



TRANSLATION AND COMPARATIVE BILINGUAL REVISION SERVICES

FINDINGS REPORT

Request for Information (RFI)
December 2019 – February 2020

Letter of Interest: 40003-182196/A

This document **is not** a request for proposal, request for quotation or call for tender notice. This document should not be considered as a formal commitment by Canada to issue a contract in the future.



Findings Report.

The Department of Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) promotes dialogue between industry and client departments to better align their needs with viable solutions proposed by participants.

PWGSC strives to engage buyers and suppliers early in the procurement process by offering one-on-one meetings with suppliers. The purpose of these public consultations is to ensure collaboration between the Government of Canada, Industry and Client Departments in order to offer them an open and transparent opportunity to give formal feedback on acquisition initiatives and projects, as well as make recommendations for enhancements.

As part of the development of the procurement strategy for this requirement, Canada has published an RFI to gather feedback from the industry members on the project “Translation and Comparative Bilingual Revision Services” in order to refine the requirement and the procurement strategy. Therefore, the requirements may be revised once the information is collected by Canada during this RFI process.

As part of the RFI, one-on-one meetings were held during the RFI period; Canada received valuable feedback that will be considered and further analyzed.

Please note the change in the Contracting Authority

Etienne Sevigny

Public Works and Government Services Canada
Acquisitions Branch
Specialized Professional Service Procurement Directorate
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau, Quebec
K1A 0S5

Telephone: 819-639-3074

E-mail: etienne.sevigny@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca



Findings Report on Industry Engagement Questions

Posting: December 24, 2019, PWGSC published the RFI 40003-182196/A

RFI Participants: Seven (7) suppliers participated in the process,

One-on one meetings: Six (6) suppliers requested and participated in the one-on-one meetings during the RFI period.

Gov. Participants: Members of PWGSC, ATSSC.

First of all, Canada would like to thank all suppliers that were involved in the RFI process for their time and feedback provided. Please find below a summary of the findings of the written feedback and the one-on-one meeting sessions. Canada anticipates publishing a complete RFP in spring 2020.

The following Findings Report consists of a summary of responses received.

Questions to Industry	
Q1	The ATSSC requires suppliers that are capable of providing approximately 3.2 million words of English-to-French and French-to-English translation, and comparative bilingual revision per year in accordance with the RFI SOW. Considering approximately 90% of the ATSSC's business volume is legal text and ATSSC requires timely and accurate translations in the context of the legislation of multiple Tribunals, does your company have the capacity to do the entire workload of this requirement? If not, what percentage of the business volume can you handle?
A1	Summary: Five (5) suppliers can perform 100% of the work and two (2) other suppliers can perform approximately 50% - 55%.
Q2	Do you have the capacity to provide sufficient qualified resources (9 translators and 3 revisers) in Canada to perform all the work described in the SOW? If not, how many translators and revisers are you capable of supplying that meet all of the requirements?
A2	Summary: All seven (7) suppliers have the capacity to provide sufficient qualified resources which was defined as nine (9) translators and three (3) revisers. It was discussed during the meetings that the Canadian Content would be applicable and would form part of the contract. All the work must be conducted in accordance with this requirement and the SOW in the contract.



<p>Q3</p>	<p>All translations and comparative bilingual revisions must be quality-controlled before they are delivered to the ATSSC. Describe how your company performs quality control (of accuracy, language, style, adaptation, terminology, formatting, etc.)?</p>
<p>A3</p>	<p>Summary: All seven (7) suppliers provided details on documented comprehensive quality-control plans. Six (6) suppliers indicated they are International Organization for Standardization (ISO) certified, either 9001 or 17100. Five (5) suppliers indicated they are Canadian General Standards Board (CGSB) certified. The one supplier who doesn't have either the ISO or CGSB certification noted concerns with them. Refer to Answer 8 for additional details.</p>
<p>Q4</p>	<p>Is there a mechanism in place to monitor your quality, responsiveness and service performance? If yes, could you describe the mechanism you use to monitor your translation and revision services? Please provide concrete, relevant examples.</p>
<p>A4</p>	<p>Summary: All seven (7) suppliers provided details of this process as part of their quality control plan. There were various methodologies presented ranging from ongoing quality control to ad hoc evaluations as well as discussions with clients on quality of deliverables.</p>
<p>Q5</p>	<p>Could you provide feedback on the proposed mandatory and point rated evaluation criteria in Annex C? Do you have any concerns with the evaluation criteria? If yes, please specify which criterion (or criteria) is (or are) of concern and the reason why it is of concern. Should Canada use other elements / criteria to evaluate bids?</p>
<p>A5</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>Exam The majority of respondents were in favor of using an exam to evaluate suppliers' quality of work.</p> <p>Number of words per resource The majority of respondents highlighted that 2500 words per day for Legal translation is too much. Industry recommended to reduce the number of words to be between 1500-2200 words per resource per day to allow time to adequately control the quality of the translation.</p> <p>A question arose regarding Translators' output: How will Canada verify the individual output of translators? It was suggested that Canada request a statutory declaration from the Bidder.</p> <p>Number of words - Corporation Regarding the company output, respondents pointed out that the output for the company should be higher than 5000 words per day.</p> <p>Point allocation Industry recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More weight / value be given to the point allocation for the Corporate Point Rated Technical Criteria than what is currently proposed. Canada should add more value on the overall expertise, capacity and responsiveness of the company.



- The point allocation for the exam be increased.
- Canada review the resources mandatory and point-rated evaluation criteria since the number of qualified translation professionals might be limited. The lack of qualified resources could be greater if Canada requires proposed resources to have several university degrees and meet the security requirement.

Quality

Suppliers stated that the evaluation methodology should allow Canada to award a contract to the best company.

Translation tool

There was also discussion on Translation tools, translation memory and when a tool should or should not be used. Canada is not prescriptive on the usage of such tools. It is up to the supplier to determine and use all tools and mechanisms necessary to obtain the quality of the work in accordance with the SOW.

Education and experience

Regarding criteria RT1 and RREV1 which allocate points for a law degree some suppliers raised that translators without a law degree can and do gain expertise in legal translation through experience and that Canada should consider allowing sufficient experience in legal translation to be considered equivalent to the degree while also allowing award of additional points to resources with a law degree.

Additionally, one supplier mentioned that a degree in translation with a legal specialization exists and recommended allocating points for this option.

References

Two area of concerns were brought to Canada's attention regarding the availability of references for resource experience: very few clients know who (resource) translated their texts and, in instances where the references are no longer with the organisations for whom the work was performed, alternate references (without relevant information or expertise in the area of the translation) may not be able to provide reference.

Supplier feedback recommends that references should be required only for the translation service provider rather than for proposed resources.

Corporate Experience MC1

There are two (2) different trends of thought regarding MC1. Some suppliers think Canada should keep it at 10 years or more while others think that Canada should lower the experience to 5 years. One supplier suggested to change the point allocation for this criterion.

IT Capability

Canada will clarify the requirement for Windows and Microsoft Office Suite version.



Q6	Does your company foresee any issues with the number of references that are required? If yes, please provide comments or suggestions. Note that Canada recognizes that some references might be duplicates.
A6	<p>Summary: All suppliers confirmed they should be able to provide references with the caveat that some references might be duplicated.</p> <p>Two suppliers considered the references for individual translators impractical or onerous. One of the two suppliers further clarified that the clients do not know who, or how many resources, translated and edited their documents. As such, only the company is able to assess translators and references should be limited to the company only.</p>
Q7	Are there any areas of the SOW and evaluation criteria that are unclear ? If so, could you propose adjustments or changes for clarification?
A7	<p>Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With regard to security requirements, suppliers would like to know in advance what percentage of documents would be classified as Protected B. 2. There was a lot of feedback on the evaluation criteria and Canada will consider the feedback obtained. 3. Suppliers suggested that a statutory declaration be required in order to confirm the word capacity per day for translator resources. 4. Finally, one supplier suggested that we limit the number of reference documents presented in the SOW (Appendix 2).
Q8	Are your company, its translators or sub-contractors certified by a national or international organization? If so, which one(s)?
A8	<p>Summary: Certification –Corporate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Six (6) suppliers are International Organization for Standardization (ISO) certified either 9001 or 17100. Five (5) suppliers indicated they are CGSB 131.10 certified. 2) Two (2) suppliers suggested that the CGSB certification should be mandatory given Canada’s requirement. 3) One (1) supplier mentioned that one of the certifications should be mandatory, but not both, while other suppliers considered these certifications to be the basics of the translation industry and therefore should be mandatory for both the translators and the company. 4) Three (3) suppliers mentioned that the CGSB certification is essential. 5) One (1) supplier clarified that the organizational certifications relate to work and hiring processes and do not guarantee the quality of work and service provided to clients.



	<p>6) As part of the corporate certifications (ISO and CGSB), suppliers highlighted that if they are not part of the evaluation as mandatory criteria they should be point rated criteria.</p> <p>Certification - Resources</p> <p>1) All suppliers indicated that at least some of their resources have individual certifications such as Ordre des traducteurs, terminologues et interprètes agréés du Québec (OTTIAQ), Association of Translators and Interpreters of Ontario (ATIO) or similar regional certifications for other provinces and territories.</p> <p>2) One (1) supplier noted that in the province of Quebec, OTTIAQ does not carry out exams to qualify individual for membership.</p> <p>3) Regarding the certifications for translators, there was no consensus from the suppliers. They did not all agree on the need to have the certifications (OTTIAQ, ATIO, GAIA & ATA etc.) as mandatory or point rated criteria.</p>
Q9	What are your hiring criteria for translators?
A9	<p>Summary: All suppliers provided their hiring criteria and mechanism.</p> <p>The hiring criteria are somewhat a blend of: degree, professional certification, experience, recommendations from previous clients, personal attributes and a selection exam.</p>
Q10	Do you hire sub-contractors? If yes, what are your selection criteria for sub-contractors?
A10	<p>Summary: Four (4) of the suppliers hire sub-contractors. Selection criteria are similar to those for hiring full-time employee as stated in A9.</p>
Q11	The current requirement may ultimately be divided into several contracts , depending on responses from potential suppliers about their capability to provide the aforementioned translation and comparative bilingual revision services. If more than one contract is awarded, it is proposed to distribute the business by business unit defined in the SOW with higher ranked Contractors receiving a higher volume of business than lower ranked Contractors and with CBR business going to a contractor who did not translate the source text. Do you have any concerns with this methodology?
A11	<p>Summary: Industry seems divided on the question. Some suppliers prefer one (1) contract awarded for the entire requirement and some are satisfied with the multiple contract approach.</p> <p>Suppliers in favour of the one (1) contract approach mentioned that this methodology must be done in order to ensure optimal consistency, control and cost savings.</p> <p>According to a supplier if Canada divides the requirement into several contracts, it will be difficult to maintain consistency in translations unless suppliers can access information on a Cloud based system.</p>



	<p>Suggestions on work allocation if multiple contracts :</p> <p>If Canada is to award multiple contracts, suppliers suggested Canada should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute the volume of business logically with the top ranked contractor receiving a larger portion, • Identify the number of words which has an impact on the bid price and the business unit(s) associated to each contract. • If feasible, match the contractor and the business units based on strengths and experience of each supplier. <p>One supplier advised against adopting a “right of first refusal” process to allocate work after award. This method allows for less attractive jobs to be passed on to another supplier.</p> <p>One supplier proposed that Canada use the approach of a rotational distribution of business once suppliers meet the minimum qualifying requirements for quality and capacity and are awarded contracts.</p>
<p>Q12</p>	<p>In the event that the proposed strategy in question 11 is implemented, if a translation contractor was to have their contract terminated for performance reasons the work would be re-distributed to one or more of the other translation contractors. Do you have any concerns with this strategy?</p>
<p>A12</p>	<p>Summary: In the event that Canada will use multiples contractors and a termination occurs the majority of suppliers are in agreement with the redistribution of the work.</p> <p>Suppliers also indicate they would like to know the performance indicators that could lead to a contract termination.</p> <p>There was also a question of ethics regarding a third party doing the Comparative Bilingual Revision.</p>
<p>Q13</p>	<p>It is proposed that additional or replacement resources that are added after the initial contract has been awarded must meet all mandatory evaluation criteria and achieve as a minimum the average mark for the point rated criteria of the resources that were proposed in the bid. Do you have any concerns with this strategy?</p>
<p>A13</p>	<p>Summary: Suppliers have either the proper workforce or have the proper recruitment mechanism in place to be able to hire or find qualified translators to meet the requirement.</p> <p>It has been raised by suppliers that a supplier that will have submitted excellent translators at the time of bid may have some difficulties finding proper replacement or additional resource after award due to the average being too high.</p>
<p>Q14</p>	<p>In the case of repeated poor translation or errors Canada reserves the right to terminate the contract for default. Prior to considering contract termination, how should Canada handle poor translation quality? Should Canada use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the liquidated damages to rectify a text at a flat rate of X\$ per hour or b) should Canada use a method such as service credit?



	<p>Do you have another mechanism to propose that could alleviate or reduce the risk for Canada to receive receiving poor work or poor translation? This could also be used to monitor the CBR work. How should Canada handle multiple or repetitive poor translation?</p>
<p>A14</p>	<p>Summary : Generally speaking, industry is in agreement with the reduction of fees on a particular job if the quality is not good (Service credit, liquidated damages or a flat fee could be applied).</p> <p>A supplier suggested that we allow a maximum of three (3) poor translations prior to terminating a contract.</p> <p>Multiple suppliers suggested an adaptation period upon contract award to implement and refine business processes to meet client requirements.</p> <p>It was also suggested by some suppliers that we keep an open communication with suppliers, and return the work to the contractor whenever the quality of the work is not in accordance with the SOW and depending on the frequency and the severity of the problem Canada may decide to terminate a given contract.</p> <p>A supplier also recommended a conflict resolution process to address minor things such as tone of voice terminology etc.</p>

Conclusion

Canada would like to thank all suppliers who took part in this engagement process. The feedback provided by industry members was welcomed and appreciated by Government of Canada representatives.

The Government of Canada reiterated the benefits of participating in the public consultation processes which is essential in making informed decisions for acquiring services in accordance with the priorities of the Crown and the Canadian people.

Canada will consider the feedback obtained.