

Questions and Answers for RFP 2020094

Question #	Questions Received from Bidders	Responses to Bidders
1	<p>Our physical offices are in Montreal, located 11 km away from OSFI's premises according to Google Maps. We are also very close to major highways and one minute away from Du Collège station, which makes our school a convenient location. Could our school be still be eligible even though we exceed the criteria described in O1.4 on page 19 by 1 km?</p>	<p><i>As per Article 2, Basis of Selection, "to be declared responsive, a bid must meet all mandatory criteria." Therefore, the training facility must be located within a 10km distance of the address stated in M1.4.</i></p>
2	<p>The closing date to respond to the RFP is May 21, 2020, which is behind us. Could you set a date after the publication of the RFP?</p>	<p><i>The closing date has been corrected. Please see RFP amendment no. 1.</i></p>
3	<p>In part 4 of the RFP, Table 3: R-F (French teacher), technical criterion b (page 30 of 76), the allocation of points is done starting from 48 months of experience, whereas in table 4: R-E (English teacher), technical criteria b (page 31 of 76) the allocation of points is done starting from 49 months of experience. The English version of this same criterion (page 28 of 71 in the English version) indicates 48 months of experience. Could you please clarify whether English teachers must have 48 or 49 months of experience?</p>	<p><i>The French RFP has been corrected so that 48 months of experience is required to obtain points. Please see French RFP amendment no. 1.</i></p>
4	<p>In part 4 of the RFP, page 34 of 76, Region 3 of 4- Montreal, QC, section 1 of the table provides for full-time language training for the first year of the contract. This full-time training does not appear in option periods 1, 2, 3 and 4. However, in the statement of work, item 4.1, the table of requirements for the type of training on page 52 of 76 indicates that full-time training services in a one-on-one setting are required in Montreal. Could you clarify this point?</p>	<p><i>Full-time language training may be required during any exercised option periods in the Montreal Region. Please see RFP amendment no. 1.</i></p>
5	<p>The address of the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions in Vancouver is not the same</p>	<p><i>The Vancouver address in the French RFP has been corrected. Please see French RFP amendment no. 1.</i></p>

	on page 22 of 76 and on page 55 of 76. Please clarify the address of the Vancouver office.	
6	In part 4 of the RFP, region 4 of 4, Vancouver, B.C., the table of the type of training specifies that the training for Vancouver will be online only. If that is the case, could you withdraw criterion O1.4 for the Vancouver region (page 22 of 76)? There should be no need for a physical contractor location within 10 km of the OSFI office for online training.	<i>M1.4 for the Vancouver Region has been replaced the point-rated criteria R2. Please see RFP amendment no. 1.</i>
7	<p>In the response tables for Mandatory Requirement: O2 Proposed Resources (Table 1 M-F item 5. page 26 of 76 and Table 2 M-E item 5, page 29 of 76), you state “The bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum of four years of experience within the seven years prior to the RFP issuance date in the delivery of English language training to adults in a one-on-one setting, including assessment services to determine the learner’s skill level. The contractor must provide the following information on how the proposed resource gained the reported experience a. name of the client or department and contact information; b. start and end dates for each task; c. details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the tasks, including deliverables; and d. reference.”</p> <p>Given the nature of language training within the Government of Canada, some clients require full-time or part-time training on a one-on-one basis, over periods ranging from a few weeks to several months. As a result, our teaching resources may be assigned to many clients in a given year. The volume of data to demonstrate compliance of our resources could be dozens of pages long. How would you like to see the experience acquired over 4 to possibly 7 years demonstrated?</p>	<i>Tables 1: M-F and 2: M-E have been amended. Please see RFP amendment no. 1.</i>

8	<p>In the response tables for Mandatory Requirements: O2 Proposed Resources (Table 1 M-F items 4d. and 5c. on page 26 of 76 and Table 2 M-E items 4d. and 5c. on page 29 of 76), you use the term “réalisations attendues” [expected achievements], whereas in the English version of the RFP the term is “deliverables” which has a different meaning. Can you explain what you mean by “deliverables”?</p>	<p><i>The term “deliverables” refers to any measurable, tangible, verifiable outcome, result, or item that must be produced to complete a project or part of a project.</i></p>
9	<p>Pertaining to the teachers’ work experience with adult language training, does the experience have to be with the PFL2 and CEWP curriculum specifically, or can their experience have been gained with other clients? Examples of other clients: Bank of Canada, Auditor General, City of Ottawa, and CMHC.</p>	<p><i>We are looking for experience in adult language training, and a strong understanding of the Federal Government’s qualification standards in relation to official languages/linguistic profiles. The experience, however, is not restricted to the PFL2 and CEWP curriculum.</i></p> <p><i>However, please note that Bidders must demonstrate compliance only to the technical requirements as stated in Attachment 1 to Part 4. The reference to PFL2 and CEWP is in the Statement of Work, and therefore is related to the performance of a resulting Contract.</i></p>
10	<p>Are Bank of Canada employees considered Federal Public Servants in the context of this proposal? This question is relation to the 1200 hours required from the teachers with Federal Public Servants.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
11	<p>In view of the publication of Amendment 001 this morning, the answers to be provided will require a considerable amount of research. In addition, the current pandemic and health conditions in Ontario under the “stay at home order” continue to force people to telework and limit our access to archived data in our office. Would it be possible to obtain an extension of the closing date for submitting proposals?</p>	<p><i>An extension is granted to May 28, 2021. Please see RFP Amendment No. 2.</i></p>
12	<p>In Amendment No. 1, page 3, the address of the Vancouver office is 605 Robson Street, but on page 9, the submitted correction is 1095 Robson Street. Could you clarify what the exact address of the Vancouver office is?</p>	<p><i>The Vancouver address in the French RFP has been corrected. Please see French RFP Amendment No. 2.</i></p>

13	<p>Could you give us an idea of the expected hourly business volume for the four regions concerned?</p>	<p><u>Anticipated annual training volume of individuals</u> <i>Montreal: 2 in English and 2 in French</i> <i>Ottawa: 2 in English and 6 in French</i> <i>Toronto: 5 in French</i> <i>Vancouver: 2 in French</i></p> <p><i>The volumetric data does not represent a commitment by Canada that Canada's future usage of the services described will be consistent with this data.</i></p>
14	<p>In the Vancouver Region pricing schedule (page 35 of 76), why do you ask for only one price for online language training, compared with the other regions, whereas, further to Amendment 001, you maintain a R2 rated criterion for training facilities located less than 10 km from the OSFI's Vancouver office? Rents in Vancouver are high and should be taken into account in a training scenario involving training on the contractor's premises.</p> <p>Would it be possible to add a line in the price schedule for part-time individual language training in the contractor's facilities, as is the case in the pricing schedules for regions 1, 2 and 3, given that the criterion that the contractor's facilities be less than 10 km from the OSFI has been maintained?</p>	<p><i>As per Annex A – Statement of Work, Article 7.2.2 – Contractor's training facility location requirement for the Vancouver Region:</i></p> <p><i>"Should the Contractor not have a training facility within 10 km from the learners' OSFI work location, OSFI may request the training be conducted at the OSFI facility instead or may procure the training from a different service provider capable of meeting this requirement."</i></p> <p><i>OSFI declines to amend the pricing tables.</i></p>
15	<p><u>Mandatory Technical Criteria (for all regions)</u> you state '...Contractor's training facility,... must be located within a 10 KM distance from the following OSFI location'. As language services providers to government employees for over 25 years, with our head office based in southern Ontario, and with qualified teachers in every major city across Canada, we question the requirement for providers to have a facility within 10 kms of your office locations. The requirements indicate that options may include delivery to be virtual, and/or on site at either OSFI facilities or the Contractor's. Given those options, the requirement for Contractors to also have a facility in exactly the same locations seems unnecessary and prohibitive to many providers.</p>	<p><i>Bidders must provide the location of their training facility in order to demonstrate that they are compliant with the mandatory criteria M1.4 in Regions 1, 2, and 3.</i></p>

	Our environmental footprint reduction mandates the utilizing of qualified resources that are closest to student/client location but we are not comfortable providing the personal addresses of our resources to satisfy your 10 km distance requirement. Does this mean we would therefore be disqualified for that reason? Please confirm.	
16	<u>Location in regards to current world pandemic:</u> This bid requires on-site services for all but Vancouver location (with the option of virtual training) but as the present pandemic protocols must be followed, and language training is not considered an essential service, wouldn't it be more prudent to requesting all online training services at this time? It is equally as effective, more efficient, and most importantly, provides for a safe delivery for both teachers and students. Would bids from online service providers be accepted?	<i>OSFI declines to amend the RFP as there may be a requirement for in-person training once COVID-related restrictions are revoked.</i>
17	Do you abide by the <i>Privacy Act</i> ? In Appendix A of attachment 1, tables 1 and 2 of the resource evaluation criteria, you ask for the client's name and contact information when it concerns a federal employee taking individual training. Do you maintain this criterion as written?	<i>For Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A to Attachment 1, OSFI is not requesting information of individuals, but of businesses and government departments who were the clients.</i>
18	Will the French and English instruction be provided virtually or in person?	<i>Training may be conducted online or in-person, depending on the COVID-related restrictions and the needs of individual learners.</i>
19	Our educational brand has several learning centers in different cities (Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal, Ottawa, etc). My question is that for bidding, should we bid separately for each center in each city or one bid for all locations can suffice?	<i>Bidders may submit one bid, containing technical and financial responses to any or all regions. A combined rating of technical merit and price will be determined separately for each region proposed in a bid.</i>
20	Amendment #1, page 3 of 7 has changes to Table 1: M-F, (French Instructor), specifically the removal of "c. Details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the assignment(s)	<i>The referenced client projects must provide the following details:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Name of the client or Department and contact information;</i> b. <i>The total number of hours performing the above mentioned; and</i> c. <i>The start and end dates for the assignment(s) with the client or Department.</i>

	<p><i>including deliverables; and d. A reference". We are assuming that the following "Bidder Response/Client Project #1 and #2" required responses should also be confined to just the " a. Name of the client or Department and contact information; b. The start and end dates of the assignment(s);". Can you confirm?</i></p>	
21	<p>Amendment #1, page 4 of 7 has this: "6. At Appendix A to Attachment 1 – Resource Evaluation Criteria Tables, Table 1: M-E (English Instructor):"(and then what to delete and insert). There is however no Table 1 for the English instructor. We assume that this was meant to say "Table 2: M-E (English Instructor)". Can you confirm?</p>	<p><i>Correct, it is Table 2: M-E (English Instructor).</i></p>
22	<p>Similar to our question #1, with the same change to the English instructor: to remove " <i>d. Details about the work performed by the proposed resource on the assignment(s) including deliverables; and e. A reference"</i> we assume again that the following "Bidder Response/Client Project #1 and #2 required response should also be confined to just the " <i>a. Name of the client or Department and contact information; b. The start and end dates of the assignment(s);". Can you confirm?</i></p>	<p><i>Please see response to question no. 20.</i></p>
23	<p>We also have noted that the amendment in relation to the English Instructor, the "DELETE" instruction wording is not the same as the original wording in the RFP. The original RFP wording is " <i>The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource have completed a minimum of 1,200 hours delivering English Language Training to Federal Public Servants"</i> while the amendment DELETE instruction has" <i>The proposed resource must have completed a minimum of 1,200 hours delivering English Language Training to Federal Public Servants"</i> We are assuming that this is just a typographical error. Can you confirm?</p>	<p><i>The criteria inserted in Amendment no. 1 is to be applied.</i></p>

