



**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

Quebec

K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT  
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

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

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

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Relocation Services Division/Division des services de  
réinstallation  
Terrasses de la Chaudière 5th Floor  
10 Wellington Street  
Gatineau  
Quebec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> NHGRS	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-193470/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20193470	<b>Date</b> 2020-03-11
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZU-002-37295	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 002zu.EN578-193470	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-03-18</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Carrière, Dominic	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 002zu
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 203-4871 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**NHGRS RFI #2****Amendment 002 to solicitation EN578-193470/B**

This RFI amendment is raised to:

- i. Update the schedule of the procurement process; and
- ii. Publish a summary of the feedback received during RFI #1 and Canada's responses.

**1. Procurement Process**

The following steps are currently planned in this procurement process:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Completion</b>
Draft RFP	Spring 2020
RFP Release	Summer/Fall 2020
RFP Evaluations	Fall 2020
Contract Award	Winter 2021

**2. Summary and Canada's responses**

Canada would like to thank all respondents for the time and effort that went into the constructive feedback received in response to the NHGRS RFI #1.

A total of three companies responded. Below you will find a high level summary of the feedback received in response to the questions and Canada's responses to feedback received.

Please note that Canada has considered all industry feedback received, although comments that did not directly address the questions asked were not included in the summaries below.

**Question 1**

- 1a)** What are your comments on the planned number of zones, their size, and the services included in the three groupings (origin, destination & miscellaneous services)? Canada is open to considering other pricing methodology options in order to achieve the best/lowest prices.
- 1b)** Is there a benefit to Canada and/or a contractor to have peak and non-peak pricing? If so, what types of rates should, and should not, warrant peak and off-peak pricing (e.g. packing, transport, storage, etc.), and why?
- 1c)** Is there a minimum weight the industry uses for origin and destination services?

**Industry Feedback**

Industry is questioning why zonal structure is being considered and the GAMS rate is being separated into multiple components (e.g. origin services, destination services, etc.). It was also brought to our attention that, if the intent is to go with zonal rate, Canada should review the zone to align them with low

and high traffic areas, and volume should dictate how we create the zones. With regards to cost, the feedbacks received were that a basis of payment based on the Metric System would increase the industry programming cost and would be reflected in their prices. Non bundled services could provide a better costs and industry would see some saving if we are moving towards a more paperless requirement. As for the transportation, it was suggested that it should be based on weight and distance.

In general, it was indicated that there is no real benefit to having a peak and off peak pricing. Canada should consider allowing load shifting (moving DSR date left or right) in order to allow for moves to be serviced, perhaps at a discount rate similar to the airline industry.

There is a need for a minimum weight which should varies depending upon the type of move. Currently, the minimum weight is 500 lbs and 1000lbs for cross border. In some instances it may be that other minimum weights are used to accommodate moves such as air or sea

### **Canada' Response**

The zonal concept will be revisited to achieve the best price for Canada and simplicity of application.

Canada will take into consideration Industry feedback about peak pricing and associated opportunities when developing the requirement and BOP.

Due to the variability of minimum weights, Canada intends to maintain a 500lbs and 1000 lbs cross border minimum.

### **Question 2**

- 2a)** What would you recommend to minimize RCP/PC charges to Canada?
- 2b)** Is there a cost benefit in having different RCP/PC rates for:
  - i. Shipments between or within Zone 7 CRL and other Zones?
  - ii. Shipments within/between USA zones?
  - iii. Shipments to/from between Mexico and USA and/or Canada?
  - iv. Different weight bands?
- 2c)** What is your recommended method for estimating the value of shipped goods, e.g. \$10 per hundred pounds?
- 2d)** What is your recommended methodology for identifying high-value goods, e.g. \$100 per pound, \$1,000 per item?
- 2e)** Are there risks that Canada could assume that would enable contractors to bid lower RCP/PC prices?
- 2f)** Are there other protection coverage options that would provide savings e.g. cost sharing?

### **Industry Feedback**

Industry cites there is no economic benefit to changing the RCP rate based on a zone or cross border move and recommend having just the one rate.

In general, industry suggests retaining the valuation of \$10/lb.

The feedback is that we should include a process or specific language related to the high value goods.

There could be limits of exposure to claims put in place, however changes to the way that RCP is calculated will improve the way in which the RCP charges reflect the valuation of the goods as provided the shipper. Members should pay the additional costs (beyond the \$10/lb) and claim through the relocation services provided by the departments.

Industry suggests that a shared liability model would be time consuming and costly. Primary concern is with those claims which are difficult to resolve and result in legal action adding costs. Canada must maintain that it is not part of the claim settlement process but Canada should be very interested in being informed of fraudulent activity. Claim history management is also a viable option.

#### **Canada' Response**

Based on feedback, Canada will continue a valuation per pound and will make the option of buying extra coverage available.

For high value items, which will be defined in a future Statement of Work, Canada will explore having Shippers complete forms listing high value inventory items associated with a move. In cases where high value items result in insufficient base coverage, Canada will explore options for the Shipper to acquire additional coverage via the contract.

#### **Question 3**

- 3a)** Would a combination of multiple freight BOP methods be appropriate, e.g. flat rate per kilometer and per container?
- 3b)** What are your suggestions that would enable you to propose your lowest possible price, which may or may not include a zonal rate? Canada is open to considering other pricing methodology options in order to achieve the best/lowest prices

#### **Industry Feedback**

In general, it was suggested that only one rate should be used for the ground transportation.

Industry also suggested that smaller bundling of services which will allow for origin/destination and freight rates will account for differences in rates in different parts of North America. Fuel surcharges will be adjusted to reflect more current industry models for calculating those charges.

#### **Canada' Response**

Based on the feedback, Canada is endeavoring to have a single ground transportation rate per country of origin (Canada, US and Mexico) as it seems to be the simplest method. In addition,

Canada has limited bundling to origin and destination services and the remaining will be single line item.

#### **Question 4**

- 4a)** Does the proposed GTT Table in Annex C impact service delivery and/or price? Please elaborate. Is there a different method of service delivery (e.g. containers and/or freight) that would enable industry to meet these GTTs with minimal impact on price?

- 4b)** Is additional time required for a small load and, if so, how much additional time? How do you define a small load (e.g. what weight)?
- 4c)** Do you think different GTT Tables are warranted for the APS season (May to September) and the non-peak season (October to April)? If so, please elaborate.
- 4d)** Is additional time required for moves between different zones (e.g. C1 and C6 to/from other zones)?
- 4e)** Is additional time required for crossing borders (Canada- USA, USA-Mexico)? Would additional time be required by mode for border crossings?
- 4f)** Should there be a GTT difference for containerized loads and loose loads? If so, please elaborate and please provide a sample GTT table for containerized loads.

**Industry Feedback**

Canada should change the hours of service, the need to consolidate multiple loads to create a full truck load and other elements that impact transit time need to be taken into consideration. It also suggested that there may be an opportunity for having faster services in "expedited delivery lanes" this would not result in cheaper rates, the savings would be realized in shorter periods needing interim lodgings and meals.

The ability to service a small load is dependent upon the number of loads needed to fill the truck and also the distance it is travelling. The current model (current contract) takes that into consideration. This is not a linear relationship where weight is not taken into consideration, only distance is calculated.

Industry feedback reflects that additional time is needed for off-peak periods in order to allow for more load consolidation.

It was suggested that some zones need additional time but, because the question is related to how the zones are constructed, industry will be able to respond more adequately once the zones are fully revealed.

More time is needed for documentation preparation, customs clearance and load consolidation (for north/south cross border moves with qualified drivers who have proper clearances to cross the borders)

Industry identifies that there should be no difference between containerized loads and loads in moving vans.

**Canada' Response**

Canada will consider these inputs when constructing the final GTT (now being referred to as TTG). Canada would be very interested in having further suggestions regarding how these expedited lanes would work compared with the remainder of the service area. Please provide your written suggestions to the Contracting Authority at any time.

Canada acknowledges feedback that there should be no difference between containerized loads and loads in moving vans.

**Question 5**

- 5a)** Is the notification timeframe for rush moves reasonable? Please elaborate.

- 5b)** What do you consider as a reasonable premium (\$) to charge for a rush move? Please explain your rationale.

**Industry Feedback**

Industry feels that no right of refusal for rush moves is not tenable. The current construct of a rush move being defined as less than 10 business days needs to be maintained.

Various suggestions were received regarding adequate compensation. Industry suggests that a flat rate is not ideal. Percentages such as 15%, 25% were suggested in addition to the current 2%/5% model, however, it is noted that money is not always the answer as it is a matter of capacity that allows the Contractor to accept to service a move.

**Canada' Response**

Canada will take this under advisement and is interested in different constructs that will ensure that the Contractor gets minimum notification so that there are no last minute refusals of moves on the part of all contractors which then in turn cause a problem. Please provide your written suggestions to the Contracting Authority at any time.

Canada will take under advisement the suggestions provided regarding adequate compensation.

**Question 6)**

- 6a)** Would your company be able to provide PMV storage as described above? If so, which option(s) are you able to provide?
- 6b)** Are there other PMV storage options available to Canada that your company can suggest?

**Industry Feedback**

Moving companies generally do not have the ability to store PMVs. Some have relationships with their Car Carriers which may provide regional storage capabilities. If Canada wishes to seek pricing for PMV storage, it will have to commit to minimum storage volumes so that it is worth while putting in place those services.

Generally it was suggested that Car Carriers should be involved in discussions on PMV storage requirements.

**Canada' Response**

Canada has taken this information under advisement and will review the requirement to determine if it should be in the Household Goods Contract.

**Question 7**

- 7a)** Does your organization have an environmental policy or plan? Please explain.
- 7b)** Which environmental initiatives have been implemented by your organization, and which ones are you planning to implement in the near future (paper reduction, green travel policy, etc.)? Please explain and specify.

- 7c)** Are there replacement products available that you would consider using in the moving industry which are not presently recyclable which might be available in a biodegradable form, e.g. plastic wrap, tape? If you would not consider them, please explain why.

**Industry Feedback**

In general, the industry indicates that it is following the TB Green Procurement guidelines. Specifics would be offered with the RFP submissions. There is interest in reducing the need for paper invoicing (packages of paper sent to Canada for payment backup info).

Industry is actively exploring opportunities to utilize environmentally friendly products including plastic crates for local moves. Some of these initiatives are predicated on market penetration (plastic crates) since these assets need to be retained by the moving company and not held by the shipper.

**Canada' Response**

Canada will review the achievable goals regarding implementation or monitoring of any Green Procurement initiatives in the Household Goods Contracts.

Canada will explore the possibility of reducing the hard copy size of these invoice packages by allowing electronic copies (scans, etc.) of supporting documentation.

Canada is interested in any further information that may lead to reduced environmental impacts. Please provide your written suggestions to the Contracting Authority at any time.

**Question 8**

- 8a)** What is the maximum number of peak season relocations your company could complete during the APS season?
- 8b)** Is there a minimum number of total relocations or APS moves your company needs in order to interest you in bidding on the NHGRS procurement and, if so, what are those numbers?
- 8c)** Keeping in mind that Canada is interested in minimizing relocation costs, what are your views on the optimum number of contractors required during peak (May to September) and non-peak seasons?
- 8d)** Would peak and non-peak pricing provide lower overall pricing?
- 8e)** Would the above contemplated business distribution model impact your decision to bid and, if so, why?
- 8f)** What changes would you propose making to the above business distribution model that would ensure Canada obtains reasonable pricing while meeting its relocation needs, during the peak season (May to September)?

**Industry Feedback**

A variety of responses were received that indicate any company can handle 100% of the move volume given adequate notice of the moves and compensation for them. Without that notification, it is not possible to reasonably respond.

Unless there is year round volume, there is low interest at bidding on this requirement.

**Canada' Response**

Canada understands that multiple contractors would be required to meet the peak demand and will take the feedback regarding year round volume into consideration when creating its final requirements.