

## ANNEX C – TECHNICAL EVALUATION

### 1. Technical Bid Format

The technical bid must address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. Simply repeating the statement contained in the bid solicitation is not sufficient.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the bid, **Canada strongly requests that bidders address and present topics in the order of the evaluation criteria under the same headings.**

To avoid duplication, bidders may refer to different sections of their bids by identifying the specific paragraph and page number where the subject topic has already been addressed.

The Bidder is advised to pay careful attention to the wording used throughout this Request for Proposal (RFP). Failure to satisfy a term or condition of this RFP may result a bid being deemed non-responsive.

All information required for evaluation purposes must be included directly in the Bidder's technical bid. The evaluation team cannot consider information not provided directly in the technical bid (e.g. links to additional website content, references checks, etc.).

### 2. Mandatory Technical Criteria

Technical bids will be evaluated against the mandatory technical criteria below.

For a bid to be declared responsive to the solicitation requirements it must demonstrate and meet all of the mandatory technical criteria. Bids declared non-responsive to the mandatory technical criteria will be given no further evaluation.

Note: Any dates provided should indicate months and years (e.g. November 2008 – July 2015).

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria		
2.1	<p><b>Proposed Project Lead's CV:</b> Bidder must clearly identify one (1) Project Lead who must have a minimum of five (5) years experience on projects related to aquaculture regulation, operation and management in Canada and submit a detailed CV listing the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.1 Identification of Project Lead</li> <li>2.1.2 Education</li> <li>2.1.3 Employment history</li> <li>2.1.4 Titles of previous projects including at least two (2) recent relevant project examples in the past five (5) years related to aquaculture regulation, operation and management in Canada</li> <li>2.1.5 Published works and authored reports</li> <li>2.1.6 Any other professional activities relevant to the contract (e.g. membership in professional associations; contributions to the field not captured in other sections).</li> </ul> <p>Note: The month and year of dates should be indicated – e.g. November 2008 – July 2015. <i>Evaluated against Mandatory Technical Criteria 2.1.1 through 2.1.6. And further evaluated under Point Rated Criteria 3.1 and 3.2.</i></p>		
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Met / Not Met	Remarks / Notes
<i>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</i>			

2.1.1	The Bidder has clearly identified the <u>Project Lead</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.1.2	The Bidder identified the Project Lead's <u>education</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.1.3	The Bidder identified the Project Lead's <u>employment history</u> including a minimum of five (5) years experience on projects related to aquaculture regulation, operation and management in Canada.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.1.4	The Bidder identified the Project Lead's <u>Titles of previous projects</u> including at least two (2) recent relevant examples in the past five (5) years related to aquaculture regulation, operation and management in Canada	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.1.5	The Bidder identified the Project Lead's <u>published works and authored reports</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.1.6	The Bidder identified the Project Lead's <u>other professional activities relevant to the contract (e.g. membership in professional associations; contributions to the field not captured in other sections)</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>			
2.2	<p><b>Understanding of Scope and Objectives of the project and Work methods:</b></p> <p>Bidder must provide details on their understanding of the scope of work and how they intend to meet the objectives of the project.</p> <p><i>Evaluated against Mandatory Technical Criteria 2.2.1. Further evaluated under Point Rated Criteria 3.3 and 3.4.</i></p>			
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Met / Not Met</b>		<b>Remarks / Notes</b>
		<i>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</i>		
2.2.1	The Bidder has provided information on their <u>understanding of the work and how they intend to meet the objectives</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Bids that do not demonstrate and meet all of the mandatory technical criteria will be given no further evaluation.**

### 3. Point Rated Technical Criteria

Technical bids will be evaluated against the point rated technical criteria below. The maximum length of proposal is ten (10) pages, excluding supporting images and resumes.

Solicitation No.:  
5P420-21-0210/A

Amendment No.:  
00

Contracting Authority:  
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:  
PW-22-00982090

Title:  
Review of current aquaculture management and best practices in Canadian marine and coastal waters, and the Great Lakes – Parks Canada Agency

For a bid to be declared responsive to the solicitation requirements it must meet or exceed the minimum weighted points required for the point rated technical criteria. Bids that do not meet or exceed the minimum weighted points required for the point rated technical criteria will be given no further evaluation.

**Point Rated Technical Criteria 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 will be evaluated using the [Generic Evaluation Criteria](#).**

- Each point rated technical evaluation criterion has a weight that reflects its importance in the proposal submission.
- The degree to which the proposal satisfies the requirement of each criterion will be assessed and a score will be assigned ranging from 0 to 10.
- Scores will be assigned in accordance with the Generic Evaluation Criteria, with 0 meaning the proposal completely fails to satisfy the requirements, and 10 meaning the proposal fully meets the outlined criterion.
- The assigned score out of 10 will then be multiplied by the weight indicated for that point rated evaluation criterion to determine the total value of points awarded.
- Technical bid evaluation may be performed by an individual or an evaluation board. Should evaluation be performed by an evaluation board, evaluation board members will individually evaluate the technical bid(s) and will rate each criterion using the Generic Evaluation Criteria. The evaluation board will then reach consensus on a final evaluated score for the technical bid(s).

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.1	<b>Project Lead’s number of years of experience leading projects and/or research related to aquaculture regulation, operation and management in Canada. Points will be awarded as follows:</b>  5 - less than 10 years = 5 points 10 - less than 15 years = 10 points 15 - less than 20 years = 15 points Over 20 years = 20 points	1.0	/20
3.1 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	<b>Reference(s):</b>		
	<b>Strengths:</b>		
	<b>Weaknesses:</b>		
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.2	<b>Project Lead number of projects, publications and/or reports on aquaculture regulation, operation and management in Canada or other topics directly relevant to the subject matter of the contract, points will be awarded as follows:</b>  One point will be assigned per project, publication, or report up to a maximum of 20 points.	1.0	/20
3.2 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	<b>Reference(s):</b>		
	<b>Strengths:</b>		
	<b>Weaknesses:</b>		
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded

Solicitation No.:  
5P420-21-0210/A

Amendment No.:  
00

Contracting Authority:  
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:  
PW-22-00982090

Title:  
Review of current aquaculture management and best practices in Canadian marine and coastal waters, and the Great Lakes – Parks Canada Agency

			**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Understanding of Scope and Objectives of the project:</b> In their proposal the bidder should clearly demonstrate an understanding of the scope and objectives of the work required to complete all tasks and deliverables identified in the SoW, including both up-to-date aquaculture regulation, operation, and management in Canada, as well as innovations in ecologically sustainable aquaculture in Canada and/or the world.	<b>1.0</b>	<b>/40</b>
<b>3.3</b> <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	<b>Reference(s):</b>		
	<b>Strengths:</b>		
	<b>Weaknesses:</b>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b> <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Work methods:</b> Demonstrates a comprehensive and detailed workplan/ methodology, including details related to schedule, sources and quality of data / information used in the research, and how all the items in the Statement of Work on up-to-date aquaculture regulation, operation, management in Canada, and on innovations in ecologically sustainable aquaculture in Canada and/or the world will be achieved.	<b>1.0</b>	<b>/40</b>
<b>3.4</b> <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	<b>Reference(s):</b>		
	<b>Strengths:</b>		
	<b>Weaknesses:</b>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b> <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Writing expertise: project lead proposal is</b> clear, concise, logical, professionally-written, and well-supported by evidence.	<b>1.0</b>	<b>/30</b>
<b>3.5</b> <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	<b>Reference(s):</b>		
	<b>Strengths:</b>		
	<b>Weaknesses:</b>		

<b>Maximum Points Available for Point Rated Technical Criteria</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Minimum Points Required for Point Rated Technical Criteria</b>	<b>100</b>

Bids that do not obtain the required minimum of **100** points overall for the point rated technical criteria will be given no further evaluation.

#### 4. Generic Evaluation Criteria

Parks Canada Agency (PCA) Evaluation Board members will individually evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Proponent's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion using the generic evaluation table below.

<b>Non Responsive</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Fully Satisfactory</b>	<b>Strong</b>
<b>0 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>4 Points</b>	<b>6 Points</b>	<b>8 Points</b>	<b>10 Points</b>
No information submitted	Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understanding in some areas of the requirements	Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the requirements	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements
Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be corrected		No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses
	Proponent lacks qualifications and experience	Proponent has an acceptable level of qualifications and experience	Proponent is qualified and experienced	Proponent is highly qualified and experienced	Proponent is a leader in their field
Sample projects not related to this requirement	Sample projects are generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Sample projects precisely related to this requirement
Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, could ensure adequate results	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results	Exceptionally capable, no doubt of efficacy