



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions\Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
See herein for bid submission
instructions/

Voir la présente pour les
instructions sur la présentation
d'une soumission

NA
Alberta

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)

Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

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

Public Works and Government Services / Travaux
publics et services gouvernementaux
Canada Place/Place du Canada
10th Floor/10e étage
9700 Jasper Ave/9700 ave Jasper
Edmonton
Alberta
T5J 4C3

Title - Sujet Aerospace Training	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8485-205759/A	Date 2020-07-09
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8485-205759	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
File No. - N° de dossier EDM-9-42135 (607)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$EDM-607-11836	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2020-05-13	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-07-21	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Jenkinson, Lorraine	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur edm607
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (587) 337-2458 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (780) 497-3510
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité 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

Acknowledgement copy required	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
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)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8485-205759/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8485-205759

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
EDM-9-42135

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
EDM607
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

TITLE: FIXED AND ROTARY WING TEST PILOTS AND ENGINEERS TRAINING (CIVIL AVIATION ORIENTED) IN SUPPORT OF DGAEPM / AETE

This solicitation amendment is to provide clarifications to the Solicitation.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS:

Q-1 With regards to the solicitation W8485-205759/A, I am looking to submit [our] financial statements as per the standing offer's financial capability (SACCs M9033T) requirements. As Standing Offer Authority may I submit the documentation to you? If not may I ask that you refer me to the correct contact for submission.

A-1. The Financial statements do not have to be submitted with the Bid. If they are required the Contracting Authority will request them.

Q-2. I am requesting further information on paragraph 3.3.1 a) iv) "Minimum 50% of total flight time on a multi engine above 7000lbs gross weight" for the RW course.

It is my understanding based on our training program and the websites of [other schools] that all three schools do not currently provide 55 flight hours on aircraft above 7000lbs within our programs. Please note the cost of a helicopter in this category [may increase substantially]. Each school's program currently provides helicopters in this weight class but the flight hours would normally be approximately 10-20 flight hours per course vice 55 hours.

A-2. Yes, paragraph 3.3.1 a) iv) "Minimum 50% of the total flight time on a multi engine above 7,000lbs gross weight" is an essential Rotary Wing requirement and all bidders must meet these flight hours. The requirement is amended as follows:

3.3.1 a) iv) Minimum 50% of the total flight time on a multi engine above 7,000lbs gross weight, or certified IAW CAR/FAR Part 29 (or equivalent)".

Q-3. [Our] understanding is that the RCAF requirement is for 110 hours flying time (and within this figure, Level D simulators could be utilised for up to 10 hours) with a minimum of 15 types flown (at least for fixed wing). [We're] trying to identify whether the 110 flying hours / 15 FW types is an absolute 'must' requirement or is it a 'should' requirement and, if it is not met, could it be countered by the positive benefits of high quality instruction on a modern [aircraft] fleet with numerous very effective qualevals etc.? Are these requirements "show stoppers" if the training provider offers a course of 100 flying hours (for example) and (let's say) 13 different types (as a random example)?

A-3. The training program requirements identified in the Statement of Work – Annex "A", section 3 Course Specifications are mandatory. Please refer to sections 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.3.1 and 3.4.1 introductory sentences:

"The [program name] training program **must** include the following flight time and type requirements:"

Q-4. [We are] specifically concerned with Section A-3 Academic Instructor Personnel, A-4 Flight Instructor Personnel, and A-5 Instructor Diversity.

It is [our] understanding that the Canadian Armed Forces and AETE in particular put value on the education, experience and diversity of the TPS faculty. One of [our] key strengths is the education, experience, and diversity of our instructors. [We are] also larger than a number of our competitors.

Section A-3 establishes rating criteria for Academic Instructors: Education, Flight Test Experience, Teaching Experience. Section A-4 establishes rating criteria for Flight Test

Instructors: Flight Test Experience, Total Flying Hours. Section A-5 establishes criteria for Instructor Diversity.

There is a statement that reads “**Applies to all staff that will be involved in course delivery to students. To receive applicable points, all instructor staff must meet applicable points-rated criteria.**” This direction is somewhat unclear, and can be interpreted in multiple ways:

1. Identify all staff involved in course delivery compare all staff to the criteria rate them against the criteria and total the points. For example. An organization has 20 instructors 10 academic only, and 10 Flight /Academic Instructors. Within that 20 Instructor population there are very experienced Test Pilots and FTEs with Master's Degrees and some Doctorates ranging down to some new instructors that have recently left military service, have a great deal of flight test and flight experience, but have not yet completed their Masters degrees. In this method we take all 20 instructors rate them against the criteria and come out with a range of scores. For the Education Criteria. There are 10 instructors with multiple Master's or Doctorates, 7 others with masters, and 3 new instructors with only BS who are working on their Master's. The Score would be: $10 \times 2 = 20$ plus $7 \times 1 = 7$ plus $3 \times 0 = 0$ so their total education score is 27.
2. An alternate calculation could be that the score cannot be higher than the lowest education level, lowest amount of flight test experience, lowest teaching experience, lowest number of flight hours of the newest instructor. Using this criteria and the above example of instructor's education levels the whole organization would receive 0 points for education because 3 of their 20 instructors have newly joined the organization and have not yet gained their Master's degree.
3. The resulting score is radically different. Method 1 = 27 pts; Method 2 = 0 points even though the organization has 17 instructors with graduate degrees 10 of which are Doctorates.
4. A small organization could have 1 academic instructor with a Doctorate, 9 Flight instructors and score maximum points where a large organization with twice the instructors, 10 times the graduate degrees and greater experience in all other metrics and score 0 or nearly 0 points.

This apparent bias is the same for the other rating criteria as well.

Regarding A-5, a large organization with more than 10 instructors gains no credit for those additional instructors who represent an even more diverse population.

[We believe] that:

1. The scoring methodology is not clear.
2. If the methodology limits the organizations score to the lowest level of one instructor vs the true experience level of all of the individual instructors the methodology is biased to small organizations and does not clearly score an organization's true experience level.
3. By limiting A-5, Instructor Diversity, to a maximum of 10 instructors the rating is biased to smaller organizations.
4. [We believe] the scoring criteria is valid, but the methodology is biased towards small organizations and should be changed to capture data on all instructors individually. Instructors must be employees of the Test Pilot School so as to prevent inflated scores based upon temporary or contract instructors. This will present the proposal evaluators with a true and accurate representation of the Education and experience of the TPS organization's whole instructor staff, not of the newest instructor.
5. Total Score should not be capped at 32 as this is biased against larger Test Pilot Schools.
6. Caps are generally biased against larger schools with more instructors and more resources in general.

We all want a fair evaluation, but it appears as though the scoring criteria for instructors is heavily biased towards smaller organizations. Scoring based upon individual qualifications, Method 1,

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W8485-205759/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8485-205759

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
EDM-9-42135

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
EDM607
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

provides a true and unbiased measure of an organization. Those who only have an undergraduate degree still score 0, but others qualifications are taken into account.

[We request] a review of the scoring methodology of A3, A4, and A5 to ensure a fair evaluation for all organizations irrespective of size.

[We] further request additional guidance on scoring following the review.

- A-4. The term Instructor applies to all staff that will be involved in course delivery to students. To receive applicable points, all instructor staff must meet applicable point-rated criteria. Having said that, the school can decide who will be involved in the course delivery to students (i.e.: it does not have to be their full cadre of instructors). For example, a school with 20 academic instructors of which 5 have a PhD, 7 have a Master's Degree and 8 have a Bachelor Degree could, if they chose, only involve the 5 academic instructors with a PhD in the delivery of the academic portion of the course. They would then score the full 2pt in A-3a but, assuming they have no additional flying instructors, would only score 5 points in A-5. Bidders can choose which academic instructors and flying instructors they want to take credit for but once they chose, they have to stick with those for the rest of the scoring exercise. Of note, for A-5, if an instructor is both an academic and a flying instructor, they will only be counted for 1 point.

The scoring scheme was designed this way for two reasons:

- a) Avoid schools that have very low overall credentials but a lot of instructors (low individual flight test experience, low individual flying hours, low individual teaching experience).
- b) Avoid having high number of instructors artificially skew the overall results too high (like a school that have a small fleet but have a lot of instructors). Capping the number of points for both the number of instructors and the number of aircraft will allow a fair balance.

We are assessing the quality rather than the quantity.

If your Bid has already been submitted, you may wish to revise it. Revisions to your bid can be submitted by ePost. Please clearly indicate the content in the subject line and/or on the cover page.

Any revisions to your Bid must be received by the Bid Receiving Unit on or before the time and date stated on page 1 of this document. Any revisions to your Bid received after the closing date and time will be considered late and will be returned unopened.