

Questions and Answers Series #1

For the Senior Analyst stream

Question # 1:

M3 –The Bidder **must** demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience processing complex ATI requests in both official languages (English and French). The Bidder **must** provide three (3) client project references.

In order to demonstrate this, the Bidder **must** provide the following information:

- Copy of the original request
- Copy of the response prepared by the proposed resource
- Timeline of the projects; start and end date (month-year to month-year)
- Client Organization
- Resource role and responsibilities
- Summary of each project that identifies the services provided/ activities performed
- Confirmation of language in which the request was processed

Note: Bidders **must** provide two (2) client project references in French and one (1) in English

Could you confirm if you are looking for a final letter to the requester OR the actual package that was released? Our concern about sharing the actual package that was released is the size of the file. It will be too large to include in the RFP response. 'Confirming that we're not/not looking for a copy of the actual release package, but rather a summary of the project/file the proposed resource worked on ---or a copy of the final letter to the requestor---, as long as the material provided demonstrates the complexity of the project/file processed (as well as other information identified above).

Also, could you clarify that when you're referring to "summary of each *project* that identifies the services provided" – in this context, a "project" would refer to a file example? Indeed, we used the term 'project' in lieu of 'file', but for us, in this context, both terms meant the same. So yes, 'file' equals 'project'.

Question # 2:

R1 -The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the proposed resource has experience:

Making recommendations based on the provisions of the Access to Information Act and its related regulations/directives.

Evaluation Grid:

The Bidder will receive up to five (5) points for each project (Maximum 6 projects) that demonstrates the experience as indicated above.

- 5 points – Experience clearly demonstrated
- 3 points – Experience not clearly defined
- 0 points – Experience not demonstrated

Could you clarify if you are requesting “using file descriptions” instead of projects? Yes, we’re requesting ‘file descriptions’; we’ve used the term ‘project’, but could have used ‘file’ as well, as, to us, in this context, both terms are the same.

Questions # 3:

R2 -The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the proposed resource has experience:

Responding to complaints from any relevant oversight bodies (i.e. Office of the Information Commissioner; Treasury Board).

Evaluation Grid:

The Bidder will receive up to five (5) points for each project (Maximum 6 projects) that demonstrates this experience as follows:

- 5 points – Experience clearly demonstrated
- 3 points – Experience not clearly defined
- 0 points – Experience not demonstrated

Could you confirm that you are referring to examples of complaint files, rather than projects? Yes, we’re confirming that we’re referring to ‘examples of complaint files’; we’ve used the term ‘project’ but could have used ‘file’ as well, as, to us, in this context, both terms mean the same.

Question # 4:

The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the proposed resource has experience:

Using ATIP Case management and redaction software

Evaluation Grid:

The Bidder will receive up to two and a half (2.5) points for each project (Maximum 6 projects) that demonstrates this experience as follows:

- 2.5 points – Experience clearly demonstrated
- 1.5 points – Experience not clearly defined
- 0 points – Experience not demonstrated

Could you confirm you are referring to files instead of project descriptions? Yes, we’re confirming that we’re referring to ‘file’; we’ve used the term ‘project’ but could have used ‘file’ as well, as, to us, in this context, both terms mean the same.

Questions # 5:

The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the proposed resource has experience:

Demonstrating the capacity to develop training curriculum and/or provide training related to Access to Information.

Evaluation Grid:

The Bidder will receive up to five (5) points for **each project** (Maximum 4 projects) that demonstrates this experience as follows:

- 5 points – Experience clearly demonstrated
- 3 points – Experience not clearly defined

Could you confirm if specific examples of training curriculum or training courses are accepted as “projects” to demonstrate the experience in developing and/or providing training? *Confirming that we’re looking for examples of training curriculum or courses the proposed resource has developed for, and delivered to, employees (e.g. training deck), and examples would specify the number of persons trained as part of this training.*

For the Privacy Stream:

Questions # 1

M1 - The proposed resource **must** have a minimum of five (5) years of experience within the last seven (7) years working directly on complex Privacy files.

In order to demonstrate this, the Bidder **must** provide a minimum of four (4) **projects** that includes the following information:

- Timeline of the projects; start and end date (month-year to month-year)
- Client Organization
- Resource role and responsibilities
- Summary of **each project** that identifies the services provided/ activities performed highlighting:

I. Involvement working on complex Privacy issues.

Could you confirm that you are referring to Privacy files instead of projects? *Yes, we’re confirming that we’re referring to ‘privacy files’; we’ve used the term ‘project’ but could have used ‘file’ as well, as, to us, in this context, both terms mean the same.*

Questions # 2:

M2 - The Bidder **must** demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience processing complex Privacy files in both official languages (English and French). The Bidder **must** provide two (2) client project references.

In order to demonstrate this, the Bidder **must** provide the following information:

- Copy of the original request**
- Copy of the response prepared by the proposed resource**
- Timeline of the projects; start and end date (month-year to month-year)

- Client Organization
- Resource role and responsibilities
- Summary of each project that identifies the services provided/ activities performed
- Confirmation of language in which the request was processed

Note: Bidders **must** provide one (1) client project references in French and one (1) in English

It is not possible to obtain copies of original Privacy requests and responses, as this information as this could be a privacy breach. *My apologies; this is an oversight on our part; of course, we're not to request a copy of an original privacy request, nor the related response.*

If the objective of Agriculture Canada is to confirm the resource's capability to work in both official languages, we suggest that an email reference letter attesting the proposed resource's capability would be sufficient. *Yes, 'confirming that a reference letter/email that includes: (i) a confirmation that the proposed resource has worked on privacy files in English and French over the past five years; (ii) a summary of the privacy files the proposed resource worked on in both official languages that demonstrates the complexity of the privacy file processed (as well as other information identified above) would do.*

Question # 3:

For R1, R2, and R3 – could you confirm that instead of project, you are referring to specific examples of Privacy files (R1), Privacy Breaches (R2), and Policies/Directives (R3)? *Yes, confirming that we're looking for examples of privacy files and privacy breaches worked on by the proposed resource, and examples detailing departmental policies/directives/guidelines on privacy matters that the proposed resource has developed or updated.*

Question # 4:

R4 – in order to demonstrate this experience, could we provide examples of privacy training that has been developed? *Yes, bidder(s) can provide examples of privacy training curriculum or courses the proposed resource has developed for, and delivered to, employees (e.g. training deck), and examples would specify the number of persons trained as part of this training.*