a minimum of 70 percent in each rated criterion and sub-criterion. Arrangements that do not obtain a minimum of 70 percent in each rated criterion and each sub-criterion will not be given further consideration.

R.1 EXPERIENCE OF THE FIRM AND QUALITY OF VIDEO PRODUCTION SAMPLES PROVIDED

(Maximum 100 points - Minimum of 70 percent of the available points for each of R.1.1, R.1.2 and R.1.3)

The Supplier will be assessed against the video production samples provided in accordance with **M.3**. Should the running time of the submitted samples exceed twenty (20) minutes in length, only the first twenty (20) minutes will be evaluated.

The USB key demo should be able to be played on any laptop computer. The USB key demo should be menu driven in MP4 format.

To better understand the samples submitted for the mandatory criterion **M.3**, the following information should also be provided for each video production sample. **Please complete the Video Demo - "Proposed Project Fact Sheet" located in Appendix "1"**.

Client;
Client contact;
Description and purpose of production; Target audience(s);
Creative approach; Production dates;
Production budget;

The video production samples will be evaluated on the following rated criteria:

**R.1.1 Video production samples demonstrate creative and technical excellence
(Maximum 40 points – Minimum 28 points).**

At a minimum, the following criteria will be evaluated: your approach (is it attractive, creative, innovative or appropriate); the quality of images; quality and effectiveness of cinematography, the use of special effects and graphics; use of camera angles; lighting; editing; and effective use of music and sound.

Percentage factors utilized for the evaluation of R.1.1:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): **This is the established minimum.** All of the above-mentioned criteria are acceptable. Approach demonstrates some creativity and innovation.

Good (0.8): Slightly exceeds the established minimum, with one (1) or two (2) criteria that are very good. Approach demonstrates creativity and innovation.

Very Good (0.9): The majority of the criteria are very good. One (1) or two (2) criteria may be excellent. Approach demonstrates very good creativity and innovation without being outstanding.

Outstanding (1): Very unique, bold, and creative approach. Has excellent quality and use of images. Outstanding cinematography. Video production samples demonstrate excellent use of special effects and graphics and lighting. Has very appropriate use of music and sound.

**R.1.2 The effective use of treatment, script, language and visual techniques to communicate the themes and messages.
(Maximum 40 points – Minimum 28 points).**

At a minimum, we are looking for the following criteria: engaging and complete storyline, clear script, appropriate use of language, quality of translation (if a translation was completed), effective communication of content and messages both in narration and on-camera and use of other techniques to get the message across. The success in conveying messages in both English and French is equivalent.

Percentage factors utilized for the evaluation of R.1.2:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): **This is the established minimum.** All of the above-mentioned criteria are acceptable, and meets the established minimum. The treatment, script, language and technique adequately help convey themes and messages.

Good (0.8): Slightly exceeds the established minimum, with one (1) or two (2) criteria that are very good. Treatment, script, language and technique help convey the themes and messages.

Very Good (0.9): The majority of the above-mentioned criteria are very good. One (1) or two (2) criteria may be excellent. Treatment, script, language and techniques effectively communicate themes and messages without being outstanding.

Outstanding (1): Outstanding delivery of content, themes and messages. Treatment, script, language and techniques are communicated very well, both in narration and on-camera. Appropriate techniques were used.

R.1.3 Video production samples demonstrate a wide variety of visual and dramatic devices, such as: graphic animation sequences; typography/on-screen text; motion graphics and animations; still imagery; imported (stock) film footage; off-camera and on-camera narration; music; sound and special effects (Maximum 20 points – Minimum 14 points).

At a minimum, we are looking for the use of six (6) of the ten (10) above-mentioned visual or dramatic devices.

Percentage factors utilized for the evaluation of R.1.3:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): **This is the established minimum.** At least six (6) of the listed devices are effectively used.

Good (0.8): Slightly exceeds the established minimum, with two (2) or three (3) of the devices that are very good.

Very Good (0.9): Exceeds the established minimum. The majority of the devices are very good. Four (4) or five (5) devices may be excellent, without being outstanding.

Outstanding (1): A very effective blend of six (6) or more visual or dramatic devices. Devices are relevant to the subject matter. The quality and effectiveness of at least six (6) devices are outstanding.

R.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH

(Maximum 20 points – Minimum 14)

R.2 will be evaluated on the following rated criteria:

The Supplier should propose a general preliminary project management approach for video production projects that provides flexibility and considers client needs.

The Supplier should provide a detailed description of the proposed project management approach and the procedures, schedule controls, as well as the tools and techniques that will be used to plan, organize, direct and control projects.

The Supplier should provide a detailed description of the Supplier's processes to identify risks associated with each video production project and to develop risk mitigation strategies.

The description of the project management approach should illustrate how the Supplier will ensure that performance, quality, scheduled goals are achieved for video production projects.

The description of the project management approach should reflect how the Supplier proposes to work in collaboration with Project Managers and Project Teams for the development of the treatment and production of video production projects. The description should also outline the key areas of video production projects that require input from the Client.

Percentage factors utilized for the evaluation of R.2:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): **This is the established minimum.** Details provided to describe the Supplier's process; schedule controls and planning tools and techniques. Demonstrates good techniques to be put in place and used to plan, organize, direct and control projects. Details provided to describe the Supplier's processes to identify risks relevant to video production projects and to develop risk mitigation strategies. Demonstrates client involvement in the approach.

Good (0.8): Details provided to describe the Supplier's process; schedule controls and planning tools and techniques are complete. Demonstrates good techniques to be put in place and used to plan, organize, direct and control projects. Details provided to describe the Supplier's processes to identify risks relevant to video production projects and to develop risk mitigation strategies. Demonstrates client involvement in the approach and outlines key areas that require input from clients. Approach for working with Project Authorities is good.

Very Good (0.9): Details provided to describe the Supplier's process; schedule controls and planning tools and techniques are clear and complete. Demonstrates very efficient techniques to be put in place and used to plan, organize, direct and control projects. Details provided to describe the Supplier's processes to identify risks relevant video production projects including possible time delays related to approval processes. Clearly describes the Supplier's processes to develop risk mitigation strategies for identified risks and time delays. Demonstrates good level of client involvement in the approach and outlines key areas that require input from clients. Approach for working with Project Authorities is very good.

Outstanding (1): Details provided to describe the Supplier's process; schedule controls and planning tools and techniques are clear and complete. Very efficient and innovative techniques to be put in place and used to plan, organize, direct and control projects. Clearly describes the Supplier's processes to identify risks relevant video production projects including possible time delays related to approval processes. Clearly describes the Supplier's processes to develop risk mitigation strategies for identified risks and time delays. Demonstrates excellent client involvement in the approach and outlines key areas that require input from clients. Approach for working with Project Authorities demonstrates flexibility.

2. BASIS OF SELECTION

2.1 Minimum Point Rating

To be declared responsive, a supplier must:

- a) comply with all the requirements of the Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA); and b) meet all mandatory technical evaluation criteria; and
- c) obtain the required minimum of 70 percent of the available points for each rated criteria and an overall passing mark of **84** points on a scale of **120 points**.

Suppliers not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) above will be declared non-responsive.

All fully responsive suppliers and all fully responsive Aboriginal suppliers will be listed on the general list of Supply Arrangement Holders. A separate list will be created for Aboriginal suppliers only under the Set-Aside Program for Aboriginal Business.

There is no limit to the number of Supply Arrangement's to be put in place.

APPENDIX "1" VIDEO DEMO - "PROPOSED PROJECT FACT SHEET"

In order to ensure that the evaluation team gets the information needed to evaluate the demo, please ensure that the following information is provided on a "per project" basis.

Client:	Company, department or agency name.
Client Contact:	Name and contact information for company/department/agency representative that managed the project.
Description and purpose of production:	Brief description of the production. What was the communications or training challenge? What was the primary goal?
Target Audience(s):	Who was or were the target audience(s)?
Creative Approach:	What creative devices were used? How did these contribute to meeting the stated goal?
Production Dates	When did the project start (contract signing); and when did it end (launch/first use of video)?
Production Budget:	What was the total production cost? (If the program was produced in both English and French, please provide the total cost of both programs).

Annex B – Proposed evaluation criteria for future Requests for Proposals using the new Supply Arrangement (SARFP)

4.1 EVALUATION PROCEDURES

- (a) Bids will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the bid solicitation including the technical and financial evaluation criteria;
- (b) An evaluation team composed of representatives of Canada will evaluate the bids.

4.1.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

All bids MUST be completed in full and provide all of the information requested in the SARFP to enable full and complete evaluation.

4.1.1.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

Proposals not meeting the mandatory criteria will be given no further consideration.

The Mandatory requirement is:

(If there is a possibility of travel or if the list of SA suppliers includes companies that are outside the region where the work will take place, include the following M.1 to allow Bidders to include the cost for travel.)

M.1 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL (This requirement is subject to the R.3 point-rated criteria)

The Bidder MUST submit one (1) financial proposal* with a **total price not exceeding \$_____** (applicable taxes are extra, as appropriate), **all travel and living expenses included.**

The Bidder's financial proposal must include the following:

M.1.a: The firm price (**excluding travel and living expenses**) to complete all of the obligations under the Contract \$_____ (applicable taxes are extra);

M.1.b: The ceiling price for **all travel and living expenses**, including all travel and living expenses associated with attending mandatory meetings \$_____ (applicable taxes are extra.).

M.1.c: The financial proposal MUST also include a detailed payment schedule* strictly in accordance with the production milestones outlined in the Annex A Statement of Work and the Bidder's detailed pricing proposal.

The table, reproduced below must be completed and included with the Bidder's pricing proposal.

*Note: Canada will not make any advance payments. The payment schedule must be based on the actual work performed at the time the milestone would be completed.

The Bidder must not propose any options, provide any optional pricing, or stipulate any conditions. Any Bidder that includes any options or conditions whatsoever will be deemed non-responsive and no further evaluation will be done.

If pricing is not provided for a milestone, a price of zero will be assigned for the component and the Bidder will be provided an opportunity to agree with the zero amount. If the Bidder agrees then the Payment schedule will be considered compliant. However if the Bidder disagrees then the proposal will be found non-compliant and no further evaluation will be done.

TABLE: Payment schedule – Including travel and living expenses as applicable:	
Production Milestones outlined in the Annex A Statement of Work	

1	Approval of research / scripts / storyboards (choose as applicable)	\$
1.a	Associated travel and living expenses (if applicable)	\$
#	Completion of video shoot(s)	\$
#.a	Associated travel and living expenses (if applicable)	\$
#	Submission of the off-line edit/rough-cut	\$
#.a	Associated travel and living expenses (if applicable)	\$
#	Approval of the on-line edit/fine-cut	\$
#.a	Associated travel and living expenses (if applicable)	\$
#	Completion of the project and receipt of all deliverables	\$
#.a	Associated travel and living expenses (if applicable)	\$

(If there is no possibility of travel, use the following M.1.)

M.1 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL (This requirement is subject to the R.3 point-rated criteria)

The Bidder MUST submit a financial proposal with a **firm price not exceeding \$ _____**, (applicable taxes are extra, as appropriate). There is no allowance for travel & living expenses under this requirement.

M.1.a.: The firm price to complete all of the obligations under the Contract \$ _____ (applicable taxes are extra);

M.1.a.1: The financial proposal MUST also include a detailed payment schedule* strictly in accordance with the production milestones outlined in the Annex A Statement of Work and the Bidder's detailed pricing proposal.

The table, reproduced below must be completed and included with the Bidder's pricing proposal.

*Note: Canada will not make any advance payments. The payment schedule must be based on the actual work performed at the time the milestone would be completed.

The Bidder must not propose any options, provide any optional pricing, or stipulate any conditions. Any Bidder that includes any options or conditions whatsoever will be deemed non-responsive and no further evaluation will be done.

If pricing is not provided for a milestone, a price of zero will be assigned for the component and the Bidder will be provided an opportunity to agree with the zero amount. If the Bidder agrees then the Payment schedule will be considered compliant. However if the Bidder disagrees then the proposal will be found non-compliant and no further evaluation will be done.

Payment schedule:		
Production Milestones outlined in the Annex A Statement of Work		
1	Approval of research / scripts / storyboards (choose as applicable)	\$
#	Completion of video shoot(s)	\$
#	\$
#	Submission of the off-line edit/rough-cut	\$
#	Approval of the on-line edit/fine-cut	\$
#	Completion of the project and receipt of all deliverables	\$

BIDS NOT MEETING THE ALL THE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS WILL BE GIVEN NO FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

4.1.1.2 POINT RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with specific evaluation criteria as detailed in this section. To be considered compliant, bidders must obtain the required minimum of 70 percent of the points for each rated criterion and an overall passing mark of 70 points. The rating is performed on a scale of 100 points. **Proposals scoring less than 70 percent in any one (1) of these criterion will not be given further consideration.**

NOTE: *Percentage factors will be the basis used to allocate points for all rated requirements. The number of points will be calculated depending on the total value given for each criterion. For example, if evaluators give 0.7 as a score for R.1 (60 points X 0.7 = 42 points), this is equal to 70% of the total value given for that criterion. Evaluators cannot deviate from the established scoring grid. For example, evaluators cannot give a score of 0.75 (75%). Evaluators would have to choose between a 0.7 or a 0.8 (70% or 80%).*

The following criteria will be evaluated:

R.1 CREATIVE APPROACH AND TECHNICAL METHODOLOGY (Maximum 60 points - Minimum 42 points)

(Note to Contracting Officer: Criteria R.1 will only be included in SARFPs where there is a requirement for a creative approach. If the client already has a creative approach for their requirement, you can delete R.1 and apply changes to the Project Management Plan criteria since it makes reference to the creative approach.)

The Bidder should propose a single creative approach and technical methodology* to meet the video production objectives. At a minimum, the creative approach should include the proposed story idea for each (of the) required video(s), and the proposed production treatment.

The creative approach should reflect the project requirements and objectives, and be appropriate for the target audience and subject matter.

*Optional creative approaches and scenarios will not be considered for the purposes of evaluation and will render the proposal nonresponsive.

R.1 will be evaluated on the following rated criteria:

The outline of the proposed production treatment is easy to visualize:
At a minimum, evaluators are looking for: clear visualization of both the structure and the creative approach of the production treatment.

Percentage factors utilized for R.1:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable and/or the story idea is average and/or not appropriate and/or it is unlikely to achieve the goal(s) of the project. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): This is the established minimum. It is easy to visualize the structure of the story and the creative approach of the production treatment. The overall structure is fine without being perfect. The story idea is average.

Good (0.8): Slightly exceeds the established minimum. It is easy to visualize the structure of the story and the creative approach of the treatment. The story idea is good. Content is accurate or mostly accurate.

Very Good (0.9): It is very easy to visualize the story and the creative approach of the production treatment. The overall structure holds very well from the beginning to the end. The story idea is strong. Content is accurate or mostly accurate. The look-and-feel of this production is obvious. A good script may also be provided.

Outstanding (1): Visualization of the video is crystal clear throughout and the creative approach of the production treatment. The overall structure holds very well from the beginning to the end. The story idea is very strong. Content is accurate. Other means are used to help visualize the content/look-and-feel of the video such as mock-ups and/or illustrated storyboards. A strong script may also be provided.

R.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN (Maximum 20 points - Minimum 14 points)

R.2 will be evaluated on the following rated criteria:

The Bidder should propose a single* preliminary project management plan that provides flexibility and considers client needs as described in this SARFP.

The Bidder should provide details to explain how the proposed project management plan will ensure the smooth delivery of the proposed creative approach and technical methodology.

The proposed project management plan should also outline how the Supplier proposes to work in collaboration with the Project Authority to ensure sufficient time for client review and for Government approval processes.

*Multiple project management plans will not be considered for the purposes of evaluation.

At a minimum, evaluators are looking for: Project management plan that provides sufficient details on the tasks related to the project, the roles and responsibilities of the Supplier and the Client as related to each task, schedule and timelines (days, weeks, hours etc..) that are suitable and realistic; possible risks specific to the project and relevant mitigation strategies.

Percentage factors utilized for R.2:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): This is the established minimum. Details on the project tasks, production phases, and roles and responsibilities are minimal. Correctly identifies risk areas specific to the project and provides some mitigation strategies. Timelines are mostly realistic, and include client involvement in plan and approach.

Good (0.8): Project management plan has sufficient details on the project tasks, production phases, and roles and responsibilities. Correctly identifies risk areas specific to the project and provides good mitigation strategies. Timelines are realistic, and include client involvement in plan and approach. Approach for working with Project Authority is good.

Very Good (0.9): Project management plan has complete details on the project tasks, production phases, and roles and responsibilities. Correctly identifies risk areas specific to the project and provides very good mitigation strategies. Timelines are suitable and realistic, and include good level of client involvement in plan and approach. Details are provided to explain how the proposed project management plan will ensure the smooth delivery of the proposed creative approach and technical methodology. Approach for working with Project Authority is very good.

Outstanding (1): Project management plan has complete details on the project tasks, production phases, and roles and responsibilities. Correctly identifies risk areas specific to the project and provides clear and valid mitigation strategies. Timelines are suitable and very realistic while offering flexibility and include excellent client involvement in plan and approach. Clear details are provided to explain how the proposed project management plan will ensure the smooth delivery of the proposed creative approach and technical methodology. The approach for working with the Project Authority is very good and demonstrates flexibility.

R.3: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL
(Maximum 20 points - Minimum 14 points)

The Bidder should submit a detailed pricing proposal (indicating units e.g. days, weeks, hours, dollar rates, etc.) that correlates with the production schedule and resource allocation of the project. The Bidder should also provide sufficient budget details in terms of categories, line items, unit prices/rates, level of effort, with consistent budget structures, and a breakdown for each production phase in correlation with the production milestones and payment schedule as specified in mandatory criterion M.1.

(Include this paragraph if travel will be charge separately.)

The Bidder should treat all travel and living expenses as a separate item. Note that the Bidder's fee should include the travel and living expenses associated with attending mandatory meetings. All travel and living costs should be calculated according to National Joint Council Travel Rates and Policies which can be found at the following weblink: <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/travel-voyage/index-eng.php>

The Financial Proposal will be evaluated based on the following:

The price should be further broken down into categories and line items for the goods and services required to deliver the completed project by production phase. Each line item should indicate the unit prices of hourly, daily or weekly rates as appropriate.

The level of effort for each service and quantity of goods should be clearly indicated by production phase. There should be an extended price for each line item: the rate times the level of effort for services or unit price times quantity for goods.

The Bidder should provide sufficient detail in their financial proposal that demonstrates to the Evaluation Team how and where the money is being spent. The financial proposal should correlate and be justifiable in relation to the proposed Project Management Plan.

At a minimum, evaluators are looking for: whether sufficient budget details are provided such as where money is allocated and if it's appropriate to the project parameters and needs, that the breakdown is clear and easy to understand and correlates well to the project plan, that budget structures/breakdowns are consistent by production phase. In addition, the budget will be assessed on whether or not the Crown is being double charged for a given day when one (1) person is proposed to fulfill two (2) or more roles (i.e. if one [1] person is proposed to fill two [2] positions). Evaluators are also looking for notes that identify assumptions and cost efficiencies**.*

**Notes to identify any assumptions that the Bidder made as the basis for budgetary decisions related to the project requirements, and also to explain the inclusion or exclusion of any services.*

***Notes to identify cost efficiencies demonstrating where and how savings for Canada have been achieved.*

Percentage factors utilized for R.3:

Not acceptable (0): The information provided was unsuitable or insufficient.

Limited (0.5): Criterion addressed, but not enough information provided and/or technically not acceptable. Less than established minimum.

Acceptable (0.7): This is the established minimum. There is a budget summary page with a breakdown for each product. Enough budget details in terms of categories, line items, unit prices/rates, level of effort; consistent budget structures and breakdowns. Enough details on where money is allocated. Some correlation to project plan. Budget allocations are appropriate in many areas for project needs and parameters, but may have certain issues that are easy to resolve. Assumptions and cost efficiencies not clearly identified.

Good (0.8): There is a budget summary page with a breakdown for each product. Sufficient budget details in terms of categories, line items, unit prices/rates, level of effort; with consistent budget structures and breakdowns by production phase. Budget is clear. Sufficient details on where money is allocated. There is good correlation to project plan. Budget allocations are appropriate. Assumptions and cost efficiencies are identified.

Very Good (0.9): There is a budget summary page with a breakdown for each product. Complete budget details in terms of categories, line items, unit prices/rates, level of effort; consistent budget structures and breakdowns by production phase. Budget is very clear. Complete details on where money is allocated. Complete correlation to project plan. Budget allocations are appropriate for project needs and parameters. Assumptions and cost efficiencies are clearly identified for project requirements.

Outstanding (1): There is a detailed budget summary page with a breakdown for each product. Clear and complete budget details in terms of categories, line items, unit prices/rates, level of effort; consistent budget structures and breakdowns are provided. Budget is very clear and easy to understand. Clear and complete details on where money is allocated. Complete correlation to project plan. Budget allocations are appropriate for project needs and parameters. Assumptions and cost efficiencies are clearly identified and are appropriate for project requirements.

4.1.2 FINANCIAL EVALUATION

The price of the bid will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, the Goods and Services Tax or the Harmonized Sales Tax excluded, FOB destination, Canadian customs duties and excise taxes are to be included.

4.2 BASIS OF SELECTION

4.2.1 To be declared responsive, a bid must:

- (a) comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation;
- (b) meet all mandatory technical evaluation criteria; and
- (c) obtain the required minimum of 70 percent of the points for each rated criteria and an overall passing mark of 70 points for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of **100 points**.

4.2.2 Bids not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) will be declared non responsive. The responsive bid with the highest number of points will be recommended for award of a contract, provided that the total evaluated price does not exceed the budget available for this requirement.

Where two (2) or more proposals achieve the identical highest number of points, the proposal with the lowest total price will be recommended for award of a contract.

All proposals will become the property of the Crown, they will not be returned.