



**RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À :**

Bid Receiving:
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA),
Head Office
644 Main Street
P.O. Box 6051
Moncton, New Brunswick
Canada E1C 9J8
(Courier Address: E1C 1E2)

E-mail: tenders-soumissions@acoa-apeca.gc.ca

**BID SOLICITATION
DEMANDE DE SOUMISSIONS**

The Bidder offers to provide to Canada the goods, services or both listed in the bid solicitation in accordance with the conditions set out in the bid solicitation and at the prices set out in the bid.

Le soumissionnaire offre de fournir au Canada les biens, services ou les deux énumérés dans la demande de soumissions aux conditions prévues dans la demande de soumissions et aux prix indiqués dans la soumission.

Date of Solicitation - Date de la demande 2021-07-15	
Address inquiries to - Adresser toute demande de renseignements à : Rodrigue LeBlanc E-mail: tenders-soumissions@acoa-apeca.gc.ca	
Area code and Telephone No. Code régional et N° de téléphone 506-851-3996	Facsimile No. N° de télécopieur
Destination ACOA Prince Edward Island Regional Office Royal Bank Building, 3rd floor 100 Sydney Street Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island	

Instructions:
Municipal taxes are not applicable.

Unless otherwise specified in the bid solicitation, all prices quoted must be net prices in Canadian funds including Canadian customs duties, excise taxes, and must be FOB, including all delivery charges to destination(s) as indicated. The amount for Applicable Taxes is to be shown as a separate item.

Instructions:
Les taxes municipales ne s'appliquent pas.

Sauf indication contraire dans la demande de soumissions, tous les prix indiqués doivent être des prix nets, en dollars canadiens, comprenant les droits de douane canadiens, la taxe d'accise et doivent être FAB, y compris tous frais de livraison à la (aux) destination(s) indiquée(s). Le montant des taxes applicables doit apparaître séparément.

Delivery required - Livraison exigée	Delivery offered - Livraison proposée
Supplier Name and Address - Nom et adresse du fournisseur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of supplier (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur (caractère d'impression)	
Signature	Date

Solicitation No. - N° de la demande P2200199	Amendment No. - N° de modification 2
Solicitation closes - La demande prend fin at - à 3:00PM (ADT) - 15:00 (HAA) on - le 2021-08-04	File No. - N° de dossier P2200199



The bid solicitation is amended as follows:

Delete: ANNEX "C" TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Insert: ANNEX "C" TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, Rev #1

(see following Page)

A Mandatory Criteria was added. See M1.

ANNEX "C"

TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, Rev #1

Part 1: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

1. The Proposals **MUST** meet all of the following mandatory requirements. The Proposals must be supported by proper and adequate detail, particularly where a mandatory item requires supporting evidence. Those not meeting all of these mandatory requirements will be given no further consideration.
2. The mandatory evaluation criteria are:

ATTENTION BIDDER: Please include the table below and write the relevant page number(s) from your proposal which addresses the issue beside the criteria below.

CRITERIA	Cross Reference to Proposal (page #)	FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES	
		MET/NOT MET	COMMENTS
M1 The Bidder must demonstrate that it is an Indigenous owned organization which Indigenous persons have more than 50% ownership and control or will be working in partnership with an Indigenous owned organization.			
M2 The Bidder must identify at least one resource on the proposed team with demonstrated experience working in Indigenous community development.			
M3 The Bidder must identify at least one resource on the proposed team with demonstrated experience in tourism destination development.			

M4	The Bidder must identify at least one resource on the proposed team with demonstrated experience in primary research.			
M5	The Bidder must identify at least one resource on the project team with a demonstrated understanding of tourism program design.			
M6	The Bidder must provide a detailed work plan including proposed approach, timeline, level of effort per resources and their assigned tasks.			
M7	<p>References:</p> <p>The Bidder must provide three (3) references that can attest to the project team's capacity to undertake work related to the review and assessment of destination development programs.</p> <p>The Bidder must also provide three (3) references that can verify the team's expertise in Indigenous community development. The minimum documentation required for each reference is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Name of client b) Current email address for client c) Brief description of work undertaken d) Date(s) and duration of project 			

Part 2: Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria

1. In addition to meeting all of the mandatory requirements, the Proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with specific evaluation criteria as detailed in this section.
2. When citing past projects as examples, details should be include information such as:
 - a. Project descriptions and overview of deliverables;
 - b. Start and end time (month / year) of the project and specify actual time period (months, years) (if applicable) spent on the project;
 - c. Role and responsibilities of your company within the project, including a description of the services provided to the client and type of deliverables; and
 - d. Identify the client organization (provide references). Include the client contact name for which the work was directly performed and contact information. Note that contact information for any reference cited should include contact name, title and current telephone number.
3. Personnel resumes used within the context of the proposal should provide detail regarding the qualifications, relevant experience, and expertise of the proposed team member(s), including a summary/description of their past projects. Note that contact information for any reference cited should include contact name, title, and current e-mail address and telephone number.
4. Note that in support of paragraphs 2 and 3 above, the evaluation team reserves the right to contact any reference provided.
5. The point-rated evaluation criteria are:

ATTENTION BIDDER: Please include the table below and write the relevant page number(s) from your proposal which addresses the issue beside the criteria below.

Point Rated Criteria		Points Breakdown	Max Points	FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES	
				SCORE	COMMENTS
R1	<p><u>Knowledge and understanding:</u> The Bidder provides contextual information on:</p> <p>a) ACOA's destination development programs in their current context, notably the core elements of the program structure</p> <p>b) Indigenous community development, including awareness of political, economic and social structures of Atlantic Canada's Indigenous communities</p> <p>c) The strategies required to successfully advance tourism through destination development</p> <p>d) A demonstrated understanding of program design</p>	<p>-Unsatisfactory (0 point): The proposal does not include contextual information on ACOA's destination development programs in their current context, nor does it include information Indigenous communities in the region, strategies for destination development or understanding of program design.</p> <p>-Satisfactory (15 points): The proposal includes some contextual information on ACOA's destination development programs, as well as discussion of Indigenous community development in the region, strategies to advance tourism through destination development and program design. However, one or more of the key component(s) are insufficient, missing or unclear to demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of context in which the work will be conducted.</p> <p>-Exceptional (25 points): The proposal contains contextual information (on all four elements and beyond), including ACOA's destination development programs, commentary on successes within Indigenous community development from a tourism perspective, and reflection on the political, economic and social structures of these communities in Atlantic Canada. The proposal also includes thoughtful discussion of strategies to advance tourism through destination development and consideration for strong program design.</p>	25		
R2	<p><u>Approach and methodology</u> The Bidder provides explanations regarding:</p>	<p>- Unsatisfactory (0 point): The proposal does not explain the approach that will be used, nor does it provide possible challenges and mitigation strategies, nor does it present an alignment of resources to each</p>	25		

	<p>a) the proposed approach to reviews of existing programs (both ACOA programs and others), consultation and case studies</p> <p>b) possible challenges and mitigation strategies</p> <p>c) alignment of resources to each project component and level of effort per method or approach</p>	<p>project component and level of effort per method or approach.</p> <p>- Satisfactory (15 points): The proposal provides some explanations regarding the proposed approaches, and how they will be carried out, and possible challenges and mitigation strategies, including resources for each project component, however, one or more of the key component(s) are not clearly explained, missing or may not be feasible to implement within the timeframe of the project.</p> <p>- Exceptional (25 points): The proposal provides explanations regarding the proposed approaches, and contains details as to how they will be carried out, and possible challenges and mitigation strategies. The Bidder aligns resources to each method and specifies level of effort per methods/approach. The proposed approaches are feasible to implement within the timeframe of the project.</p>			
R3	<p><u>Project Work Plan</u> The Bidder includes information on:</p> <p>a) the proposed method of coordination and liaison with the project steering committee</p> <p>b) a work plan that details the project timelines, milestones and deliverables as well as allocated resources to specific tasks (level of effort, timing and cost)</p> <p>c) project management approaches and mitigation strategies</p>	<p>- Unsatisfactory (0 point): The proposal does not include information on the proposed method of coordination and liaison with the Steering Committee, nor does it include a work plan that details the project timelines, milestones and deliverables as well as allocated resources to specific tasks (level of effort, timing and cost). No project management approaches and mitigation strategies proposed.</p> <p>- Satisfactory (7.5 points): The proposal includes some information on the proposed method of coordination and liaison with the Steering Committee, and includes a work plan that details the project timelines, milestones and deliverables as well as allocated resources to specific tasks (level of effort, timing and cost), may provide some information on project management approaches and mitigation strategies, however, one or more of the key</p>	15		

		<p>component(s) are not clearly explained, or are missing.</p> <p>- Exceptional (15 points): The proposal includes information that details proposed method of coordination and liaison with the Steering Committee, including a work plan with project timelines, milestones and deliverables as well as allocated resources to specific tasks (level of effort, timing and cost). The Bidder also included project management approaches and mitigation strategies that will support the timely completion of deliverables.</p>			
R4	<p><u>Project Team</u> The Bidder includes information that connects members of the project team to the following criteria:</p> <p>a) Demonstrated experience working in Indigenous community development, which may include evaluation, strategy development, or tourism development specifically</p> <p>b) Demonstrated experience deploying strategies related to tourism destination development</p> <p>c) Demonstrated experience in primary research, completing reviews and interviews to form evidence based recommendations</p>	<p>- Unsatisfactory (0 point): The project team does not have work examples related to Indigenous community development, destination development, primary research or program design.</p> <p>- Satisfactory (15 points): The project team has provided examples of work related to Indigenous community development, destination development, and primary research centered around reviews and interviews.</p> <p>- Exceptional (25 points): The project team is able to provide recent work examples in Indigenous community development in Atlantic Canada, including projects in evaluation, strategy development and specifically tourism development. The team has recent experience working in both design and implementation of destination development programs, and has done primary research centered around reviews and interviews which resulted in evidenced based recommendations.</p>	25		
R5	<p><u>Letter of Reference</u> The quality of work identified by a letter of reference indicates that the Bidder is well-suited to undertake this</p>	<p>- Unsatisfactory (0 point): The letter of reference does not provide strong recommendation related to the timeliness, quality and successful completion of</p>	5		

	work and deliver quality review, consultations and recommendations for tourism development, and attests to satisfactory performance on a similar projects.	<p>the Bidder's previous experience and/or work was not related to a project of similar type, scope and/or size.</p> <p>- Satisfactory (2.5 points): The letter of reference provides positive feedback related to the timeliness, quality and successful completion of the Bidder's previous work, for work of similar type, scope and/or size.</p> <p>- Exceptional (5 points): The letter of reference provides positive feedback related to the timeliness, quality and successful completion of the Bidder's previous work, for work of similar type, scope and/or size. The letter attests to the project team's knowledge and experience with tourism destination development.</p>			
R6	<p><u>Letter of Reference</u> A letter of reference attests that the project team is experienced in Indigenous community development, and understands the unique political, economic and social structures that these communities have.</p>	<p>- Unsatisfactory (0 point): The letter of reference does not provide strong recommendations related to the timeliness, quality and successful completion of the Bidder's previous experience and/or work was not related to a project of similar type, scope and/or size.</p> <p>- Satisfactory (2.5 points): The letter provides positive feedback related to the timeliness, quality and successful completion of the Bidder's previous work, for work of similar type, scope and/or size.</p> <p>- Exceptional (5 points): The letter of reference contains positive feedback related to the timeliness, quality and successful completion of the Bidder's previous work, for work of similar type, scope and/or size. The letter attests to the project team's knowledge and experience with Indigenous economic development.</p>	5		
Total points:			100		
Minimum Passing Score:			57.5		