Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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

Title - Sujet RFI Summary Report	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 39903-200178/B	**Date** 2020-02-25
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 39903-200178	**GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG** PW-$$ZH-151-37405
File No. - N° de dossier 151zh.39903-200178	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2020-03-12**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☐ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Cole, Heather	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 151zh
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 858-8648 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** ( ) -

Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:
Destination - des biens, services et construction:

CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY
1400 MERIVALE ROAD
OTTAWA
Ontario
K1A0Y9
Canada

Comments - Commentaires

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

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**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Training and Specialized Services Division/Division de la formation et des services spécialisés
Terrasses de la Chaudière 5th Floo
Terrasses de la Chaudière 5e étage
10 Wellington Street,
10, rue Wellington,
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Canada

Item Article	Description	Dest. Code Dest.	Inv. Code Fact.	Qty Qté	U. of I. U. de D.	Unit Price/Prix unitaire FOB/FAM Destination	Plant/Usine	Delivery Req. Livraison Req.	Del. Offered Liv. offerte
2	Chemical Residue Testing Food Product	39903	39903	1	Each	$	$	See Herein	

Consolidated Responses Received From Industry
To Request for Information (RFI): 39903-200178/A
For The Provision Of: Chemical Residue Testing in and on Food Products
Required By: Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)

Questions and Responses

1. Are you interested in attending the one-on-one sessions?

    A. There are 6 Suppliers who would like to attend a one-on-one session.
    B. There is one Supplier who does not want to attend a one-on-one session.

2. Is your Laboratory accredited by the Standards Council of Canada or the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc.?

    A. Yes, our laboratory is accredited by the Standards Council of Canada (SCC).
    B. Yes
    C. Yes, we are CALA accredited
    D. We are accredited by SCC and CALA to ISO/IEC 17025 for specific tests listed on our scopes of accreditations.
    E. Our laboratory is accredited by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc.
    F. We are accredited by the Standards Council of Canada.
    G. Yes, we are accredited by Standard Council of Canada.

3. What is your capacity and ability to provide the services and meet the requirements as defined in the Statement of Work?

    A. We have several Sciex 5000 and 6500+ LCMSMS instruments, Agilent GCMSMS, ICPMS's, and GCMS's to serve this work. These instruments have open capacity to accommodate new work. If we secure a higher volume of the overall contract for a given food group, we will add enough resources (space, instruments, personnel) to meet the required turnaround times within the first 2-3 months from the day of the award.

    B. Dioxin/PCBs: 150 samples per month and PAH: 250 samples per month.

    C. We have the capacity and ability to provide testing of several but not all of the requirements defined in the statement of work

    D. We are confident that we have the capacity and ability to provide the services and meet the requirements as defined in the Statement of Work.

    E. Our capacity and abilities are able to meet all requirements as defined in the statement of work.

    F. We meet the required capacity and we have the ability to provide the services and meet the requirements for all tests listed in Appendix 1 to Annex A with the exception of arsenic species and food colours (water and fat).

    G. We are capable of performing the services listed in the table below:

Method	Description	Estimated TAT
CTL-MASOP AOCS ca 3-46 AOAC 983.08	Moisture, dry matter, insoluble impurities, unsaponifiables **Calculations:** Moisture, Insoluble, Unsaponifiables (MIU)	4 Days
Modified AOAC 965.33 MCC 174	Peroxide value, rancidity	5 Days
AOAC 940.28	Free fatty acid (Oleic acid)	4 Days
AOAC 920.158	Iodine number	3 Days
ELISA	Chlortetracycline	5 Days
ELISA	Sulfamethazine	5 Days
ELISA CTL-VCSOP	Aflatoxin, fumonisin, ochratoxin, T-2 toxin, vomitoxin, zearalenone	7 Days
CTL-MASOP CTL-MICPSOP	Heavy metal contamination – moisture, dry matter, aluminum (Al), Cadmium (Cd), Lead (Pb), Arsenic (As)	3 Days

4. If the CFIA required a shorter turn-around time than defined in the Statement of Work, what would a minimum reasonable turn-around time be before operations are affected and impact the costs of testing to CFIA?

   A. Accepting samples for a shorter TAT depends on the analytical method, volume, and the requested turn-around time (TAT). Without knowing this in detail, it is difficult for us to provide this information. We could discuss this further in our one-on-one meeting.

   B. Without changing price, a TAT of 90 days would be reasonable. Small batches (6-8 samples) could be done in 1 week, but with an associated premium.

   C. We have the capability to provide 15-20 day turnarounds on selected tests without impacting on the costs to CFIA.

   D. The answer to this relates to batch efficiency and the rate at which samples are received. Should the turnaround time be reduced, but sample volumes not adequate to provide optimal efficiency then the cost of testing will increase. Conversely, should the lab continue to receive adequate sample volumes to maximize test efficiencies we could meet a reduced turnaround time of 10 to 15 business days.

   E. The turn-around time defined in the Statement of Work allows the laboratory operations to batch samples, maximize instrumentation and plan workflow. This allows us to keep the costs to CFIA low. Any changes to this turn-around time will impact costs.

   F. 30 day TAT is the quickest possible. The lower the TAT, the less efficient we become. For some tests that are 120 day TAT, where there are many positives seen, lowering the TAT would decrease the efficiency of the laboratory thus increasing costs. This question is very hard to answer without knowing which of the tests would be awarded; it's possible that if the TAT is decreased then there may be instances where samples would need to be cancelled after receipt; if CFIA removes the requirement to cancel testing if it is beyond the TAT, then this may be easier to manage. (This would save on sample collection, shipping and processing).

5. What is the relative impact that would occur if the turn-around time requirement on the entire sample is reduced to 90, 60, 30 days? Would this impact the number of samples you have capacity for, number of tests which could be performed on a given sample, and/or costs to CFIA, etc?

A. There is a significant cost impact on shorter TAT. At present, there is a 120-day TAT for most of the tests. This TAT would allow labs to collect reasonable volume to create a good batch size for testing. The time spend on extractions, instrument analysis, and calculations related to quality control (QC) samples in a batch is constant and irrelevant of a batch size. Therefore, having a full batch size of production samples will reduce the cost of QC samples per production sample.

   In addition, the % sample delivery rate by the CFIA samplers seem to vary, and we have found it is in the range of 45% to 60%. Therefore, it is uncertain how many samples would be received in the lab in a week. If a lab wins the 1st or 2nd place with 55% and 20% volume, those labs at least would be getting enough samples for a batch size on a regular basis. On the other hand, a lab winning the 4th place would end up getting very few samples and will have a very high cost in testing a sample. Based on the above, a shorter TAT significantly impacts the price of testing and will increase the cost to CFIA.

   A shorter TAT will also have an impact on lab's capacity and the number of assigned tests that can be done on a sample. We could discuss this further in our one-on-one meeting.

B. A TAT of 90 days would have little impact. It does not impact the capacity.

C. There would be no impact whatsoever from reducing turnaround times as indicated, there would be no impact on CFIA as regards costs, quality of work etc.

D. Our bids are made under the assumption that high volume efficiencies are possible, reducing the cost of the test. By reducing the number of samples, the lab can't realize these efficiencies resulting in a higher cost per sample. The lab assumes it will receive the full number of samples in the sampling plan and assigns the required staff and resources for this. When samples are not received, this adds to the inefficiency of the program.

E. The impact that would occur if the turn-around time requirement on the entire sample is reduced to 90,60,30 days would depend on a number of variables. Staffing, equipment and facility decisions are all dependent on our ability to optimize workflow. With decreased or variable turnaround times, workflow is generally interrupted and batch sizes decrease. Depending on volumes, when turnaround times are shorter, the need to meet turnaround-times outweighs the ability to optimize workflow and batch sizes. This means less samples are run in each batch; requiring increased staffing, equipment and facilities to be dedicated to CFIA. Thus in most cases faster turnaround times have a significantly higher cost.

F. Yes it impacts capacity. Impacts on # of tests performed on a given sample. May not be able to complete all tests on that sample in the required TAT.

6. Can you propose any suggestions to sampling and/or testing in the samples that would help mitigate impacts to the laboratory and/or CFIA?

   A. We think that providing collections to 3rd party sample collectors could be one solution to mitigate the cost impact to the lab and the CFIA as the % collection rate seem to be high. We could discuss this further in our one-on-one meeting.

   B. No

   C. We would like to suggest considering adding some of the Part A tests to Part B. This would enable CFIA to get more bids on the table, potentially provide cost savings, time savings and even get better analytical data.

D. With a more consistent sample flow to receive samples, the lab can better plan testing on a more efficient basis. If there are errors from CFIA, the administration of the sampling plan requires additional costs that are captured in the cost per test/sample.

E. There are a number of suggestions we can propose that may mitigate impact to the laboratory and/ or CFIA. One would be to provide large enough volumes within each sampling event so that batch sizes are optimized regardless of turnaround times (consistent sampling plans that have little to no variability in delivery). Another is to potentially lower the number of tests per sample.

F. There are some test/matrix combinations that could be handled more efficiently. For example the current contract is separate for antibiotics in meat and egg/dairy. As these matrices have very similar extractions and analyses, it would benefit CFIA and the laboratory to have these grouped together as one matrix category. (More lab batching efficiency typically results in lower prices for the client). There seems to be no normalized system for shipping. If we were to receive almost the same amount of samples each month then it would be more efficient (and wouldn't have to cancel samples since we received too many to process; this happens for the short TAT tests).

7. It is intended to award multiple standing offers for a period of three (3) years, with two (2) option periods of one (1) year each. Do you have any comments on the proposed period of the SO?

A. It is best to have the current standing offer period.

B. It is acceptable.

C. The periods of the SO are quite reasonable. It would however potentially benefit the CFIA to provide more notice of a forthcoming bid opportunity. It can take significant time to obtain accreditation for additional tests and even additional analysts within a test.

By extending the notice period it is likely that more laboratories would be able to put in a bid for the CFIA testing work. While some tests are routine like water testing, the veterinary residues and other Part A tests, require a massive commitment of resource and time. Smaller laboratories look at this and typically decide it is not worth the investment risk. The risks are seen as:

1) Complete the development work and then miss a deadline

2) Make the investment and then potentially wait another two years, because the anticipated renewal time did not materialize due to extensions being utilised.

If the notice was sent a year ahead of RFSO then it opens the field to new players. The bid period of 3 years is practical. Having the tool of an additional extension period is handy in case of unforeseen events. The extra notice period and adherence to the renewal RFSO would certainly make a huge difference to a small laboratory such as ourselves, indeed if we were notified now that we had a year to set up for the veterinary tests we would be all in.

D. No

E. No. This structure works well.

F. This seems appropriate.

8. Please identify any other issues, concerns, recommendations not addressed above.

A. Additional items can be discussed in one-on meeting.

B. None

C. There is also an opportunity for CFIA to get better value for money, by moving some of the Part A tests to Part B. This would open the doors to smaller laboratories who have excellent skill sets, but do not have the financial backing to set up for the entire Part A tests.

   As it stands, the bidding process heavily favours large laboratories and essentially excludes smaller laboratories, from offering their often excellent services to the CFIA. Without the heavy overheads of large laboratories, it is quite likely that CFIA could benefit from better pricing, turnaround and even better quality analysis, from dedicated smaller laboratories.

   An example of this is metals testing. We can offer testing of metals in all of the listed commodities, but cannot offer the complete veterinary residue testing package, we have the ability to offer faster turnaround testing of these commodities for metals, at extremely competitive prices, but would be excluded from bidding on this test as it is listed in part A. The same would apply to other tests such as Glyphosate where we have a routine LOQ of around 0.9ppb which is 11 times lower than the required LOQ in the part A Appendix.There is much value to be found in smaller laboratories and by moving some of the Part A tests to Part B this could easily be harnessed to the benefit of the CFIA.

D. CFIA has added a polar pesticide screen, which our lab can do but will require sufficient time to get accreditation for this method. Please allow sufficient times for the labs to acquire accreditation when new tests are introduced in the Standing Offer. We look forward to the opportunity to discuss the program one on one with the CFIA.

E. No additional comments

F. No additional comments.