



**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**

**Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer**

**Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes**

Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle du département(OCID)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent les mêmes.

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Public Engage. / Consult. Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-181138/C	<b>Date</b> 2019-08-21
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EN578-18-1138	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> cy016.EN578-181138	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$CY-016-77563	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2019-08-08	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2019-09-30</b>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Schou, Christian	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> cy016
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 995-2278 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> See herein	
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b>	<b>No - Non</b>
<b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

---

**This reason for this amendment is to advise all potential offerors of the questions and answers pertaining to this Request for Standing Offer in Part 001, and to revise the Request for Standing Offer in Part 002.**

**PART 001 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Q1 I received a notification for the following tender which seems to be a request for a standing offer however I'm unclear as to whether it includes all or some of the following GSINs:

**GSIN**

- [T001H: Stakeholder and Citizen Consultation and Engagement Services](#)
- [T001HA: Stakeholder and Citizen Consultation and Engagement Services - In Person](#)
- [T001HB: Stakeholder and Citizen Consultation and Engagement Services - Online](#)

TENDER: <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/procurement-data/tender-notice/PW-CY-016-77563>

We supply an online engagement platform so we are specifically interested in GSIN T001HB. Can you please provide some clarity about the nature of the above tender and whether it applies to GSIN T001HB?

A1 The tender in question is for Public Engagement and Consultation services and includes multiple service categories. An offer can be submitted for individual service categories, such as Category 2: Implementation and Facilitation Sub-Category- B. Online. Interested suppliers are encouraged to review the Statement of Work and the Evaluation Criteria to identify the service categories that they may wish to submit an offer for.

Q2 On page 41 of 98, the RFSO states that it is “replacing Standing Offer EN578-133044/C.” Solicitation EN578-133044/C included on p. 42 of 115 a requirement A3.1.3 Computer and Information Systems by which designers and developers of leading edge online engagement platforms could submit a proposal to prequalify. This clause is missing from the current Solicitation EN578-18-1138, locking out Canadian designers and developers of online software. Is it the GoC’s intention to suppress innovation in Canadian software by forcing Canadian software firms to sell to consulting companies in order obtain business from the GoC? Would the GoC replicate requirement A3.1.3 from the previous Solicitation so that Canadian software development companies can prequalify their software with the Government of Canada?

On p.43 of 98 of this RFSO, it states that “This Procurement Tool cannot to be used for the purchase of software alone. The Offeror/Contractor is responsible for any software required to deliver the services outlined in section A1.5 for a specific consultation project. ... In the event that the Government of Canada has an existing digital platform tool, the government may, in certain instances, require the Offeror/Contractor to provide consultation services using that digital platform tool.” Will there be a separate competition by which the GoC will identify the best available software platforms and prequalify them for use by GoC departments? How will the GoC guard against a large integrated consulting company that has made an investment in software simply using its own software without regard for whether it is the best available software?

A2 The scope of this requirement is limited to Public Engagement and Consultation Services, and supporting services needed to carry out these activities. The service category previously known as Computer and Information Systems is included under the new Category 2: Implementation and Facilitation Sub-Category- B. Online. In Annex “A” Statement of Work, in the definition of “Digital platform or tool” and A1.4 Overall scope, Caveat 5. Software, parameters for the selection of online consultation platforms are defined. The requirement under Computer and Information

---

Systems of the previous solicitation was not an option on its own, as it was one among many services that were required. It is more appropriate to leave the determination of the software with the Offerors who have the expertise in providing consultation services. This further provides the opportunity for Offerors to innovate and to propose the best platform available for any given project, whether it's in-house (ie its own software)/joint-venture, or a third party platform from a subcontractor.

This Standing Offer will not include an option for Departments to simply procure an online consultation platform and it will not identify the best available software platforms. However, it also will not preclude Departments from undertaking separate procurement activities for access to online consultation platforms. Any requirement that is exclusively for an online consultation platform would be solicited outside of this request for standing offer process by a different procurement team with expertise in the acquisition of software tools.

- Q3 On Page 47, Category Three: Analysis, Reporting and Evaluation, the number sequencing for A. and B. does not match the previous sections. Can you please confirm which information is specific to B and which is specific to A and which are for both categories?
- A3 All Services described from 1 to 2.8 in this section apply to both A. Without automated complex text analysis, and B. With automated complex text analysis. The only distinction is that B. involves automated analysis.
- Q4 On Page 25, Section 7.8.31 Selection Methodology for the "Main Offerors" bullet a) paragraph two reads that "**a proportional share** of the total business will be assigned for each of the Offerors based on the combined rating of technical merit score and financial score obtained as part of their evaluation. Offerors that have received a lesser proportion of overall standing offer business volume than their calculated proportional share will be presented as an option to the Project Authority more frequently than other Offerors?" How will you determine what the proportional share per Offeror is? More specifically, how can you determine the proportional share when the total is likely ever-changing due to the SO being widely open to Optional Users (E.G. MASH)?

How will the RFSO be administered for Optional Users? Will they be constrained to the same process as PSPC? More specifically, how will you address geographical constraints (e.g. if province of B.C. would like to use the SO and the Best Value Offeror is located in Ottawa, ON?) Will the Project Authority have the option to select the most strategic Offeror from the generated list?

- A4 The Standing Offers will initially be not open to MASH/provinces. Clauses are included in the current solicitation to allow the possibility of future implementation.

Part 002 of this solicitation amendment will include a change to the selection methodology in order to include a process that would be in place if the Standing Offers becomes open to provinces/MASH. If an optional user is ever added, its Project Authority would have the option of selecting the most suitable Offeror for their specific project.

- Q5 Page 35, Section 8.7 Ongoing Opportunity to Qualify indicates that a Notice will be posted periodically on GETS to allow new suppliers to become qualified. How will this impact the ranking of existing Offerors? What will occur if a new Best Value Offeror is identified and how will that process be managed?
- A5 Ongoing qualification currently only applies to the Supply Arrangement portion of the requirement. For this solicitation, if an offeror is successful in obtaining a Standing Offer, they will also be

---

issued a Supply Arrangement that includes the very same service categories of their Standing Offer. Ongoing qualification will be available for new suppliers or current Supply Arrangement holders who wish to add any new service categories under the Supply Arrangement tool.

Q6 Page 25, Process for Each Requirement: if the call up is always issued to the Best Value Offeror and they have the right of first refusal, what measures are in place to ensure best value to Canada? Will the performance of the Best Value Offeror (and all other Offerors) be monitored over the lifecycle of the contract to ensure Canada's satisfaction with their work? If Canada is dissatisfied, will the Project Authority be able to choose from other Offerors on the list, instead of having to go with the Best Value Offeror for every call up?

A6 The right of first refusal would only come into play if there are only two (2) Offerors that have the service categories requested by a Client. When there are more than two (2) offerors, a choice of possible firms will be provided to the Client in accordance with article 7.8.3.1 of this solicitation. A table will be included in part 002 of this amendment to better show the selection methodology.

How the Best Value Offeror will be determined can be found at article 7.8.3.1 a) of this solicitation. The Vendor Performance Corrective Measure Policy (VPCMP) will apply to this procurement tool should there be any performance issues with any Offeror.

#### **PART 002- THE FOLLOWING CHANGES FORM PART OF THE RFSO**

##### **1) At Part 1-**

###### **ADD:**

##### **1.9 Phased Offer Compliance Process**

The Phased Offer Compliance Process applies to this requirement.

##### **2) At Part 4, Article 4.1 Evaluation Procedures**

###### **ADD:**

(c) Canada will use the Phased Offer Compliance Process described below.

##### **3) At Part 4-**

###### **DELETE:**

##### **4.1.1 Technical Evaluation**

Mandatory and point rated technical evaluation criteria are fully described in Annex "D" – Technical and financial evaluation

#### **AND REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

##### **4.1.1 Technical Evaluation**

##### **4.1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria**

The Phased Offer Compliance Process will apply to all mandatory technical criteria included in Annex "D" – Technical and financial evaluation.

#### **4.1.1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria**

Point rated technical evaluation criteria are included in Annex "D" – Technical and financial evaluation.

#### **4) At Part 4-**

#### **ADD:**

#### **4.1.3 Phased Offer Compliance Process**

##### **4.1.3.1 (2018-07-19) General**

(a) Canada is conducting the PBCP described below for this requirement.

(b) Notwithstanding any review by Canada at Phase I or II of the PBCP, Offerors are and will remain solely responsible for the accuracy, consistency and completeness of their Offers and Canada does not undertake, by reason of this review, any obligations or responsibility for identifying any or all errors or omissions in Offers or in responses by an Offeror to any communication from Canada.

THE OFFEROR ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THE REVIEWS IN PHASE I AND II OF THIS PBCP ARE PRELIMINARY AND DO NOT PRECLUDE A FINDING IN PHASE III THAT THE OFFER IS NONRESPONSIVE, EVEN FOR MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS WHICH WERE SUBJECT TO REVIEW IN PHASE I OR II AND NOTWITHSTANDING THAT THE OFFER HAD BEEN FOUND RESPONSIVE IN SUCH EARLIER PHASE. CANADA MAY DEEM AN OFFER TO BE NON-RESPONSIVE TO A MANDATORY REQUIREMENT AT ANY PHASE. THE OFFEROR ALSO ACKNOWLEDGES THAT ITS RESPONSE TO A NOTICE OR A COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (CAR) (EACH DEFINED BELOW) IN PHASE I OR II MAY NOT BE SUCCESSFUL IN RENDERING ITS OFFER RESPONSIVE TO THE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS THAT ARE THE SUBJECT OF THE NOTICE OR CAR, AND MAY RENDER ITS OFFER NON-RESPONSIVE TO OTHER MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS.

(c) Canada may, in its discretion, request and accept at any time from an Offeror and consider as part of the Offer, any information to correct errors or deficiencies in the Offer that are clerical or administrative, such as, without limitation, failure to sign the Offer or any part or to checkmark a box in a form, or other failure of format or form or failure to acknowledge; failure to provide a procurement business number or contact information such as names, addresses and telephone numbers; inadvertent errors in numbers or calculations that do not change the amount the Offeror has specified as the price or of any component thereof that is subject to evaluation. This shall not limit Canada's right to request or accept any information after the solicitation closing in circumstances where the solicitation expressly provides for this right. The Offeror will have the time period specified in writing by Canada to provide the necessary documentation. Failure to meet this deadline will result in the Offer being declared non-responsive.

(d) The PBCP does not limit Canada's rights under Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC) 2006 (2019-03-04) Standard Instructions – Goods or Services – Competitive Requirements nor Canada's right to request or accept any information during the solicitation period or after solicitation closing in circumstances where the solicitation expressly provides for this right, or in the circumstances described in subsection (c).

(e) Canada will send any Notice or CAR by any method Canada chooses, in its absolute discretion. The Offeror must submit its response by the method stipulated in the Notice or CAR. Responses are deemed to be received by Canada at the date and time they are delivered to Canada by the method and at the

---

address specified in the Notice or CAR. An email response permitted by the Notice or CAR is deemed received by Canada on the date and time it is received in Canada's email inbox at Canada's email address specified in the Notice or CAR. A Notice or CAR sent by Canada to the Offeror at any address provided by the Offeror in or pursuant to the Offer is deemed received by the Offeror on the date it is sent by Canada. Canada is not responsible for late receipt by Canada of a response, however caused.

#### 4.1.3.2 (2018-03-13) Phase I: Financial Offer

(a) After the closing date and time of this solicitation, Canada will examine the Offer to determine whether it includes a Financial Offer and whether any Financial Offer includes all information required by the solicitation. Canada's review in Phase I will be limited to identifying whether any information that is required under the solicitation to be included in the Financial Offer is missing from the Financial Offer. This review will not assess whether the Financial Offer meets any standard or is responsive to all solicitation requirements.

(b) Canada's review in Phase I will be performed by officials of the Department of Public Works and Government Services.

(c) If Canada determines, in its absolute discretion that there is no Financial Offer or that the Financial Offer is missing all of the information required by the solicitation to be included in the Financial Offer, then the Offer will be considered non-responsive and will be given no further consideration.

(d) For Offers other than those described in c), Canada will send a written notice to the Offeror ("Notice") identifying where the Financial Offer is missing information. An Offeror, whose Financial Offer has been found responsive to the requirements that are reviewed at Phase I, will not receive a Notice. Such Offerors shall not be entitled to submit any additional information in respect of their Financial Offer.

(e) The Offerors who have been sent a Notice shall have the time period specified in the Notice (the "Remedy Period") to remedy the matters identified in the Notice by providing to Canada, in writing, additional information or clarification in response to the Notice. Responses received after the end of the Remedy Period will not be considered by Canada, except in circumstances and on terms expressly provided for in the Notice.

(f) In its response to the Notice, the Offeror will be entitled to remedy only that part of its Financial Offer which is identified in the Notice. For instance, where the Notice states that a required line item has been left blank, only the missing information may be added to the Financial Offer, except that, in those instances where the addition of such information will necessarily result in a change to other calculations previously submitted in its Financial Offer, (for example, the calculation to determine a total price), such necessary adjustments shall be identified by the Offeror and only these adjustments shall be made. All submitted information must comply with the requirements of this solicitation.

(g) Any other changes to the Financial Offer submitted by the Offeror will be considered to be new information and will be disregarded. There will be no change permitted to any other Section of the Offeror's Offer. Information submitted in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation in response to the Notice will replace, in full, **only** that part of the original Financial Offer as is permitted above, and will be used for the remainder of the offer evaluation process.

(h) Canada will determine whether the Financial Offer is responsive to the requirements reviewed at Phase I, considering such additional information or clarification as may have been provided by the Offeror in accordance with this Section. If the Financial Offer is not found responsive for the requirements reviewed at Phase I to the satisfaction of Canada, then the Offer shall be considered non-responsive and will receive no further consideration.

---

(i) Only Offers found responsive to the requirements reviewed in Phase I to the satisfaction of Canada, will receive a Phase II review.

#### **4.1.3.3 (2018-03-13) Phase II: Technical Offer**

(a) Canada's review at Phase II will be limited to a review of the Technical Offer to identify any instances where the Offeror has failed to meet any Eligible Mandatory Criterion. This review will not assess whether the Technical Offer meets any standard or is responsive to all solicitation requirements. Eligible Mandatory Criteria are all mandatory technical criteria that are identified in this solicitation as being subject to the PBCP. Mandatory technical criteria that are not identified in the solicitation as being subject to the PBCP, will not be evaluated until Phase III.

(b) Canada will send a written notice to the Offeror (Compliance Assessment Report or "CAR") identifying any Eligible Mandatory Criteria that the Offer has failed to meet. An Offeror whose Offer has been found responsive to the requirements that are reviewed at Phase II will receive a CAR that states that its Offer has been found responsive to the requirements reviewed at Phase II. Such Offeror shall not be entitled to submit any response to the CAR.

(c) An Offeror shall have the period specified in the CAR (the "Remedy Period") to remedy the failure to meet any Eligible Mandatory Criterion identified in the CAR by providing to Canada in writing additional or different information or clarification in response to the CAR. Responses received after the end of the Remedy Period will not be considered by Canada, except in circumstances and on terms expressly provided for in the CAR.

(d) The Offeror's response must address only the Eligible Mandatory Criteria listed in the CAR as not having been achieved, and must include only such information as is necessary to achieve such compliance. Any additional information provided by the Offeror which is not necessary to achieve such compliance will not be considered by Canada, except that, in those instances where such a response to the Eligible Mandatory Criteria specified in the CAR will necessarily result in a consequential change to other parts of the Offer, the Offeror shall identify such additional changes, provided that its response must not include any change to the Financial Offer.

(e) The Offeror's response to the CAR should identify in each case the Eligible Mandatory Criterion in the CAR to which it is responding, including identifying in the corresponding section of the original Offer, the wording of the proposed change to that section, and the wording and location in the Offer of any other consequential changes that necessarily result from such change. In respect of any such consequential change, the Offeror must include a rationale explaining why such consequential change is a necessary result of the change proposed to meet the Eligible Mandatory Criterion. It is not up to Canada to revise the Offeror's Offer, and failure of the Offeror to do so in accordance with this subparagraph is at the Offeror's own risk. All submitted information must comply with the requirements of this solicitation.

(f) Any changes to the Offer submitted by the Offeror other than as permitted in this solicitation, will be considered to be new information and will be disregarded. Information submitted in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation in response to the CAR will replace, in full, **only** that part of the original Offer as is permitted in this Section.

(g) Additional or different information submitted during Phase II permitted by this section will be considered as included in the Offer, but will be considered by Canada in the evaluation of the Offer at Phase II only for the purpose of determining whether the Offer meets the Eligible Mandatory Criteria. It will not be used at any Phase of the evaluation to increase any score that the original Offer would achieve without the benefit of such additional or different information. For instance, an Eligible Mandatory Criterion that requires a mandatory minimum number of points to achieve compliance will be assessed at Phase II to determine whether such mandatory minimum score would be achieved with such additional or different

---

information submitted by the Offeror in response to the CAR. If so, the Offer will be considered responsive in respect of such Eligible Mandatory Criterion, and the additional or different information submitted by the Offeror shall bind the Offeror as part of its Offer, but the Offeror's original score, which was less than the mandatory minimum for such Eligible Mandatory Criterion, will not change, and it will be that original score that is used to calculate any score for the Offer.

(h) Canada will determine whether the Offer is responsive for the requirements reviewed at Phase II, considering such additional or different information or clarification as may have been provided by the Offeror in accordance with this Section. If the Offer is not found responsive for the requirements reviewed at Phase II to the satisfaction of Canada, then the Offer shall be considered non-responsive and will receive no further consideration.

(i) Only Offers found responsive to the requirements reviewed in Phase II to the satisfaction of Canada, will receive a Phase III evaluation.

#### **4.1.3.4 (2018-03-13) Phase III: Final Evaluation of the Offer**

(a) In Phase III, Canada will complete the evaluation of all Offers found responsive to the requirements reviewed at Phase II. Offers will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the solicitation including the technical and financial evaluation criteria.

(b) An Offer is non-responsive and will receive no further consideration if it does not meet all mandatory evaluation criteria of the solicitation.

#### **5) At Part 7, Article 7.8.3.1 Selection Methodology for the "Main Offerors "-**

##### **DELETE:**

##### **Process for each requirement:**

##### **STEP 1:**

A list of the Offerors qualified under each of the requested Categories will be generated by PSPC. The list will include any PSAB Offerors qualified under each of the requested Categories.

##### **STEP 2:**

If the generated list includes two or fewer Offerors:

- a) The call-up will first be offered to the Best Value Offeror from the generated list for the requested combination of Categories; or
- b) If the Best Value Offeror turns down the requirement, the other Offeror from the generated list will be offered the call-up.

If the generated list includes three or four Offerors, the Project Authority will be provided two options to select from:

- a) the Best Value Offeror from the generated list for the requested combination of Categories; or b) the different Offeror from the list that is furthest away from its proportional share for the requested combination of Categories and is different from the Best Value Offeror.

##### **STEP 3:**

If the generated list includes five or more Offerors, the Project Authority will be provided three options to select from:

- a) the Best Value Offeror from the generated list for the requested combination of Categories; or b) the Offeror from the generated list that is furthest away from its proportional share for the requested combination of Categories and is different from the Best Value Offeror; or

c) the next rotational Offeror in the generated list that is different.

**STEP 4:**

The Project Authority will consider available information on Offeror expertise and select an Offeror.

**EXCEPTIONS:**

If an Offeror turns down a call-up, the Project Authority will be provided the following options: a) the remaining Offerors that had been presented to the Project Authority, if any; and b) the Offeror from the generated list that is furthest away from their proportional share and has not already been offered the call-up.

**AND REPLACE WITH:**

**Process for each requirement:**

<b>STEP 1</b>
<b>Identify Qualified Offerors</b>
The Project Authority selects required categories of services and level of security, and the Contracting Authority uses the request to generate the list of qualified Offerors. The list will include any PSAB Offerors qualified under the requested Categories.

<b>STEP 2</b>			
<b>Short-List Qualified Offerors</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	<b>If the generated list includes 2 or fewer Offerors</b>	<b>If the generated list includes 3 or 4 Offerors</b>	<b>If the generated list includes 5 or more Offerors</b>
The Project Authority will be invited to select from a short-list of Offerors that will vary based on the number of Qualified Offerors for the specific combination of requested services and security clearance levels.	One option is provided to the Project Authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Best Value Offeror</b> from the generated list for the requested combination of Categories</li> </ul> If rejected by the Best Value Offeror, the other qualified Offeror from the generated list is offered the call-up	Two options are provided to the Project Authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Best Value Offeror</b> from the generated list for the requested combination of Categories; and</li> <li>• the <b>next rotational Offeror</b> in the generated list that is different.</li> </ul>	Three options are provided to the Project Authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Best Value Offeror</b> from the generated list for the requested combination of Categories; and</li> <li>• <b>Offeror from the list that is furthest away from its proportional share</b> for the requested combination of Categories and is different from the Best Value Offeror; and</li> <li>• the <b>next rotational Offeror</b> in the generated list that is different.</li> </ul>

### **STEP 3 (if applicable)**

#### **Select Offeror**

For STEP 2B and 2C, the Project Authority will consider available information on Offeror expertise to select an Offeror from the options provided.

### **EXCEPTIONS (if applicable)**

#### **Select Offeror**

For Step 2B and Step 2C, if a selected Offeror turns down a call-up, the Project Authority will be provided the following options:

- the remaining Offerors that have already been presented to the Project Authority; and
- the Offeror from the generated list that is furthest away from their proportional share and has not already been offered to the Project Authority, if any.

#### **6) At Part 7, Article 7.8.3 Selection Methodology-**

##### **ADD:**

#### **7.8.3.4 Selection Methodology for requirements for services by Provincial/Territorial Identified Users.**

For requirements for services delivered to Provincial/Territorial Identified Users, the Project Authority will have the option of selecting the most suitable Offeror for their specific project.

#### **7) At Annex "D" Technical and Financial Evaluation, Article 1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria, MA.1 Firm's Experience-**

##### **DELETE:**

The following are the service categories:

##### Category 1: Planning and Development

Sub-Category- C. Expert and Strategic Advice

Sub-Category- D. Content Development

##### Category 2: Implementation and Facilitation

For both in person and online

Sub-Category- C. In person

Sub-Category- D. Online

##### Category 3: Analysis, Reporting and Evaluation

Sub-Category- C. Without Automated Complex Text Analysis

Sub-Category- D. With Automated Complex Text Analysis

#### **AND REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

The following are the service categories:

##### Category 1: Planning and Development

---

Sub-Category- A. Expert and Strategic Advice  
Sub-Category- B. Content Development

Category 2: Implementation and Facilitation

For both in person and online

Sub-Category- A. In person

Sub-Category- B. Online

Category 3: Analysis, Reporting and Evaluation

Sub-Category- A. Without Automated Complex Text Analysis

Sub-Category- B. With Automated Complex Text Analysis

**8) At Annex "D" Technical and Financial Evaluation, Article 1.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, R2 Project Management for both Subcategory A – In-Person and Subcategory B – Online-**

**DELETE:**

R2.1 Firm's Experience (project example) (15 points per project submitted) (Minimum pass mark for this criterion is 63 points.)

**AND REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

R2.1 Firm's Experience (project example) (30 points per project submitted) (Minimum pass mark for this criterion is 63 points.)

**9) At Annex "D" Technical and Financial Evaluation, Article 1.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, R2 Project Management for both Subcategory A – In-Person and Subcategory B – Online-**

**DELETE THE FOLLOWING TITLE OF THE EVALUATION GRID:**

Project Management (up to a maximum of 180 points) (Minimum pass mark for this criterion is 126 points.)

**AND REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

Project Management (up to a maximum of 90 points) (Minimum pass mark for this criterion is 63 points.)

**10) At Annex "D" Technical and Financial Evaluation, Article 1.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, R2A.2 Two-Way Dialogue Engagement Design and Implementation for Subcategory A – In-Person-**

**DELETE THE FOLLOWING TITLE OF THE EVALUATION GRID:**

Two-Way Dialogue Engagement Design and Implementation for A – In-Person (up to a maximum of 45 points) (Minimum pass mark for this criterion is 31.5 points.)

**AND REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

Two-Way Dialogue Engagement Design and Implementation for A – In-Person (up to a maximum of 90 points) (Minimum pass mark for this criterion is 63 points.)

**11) At Annex "D" Technical and Financial Evaluation, 1.3 Financial Evaluation for All Subcategories, Step 4-**

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EN578-181138/C  
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
EN578-18-1138

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
002  
File No. - N° du dossier  
cy016.EN578-181138

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
cy016  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**DELETE:**

- B. *Online (1 hourly rate)*  
*- Digital Platform/Tool and Facilitation*

**AND REPLACE WITH:**

- B. *Online (3 hourly rates)*  
*- Project Management*  
*- Digital Platform/Tool Technical Services*  
*- Digital Facilitation Services*

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**