





This Amendment **003** of RFP #**5000063856** is issued to:

- To respond to questions
- To amend the Statement of Work
- To amend the Evaluation Criteria

Therefore, RFP is amended as follows:

**Question 1:**

In the RFP, Annex A – Statement of Work at the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under SW.2.0 it states, *“Although studies on the production, consumption, and cost of hydrogen derived from natural gas (with carbon abatement) exist, most of these studies do not provide detailed analysis on the domestic, Canadian context.”*

In reference to the above statement related to “most of these studies”, for bidders to understand NRCan's baseline for the RFP, please indicate:

- a. At least one (1) referenced example (Title, Author, Publisher, Date) of a study that does provide a detailed analysis on the domestic, Canadian context related to production, consumption and cost of hydrogen production, consumption, and cost of hydrogen derived from natural gas (with carbon abatement).
- b. More than one (>1) referenced examples (Title, Author, Publisher, Date) of studies that do not provide a detailed analysis on the domestic, Canadian context related to production, consumption and cost of hydrogen production, consumption, and cost of hydrogen derived from natural gas (with carbon abatement).

**Answer 1 a:**

- The Transition Accelerator. September 2020. “Towards Net-Zero Energy Systems in Canada: A Key Role for Hydrogen”, in Transition Accelerator Reports, Volume 2, Issue 3.
- Canada Energy Regulator. December 2021. “Canada’s Energy Future 2021”.

**Answer 1 b:**

- International Energy Agency. May 2021. “Net Zero by 2050 A Roadmap for the Global Energy Sector”.
- International Energy Agency. October 2021. “The Role of Low-Carbon Fuels in the Clean Energy Transitions of the Power Sector”.

**Question 2:**

In the RFP, Annex A – Statement of Work at the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under SW.2.0 it states, *“Additionally, most of these studies do not compare the effects of future demand for hydrogen on natural gas based on different policy and market outlooks”.*

In reference to the above statement related to “most of these studies”, for bidders to understand NRCan's baseline for the RFP, please indicate in the Canadian context:



- a. At least one (1) referenced example study (Title, Author, Publisher, Date) that do compare the effects of future demand for hydrogen on natural gas based on different policy and market outlooks.
- b. More than one (>1)referenced examples (Title, Author, Publisher, Date) of studies that do not compare the effects of future demand for hydrogen on natural gas based on different policy and market outlooks.

**Answer 2 a:**

- International Energy Agency. October 13. **“World Energy Outlook 2021”**.
- Canada Energy Regulator. December 2021. **“Canada’s Energy Future 2021”**.

**Answer 2b:**

- Government of Alberta. November 2021. **“Alberta Hydrogen Roadmap”**.
- The Transition Accelerator. September 2020. **“Towards Net-Zero Energy Systems in Canada: A Key Role for Hydrogen”**, in Transition Accelerator Reports, Volume 2, Issue 3.

**Question 3:**

In the RFP, Annex A – Statement of Work at the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under SW.2.0 it states, *“A better understanding of the potential production, consumption, and cost of clean hydrogen derived from natural gas (with carbon abatement) in Canada is required to build on work done through the Hydrogen Strategy for Canada, in order to further identify potential to leverage Canada’s natural gas resources and infrastructure to support our hydrogen objectives.”*

Please specify in sufficient detail, or provide a published reference document, to explain “our (NRCan’s) hydrogen objectives”.

**Answer 3:**

Reference document: <https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/climate-change/canadas-green-future/the-hydrogen-strategy/23080>

**Question 4:**

In the RFP, Annex A – Statement of Work at the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph under SW.2.0 it also states, *“The near-term focus of the implementation of the Hydrogen Strategy will be on laying the foundation for the hydrogen economy in Canada, including planning and developing new hydrogen supply and distribution infrastructure”*.

What is the timeframe for “near-term”?

**Answer 4:**

2022-2025



**Question 5:**

- a. The M1 requirement is unclear and ambiguous. Would NRCan please rephrase the requirement in clear, unambiguous, simplified sentences or bullet points to explicitly identify the mandatory and the optional experience components, and combinations thereof?
- b. Please explain NRCan's meaning of "international context"
- c. Technical-and, market-, and policy-related issues are not necessarily related issues. However, NRCan groups them together as the "primary area of focus". This is unclear and contradictory. Please clearly explain the meaning of the primary area of focus when it may encompass multiple unrelated subjects.
- d. Please state NRCan's definition, level of detail/comprehensiveness, and critical aspects considered to be included and excluded in the term "technical-related"
- e. Please state NRCan's definition, level of detail/comprehensiveness, and critical aspects considered to be included and excluded in the term "market-related"
- f. Please state NRCan's definition, level of detail/comprehensiveness, and critical aspects considered to be included and excluded in the term "policy-related"

**Answer 5a:**

For greater clarity, M1 has been revised as follows:

The **Bidder MUST** have undertaken two or more projects within the last five years related to examining the intersection or relationship between hydrogen and natural gas (both within Canada and other global jurisdictions\*). The primary areas of focus of the two or more projects completed in the past five years by the bidder **MUST** have been 1) market **and** technical, or, 2) market **and** policy, or 3) market, policy, **and** technical related issues related to the intersection between hydrogen **and** natural gas, within the domestic **and** international context.

\*Other global jurisdictions are defined as any jurisdiction outside of Canada (i.e., non-Canadian).

Note – To be further evaluated under criteria R1

**Answer 5b:**

International context has been revised in M1 to read as 'Other global jurisdictions' and refers to any jurisdiction outside of Canada (i.e., non-Canadian.)

**Answer 5c:**

M1 has been revised to outline the primary AREAS of focus. Each project must include two or more primary areas of focus, as outlined in the following extract from M1:

1) market **and** technical, or, 2) market **and** policy, or 3) market, policy, **and** technical related issues related to the intersection between hydrogen **and** natural gas, within the domestic **and** international context.

**Answer 5d:**

"Technical-related" is defined as issues relating to the processes, technology, technical skill, engineering, or mechanics involved in issues related to the intersection between natural gas **and** hydrogen.



A specific level of detail or comprehensiveness is not expected as long as the bidder is able to demonstrate experience in this area.

**Answer 5e:**

*“Market-related” content for this project can be found within SW 4.1 tasks, and includes any market based information such as production, demand, cost, and consumption either past, present, or future in issues related to the intersection between natural gas **and** hydrogen.*

A specific level of detail or comprehensiveness is not expected as long as the bidder is able to demonstrate experience in this area.

**Answer 5f:**

*Policy issues could include, for example, past, current, or potential government policy/policies impacting (either positively or negatively) areas related to the intersection between natural gas **and** hydrogen. “Governments” may include Canadian, non-Canadian, or subnational jurisdictions.*

*A specific level of detail or comprehensiveness is not expected as long as the bidder is able to demonstrate experience in this area.*

**Question 6:**

Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria states the following above the Technical Mandatory Criteria, *“Bidders are also advised that the month(s) of experience listed for a project whose time frame overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once. For example: project one time frame is July 2001 to December 2001; project two time frame is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months”.*

Can NRCan confirm for M2, that the requested minimum experience must be for at least 36 non-overlapping months of dedicated subject matter work/project experience related to hydrogen blended with natural gas?

**Answer 6:**

Yes, the experience must be 36 **non-overlapping** months.

**Question 7:**

Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria states the following above the Technical Mandatory Criteria, *“Bidders are also advised that the month(s) of experience listed for a project whose time frame overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once. For example: project one time frame is July 2001 to December 2001; project two time frame is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months”.*

Can NRCan confirm for M3, that the requested minimum experience must be for at least 36 non-overlapping months of dedicated subject matter work/project experience related to natural gas systems and [natural gas] supply chains particularly within the Canadian context?

**Answer 7:**

Yes, the experience must be 36 **non-overlapping** months.



**Question 8:**

For M4, can NRCan please clarify if national governments may include countries other than Canada, and sub-national governments may include states, municipalities and regional government entities?

**Answer 8:**

Yes, national governments **may include non-Canadian jurisdictions**, and sub-national governments may include governments within or outside of Canada, including, states, municipalities, and regional governments.

Therefore, M4 is being revised as follows:

The **Project Team MUST** have considerable cumulative past experience\*\*\* in undertaking studies of a complexity comparable to that proposed in this Statement of Work for national or sub-national governments within or outside of Canada (e.g. Provincial or Territorial Governments, states, municipalities, and regional governments).

\*\*\***Considerable cumulative past experience** is defined as having undertaken two or more projects related to M1, M2, and M3 in the last five years

Note – To be further evaluated under criteria R2

**Question 9:**

In the RFP, Annex A – Statement of Work SW.3.0 states, *“The objective of this project is to study the production, consumption, and cost of clean hydrogen derived from natural gas (with carbon abatement) in Canada, and its effect on natural gas supply and demand.” AND “The project should focus on hydrogen derived from natural gas with carbon capture and storage (CCS)”*.

Why is there no mandatory or rated requirement for the bidder to have demonstrated capability and experience related to carbon capture and storage (CCS)?

**Answer 9:**

Although CCUS experience would be valuable, this study is primarily a market-focused exercise. A requirement for CCUS experience is not included in the selection criteria in order to avoid limiting the range of eligible bidders for this market-focused study.

**Question 10:**

Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria states the following above the Technical Mandatory Criteria, *“Bidders are also advised that the month(s) of experience listed for a project whose time frame overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once. For example: project one time frame is July 2001 to December 2001; project two time frame is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months”*

For R2, can NRCan please confirm that the bidder’s experience cannot double-count overlapping periods where multiple related projects may have been undertaken concurrently?

**Answer 10:**

Yes, experience **cannot double-count** overlapping periods where multiple related projects may have been undertaken concurrently.



**Question 11:**

For R2, please explain the term “*examining issues*” in the context of the bidder’s expected level of detail, depth of coverage, and results outcome in the context of the demonstration requirements.

**Answer 11:**

The bidder will be evaluated on the ability to demonstrate significant knowledge and understanding of natural gas and/or hydrogen markets and fundamentals. The “Issues” should relate to the project content including the “primary areas of focus” identified in M1 as well as the components laid out in the SW 3.0. Objective. The bidder should demonstrate how previous experience in these areas will enable them to build off related work and knowledge to complete this study. A specific level of detail or coverage is not expected as long as the bidder is able to demonstrate that the project team has the knowledge base and capacity to complete the study as requested.

**Question 12:**

For R3, indicates the scoring as, “1-5 points will be awarded to the bidder based on how effectively the proposal achieves each of the following, up to a cumulative maximum of 25 points

5 points: highly effective; 4 points: mostly effective; 3 points: somewhat effective; 2 points: mostly ineffective; 1 point: ineffective”.

Please provide or indicate in sufficient detail the rubric and definitions for this 1-5 point scoring system with respect to the level of "effectiveness" criteria to be used for the evaluation of bids.

**Answer 12:**

For greater clarity, R3 has been revised as follows:

<b>R3</b>	<b>Understanding of Requirement</b>	
	Points will be awarded for a detailed proposal and work plan that demonstrates sufficient background knowledge of, and familiarity with, the issues surrounding the project content such that an estimate of the Contractor’s likely success with the project can be formed.	
	<b>Points</b>	<b>Condition</b>
5-25	<p>Bidder will be awarded between 0-5 points based on how effectively the proposal and work plan achieves each of the following sub-categories, up to a cumulative maximum of 25 points (max 5 points per sub-category):</p> <p>1. <b>Work Schedule</b> (5 Points Max.)</p> <p>The work plan clearly identifies and describes a complete and realistic <b>work schedule</b> for achieving each task, milestone, and reporting requirement.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted, per task (as per SW.4.1), milestone (as per SW.4.2), and reporting requirement (as per SW.4.3) as outlined in the Statement of Work that is not referred to</p>	<b>Score</b>  <b>/5</b>







		<p>The work plan clearly identifies and describes a detailed and complete list of <b>potential risks and provides a realistic plan to mitigate all risks</b>. List should include a minimum of three (3) risks and a plan to mitigate all risks identified in the work plan.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted for each risk under the minimum three not included in their bid. One additional point will be deducted for each risk identified that does not include a plan to mitigate that risk.</p> <p>Points will be deducted to a minimum of zero points.</p> <p><b>5. Organized and Structured (5 Points Max.)</b></p> <p>The proposal is <b>organized and structured</b> in a clear, logical, and systematic manner.</p> <p>The proposal should include, cumulatively, a <b>minimum</b> of 5 headings <b>or</b> subheadings for each distinct section. However, more headings or subheadings could be used to improve the clarity and structure of the proposal.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted for the absence of each heading or subheading below the minimum requirement of 5 headings or subheadings. Headings and subheadings could include, <b>for example</b>, bidder/project team experiences, project team members' roles, work plan, approach and methodology, timeline, etc.</p> <p>Bidders will be awarded a minimum of zero points.</p>	<p><b>/5</b></p>	
--	--	--	------------------	--

**Question 13:**

Is NRCAN able to have a discussion with bidders on an individual basis to discuss the key objectives and scope for this initiative?

**Answer 13:**

No, NRCan is not able to have discussions with bidders during an active solicitation process. If there are specific questions related to key objectives, scope, evaluation criteria, and/or other aspects of the RFP, they must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority.



**Question 14:**

Can NRCan please confirm if the 25 page limit includes the title page, table of contents, and appendices?

**Answer 14:**

The 25 page limit does not include the title page, table of contents, annexes, and appendices. Therefore, M7 is being revised to read as follows:

The proposal **MUST** be **No longer than 25 pages in length.**

- Title, table of contents, annexes, and appendices do not count towards the 25 page limit.

The following formatting option for the proposal is **SUGGESTED**:

- Utilizes normal (2.54cm) margins;
- Utilizes Calibri, Times New Romans, or Arial font styles (does not apply to titles, headers, footnotes, and endnotes); and
- Utilizes font sizes 11 or 12 (does not apply to titles, headers, footnotes, and endnotes).

Note – The specifications above are based on standard Microsoft Word functions.

Note – Annexes may be added to the proposal for supplementary information, if required. For example, the list of related previous projects and/or team members' resumé. Annexes are not required to comply with the requirements of M7, above.

**Question 15:**

Would NRCan consider revising the criteria for M1 to include the option for bidders to demonstrate considerable past experience in conducting studies related to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context where the primary focus was technical and market **issues and** greater than 15 years past experience in conducting studies related to Canadian natural gas, natural gas liquids, petrochemicals and crude oil where the primary focus was technical and market and policy related?

**Answer 15:**

No, M1 was revised and remains as indicated in – Question #5, and the revised Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria.

**Question 16:**

Would NRCan consider revising the criteria for M2 to include the option for bidders to demonstrate extensive technical and market knowledge of hydrogen production, transportation and consumption, including as it relates to hydrogen blended with natural gas if the Bidder has 2 years of direct experience and can demonstrate greater than 15 years of technical, market and policy knowledge related to Canadian natural gas, natural gas liquids, petrochemicals and crude oil?

**Answer 16:**

No, M2 remains unchanged.

**Question 17:**

As NRCan has signaled an upper funding limitation, and that the work can be performed from the bidder's offices, and that the bidder's price constitutes 30% of the non-migratory scoring:



- a. Can NRCan please indicate the approximate range of hourly effort NRCan used to estimate the \$100,000 maximum budget?
- b. Can NRCan please provide an explanation as to the fairness and equity, when the applicable taxes (GST/HST/PST or exemption) may penalize one bidder over another based on the bidder domicile or status.

**Answer 17a:**

The number of hours required for achieving the study’s milestones will vary between potential contractors. Payment will be based on whether milestones are met, rather than the number of hours required by the Contractor for achieving milestones. The Project Authority estimates that approximately 1,300 hours could be required by a potential contractor to complete the study, however, the hourly effort will vary between potential contractors.

**Answer 17b:**

In order to make the funding limitation more equitable, the RFP is being revised as follows:

**AT 2.1.1 FUNDING LIMITATION**

**DELETE:** \$100,000.00 (Applicable Taxes Included)

**INSERT:** \$100,000.00 (Applicable Taxes Excluded)

**Amend the RFP as follows:**

**AT ANNEX A – STATEMENT OF WORK**

To correct a numbering error in the Project Requirements section of Annex A - Statement of Work:

**DELETE:** SW.4.2 Reporting Requirements

**INSERT:** SW.4.3 Reporting Requirements

**DELETE:** SW.4.3 Method and Source of Acceptance

**INSERT:** SW.4.4 Method and Source of Acceptance

**AT APPENDIX 1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**DELETE:** Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria in its entirety

**INSERT:** the following Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria in its entirety

**AT APPENDIX 1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**DELETE:** Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria in its entirety

**INSERT:** the following Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria in its entirety



## APPENDIX 1 - EVALUATION CRITERIA

Bidders are advised to address these criteria in the following order and in sufficient depth in their proposals to enable a thorough assessment. NRCan’s assessment will be based solely on the information contained within the proposal. NRCan may confirm information or seek clarification from bidders.

Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the criteria will not be considered demonstrated for the purpose of this evaluation.

The Bidder should provide complete details as to where, when (month and year) and how (through which activities/ responsibilities) the stated qualifications/experience were obtained. Experience gained during formal education shall not be considered work experience. All criteria for work experience shall be obtained in a legitimate work environment as opposed to an educational setting. Co-op terms are considered work experience provided they are related to the required services.

Bidders are also advised that the month(s) of experience listed for a project whose time frame overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once. For example: project one time frame is July 2001 to December 2001; project two time frame is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months.

### 1. Technical Criteria

#### 1.1 Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

The Mandatory Criteria listed below will be evaluated on a simple pass/fail basis. Proposals which fail to meet the mandatory criteria will be deemed non-responsive.

Criterion ID	Mandatory Criteria	Proposal Page #	Pass/Fail
M1	<p>The <b>Bidder MUST</b> have undertaken two or more projects within the last five years related to examining the intersection or relationship between hydrogen and natural gas (both within Canada and other global jurisdictions*). <u>The primary areas of focus</u> of the two or more projects completed in the past five years by the bidder <b>MUST</b> have been 1) market <b>and</b> technical, or, 2) market <b>and</b> policy, or 3) market, policy, <b>and</b> technical related issues related to the intersection between hydrogen <b>and</b> natural gas, within the domestic <b>and</b> international context.</p> <p>*Other global jurisdictions are defined as any jurisdiction outside of Canada (i.e., non-Canadian).</p> <p>Note – To be further evaluated under criteria R1</p>		



Criterion ID	Mandatory Criteria	Proposal Page #	Pass/Fail
M2	<p>The <b>Bidder MUST</b> demonstrate extensive technical, market, and policy knowledge** of hydrogen production, transportation, and consumption, including as it relates to hydrogen blended with natural gas.</p> <p>**<b>Extensive technical, market, and policy knowledge</b> is defined as having 3 or more years of direct experience related to the topics above.</p>		
M3	<p>The <b>Bidder MUST</b> demonstrate extensive technical, market, and policy knowledge** of natural gas systems and supply chains, particularly within the Canadian context.</p> <p>**<b>Extensive technical, market, and policy knowledge</b> is defined as having 3 or more years of direct experience related to the topics above.</p>		
M4	<p>The <b>Project Team MUST</b> have considerable cumulative past experience*** in undertaking studies of a complexity comparable to that proposed in this Statement of Work for national or sub-national governments within or outside of Canada (e.g. Provincial or Territorial Governments, states, municipalities, and regional governments).</p> <p>***<b>Considerable cumulative past experience</b> is defined as having undertaken two or more projects related to M1, M2, and M3 in the last five years</p> <p>Note – To be further evaluated under criteria R2</p>		
M5	<p>The proposal <b>MUST</b> include a <b>detailed work plan</b> for the entire study, which includes an explanation for the role and tasks of each Project Team or Consortium member <b>and</b> identifies the Project Leader for the Team or Consortium.</p> <p>Note – To be further evaluated under criteria R3</p>		
M6	<p>The proposal <b>MUST</b> provide an <b>approach</b> to achieving the objectives and tasks outlined in this Statement of Work.</p> <p>Note – To be further evaluated under criteria R3 and R4</p>		



Criterion ID	Mandatory Criteria	Proposal Page #	Pass/Fail
M7	<p>The proposal <b>MUST</b> be <b>No longer than 25 pages in length</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Title, table of contents, annexes, and appendices do not count towards the 25 page limit.</li> </ul> <p>The following formatting option for the proposal is <b>SUGGESTED</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilizes normal (2.54cm) margins;</li> <li>Utilizes Calibri, Times New Romans, or Arial font styles (does not apply to titles, headers, footnotes, and endnotes); and</li> <li>Utilizes font sizes 11 or 12 (does not apply to titles, headers, footnotes, and endnotes).</li> </ul> <p>Note – The specifications above are based on standard Microsoft Word functions.</p> <p>Note – Annexes may be added to the proposal for supplementary information, if required. For example, the list of related previous projects and/or team members’ resumé. Annexes are not required to comply with the requirements of M7, above.</p>		

**1.2 Evaluation of Rated Evaluation Criteria**

The criteria contained herein will be used by NRCan to evaluate each proposal that has met all of the mandatory criteria.

Proposals must achieve the stated minimum points required overall for the rated criteria to be assessed as responsive under the point rated technical criteria section; proposals not meeting the minimum required points will be deemed non-responsive.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:



Criterion ID	Point Rated Technical Criteria	Max. Points	Proposal Page #										
R1	<p><b>Previous Experience</b></p> <p>Points will be awarded to the Bidder with previous project experience related to the examination of issues related to the intersection between hydrogen <b>and</b> natural gas, within the domestic <b>and</b> international context. Only projects with a primary focus on technical-, market-, or policy-related issues would be considered. Individual projects may have more than one primary focus.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="258 579 1242 955"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Condition</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>The Bidder has undertaken <b>5 or more distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>The Bidder has undertaken <b>4 distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>The Bidder has undertaken <b>3 distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Recent is defined as within the last ten years</p>	Points	Condition	25	The Bidder has undertaken <b>5 or more distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.	20	The Bidder has undertaken <b>4 distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.	15	The Bidder has undertaken <b>3 distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.	/25			
Points	Condition												
25	The Bidder has undertaken <b>5 or more distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.												
20	The Bidder has undertaken <b>4 distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.												
15	The Bidder has undertaken <b>3 distinct, recent studies</b> relating to the intersection between hydrogen and natural gas, within the domestic and international context.												
R2	<p><b>Project Team Capacity</b></p> <p>Points will be awarded for proposals that demonstrate that the project team has the resources and sufficient personnel knowledge and capacity available to undertake the research and analysis requirements for this study. The proposal also identifies how project team members have <b>related experience*</b> to the content expectations of this study. The Bidder should identify the project team and indicate the years of experience of each member.</p> <p>*<b>Related experience</b> is defined as experience examining issues related to natural gas or hydrogen.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="258 1402 1242 1850"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Condition</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 10 years, each</b>. Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 25 years</b>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 7 years, each</b>. Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 25 years</b>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 5 years, each</b>. Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 20 years</b>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>The Project Team does not include two members with <b>related experience of at least 5 years, each</b>. Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is less than 20 years</b>.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Condition	25	At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 10 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 25 years</b> .	20	At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 7 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 25 years</b> .	15	At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 5 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 20 years</b> .	10	The Project Team does not include two members with <b>related experience of at least 5 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is less than 20 years</b> .	/25	
Points	Condition												
25	At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 10 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 25 years</b> .												
20	At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 7 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 25 years</b> .												
15	At least two members of the Project Team have <b>related experience of at least 5 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is at least 20 years</b> .												
10	The Project Team does not include two members with <b>related experience of at least 5 years, each</b> . Additionally, the cumulative number of years of <b>related experience across the Project Team is less than 20 years</b> .												



<p><b>R3</b></p>	<p><b>Understanding of Requirement</b></p> <p>Points will be awarded for a detailed work plan that demonstrates sufficient background knowledge of, and familiarity with, the issues surrounding the project content such that an estimate of the Contractor's likely success with the project can be formed.</p>	<p><b>/25</b></p>	
<p><b>5-25</b></p>	<p>Bidder will be awarded between 0-5 points based on how effectively the proposal and work plan achieves each of the following sub-categories, up to a cumulative maximum of 25 points (max 5 points per sub-category):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Work Schedule</b> (5 Points Max.)</p> <p>The work plan clearly identifies and describes a complete and realistic <b>work schedule</b> for achieving each task, milestone, and reporting requirement.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted, per task (as per SW.4.1), milestone (as per SW.4.2), and reporting requirement (as per SW.4.3) as outlined in the Statement of Work that is not referred to in the bidder's work plan.</p> <p>Bidders will be awarded a minimum of one point.</p> </li> <li> <p><b>Roles</b> (5 Points Max.)</p> <p>The work plan clearly identifies and describes a detailed, complete, and realistic breakdown and <b>assignment of the roles</b> of each member of the Project Team.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted, for each member of the Project Team that is included in the work plan without an accompanying detailed, complete, and realistic description and breakdown of their roles; to a minimum of one point.</p> <p>A sufficient description and breakdown of a member's role would include, for example, a brief description, including a general timeline, of their expected contributions and approach to each task (as per SW.4.1) that they expect to be involved with (Project Team members could, but are not required to, be involved in every task in SW.4.1). Additionally, their contributions must be realistic, under the context of the task and timeline.</p> <p>Bidders will be awarded a minimum of one point.</p> </li> </ol>	<p><b>/5</b></p> <p><b>/5</b></p>	





		<p>3. <b>Approach</b> (5 Points Max.)</p> <p>The work plan clearly identifies and describes a detailed, complete, and realistic <b>approach for reporting to and debriefing the Project Authority</b> on the progress of work.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. Two points will be deducted if the work plan does not include a proposed timeline for debriefing the Project Authority that aligns with the Milestones and Schedule (SW.4.2), Reporting Requirements (SW.4.3), and Contractor’s Obligations (SW.5.1) of the Statement of Work. Two points will be deducted if the work plan does not include general descriptions/objectives for each of the bidder’s proposed meetings/engagements with NRCan.</p> <p>Bidders will be awarded a minimum of one point.</p>	/5		
		<p>4. <b>Risks</b> (5 Points Max.)</p> <p>The work plan clearly identifies and describes a detailed and complete list of <b>potential risks and provides a realistic plan to mitigate all risks</b>. List should include a minimum of three (3) risks and a plan to mitigate all risks identified in the work plan.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted for each risk under the minimum three not included in their bid. One additional point will be deducted for each risk identified that does not include a plan to mitigate that risk.</p> <p>Points will be deducted to a minimum of zero points.</p>	/5		
		<p>5. <b>Organized and Structured</b> (5 Points Max.)</p> <p>The proposal is <b>organized and structured</b> in a clear, logical, and systematic manner.</p> <p>The proposal should include, cumulatively, a <b>minimum</b> of 5 headings or subheadings for each distinct section. However, more headings or subheadings could be used to improve the clarity and structure of the proposal.</p> <p>Bidders will begin with five points. One point will be deducted for the absence of each heading or subheading below the minimum requirement of 5 headings or subheadings. Headings and subheadings could include, <b>for example</b>, bidder/project team experiences, project team members’ roles, work plan, approach and methodology, timeline, etc.</p> <p>Bidders will be awarded a minimum of zero points.</p>	/5		



Criterion ID	Point Rated Technical Criteria	Max. Points	Proposal Page #										
R4	<b>Study Approach and Methodology</b>  Points will be awarded to proposals that clearly convey the Bidders' intended approach and methodology for developing the study and achieving the objectives and tasks of the Statement of Work (as listed in SW.4.1 of the Statement of Work).  <b>Points Condition</b>	/25											
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve all (100%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work. Additionally, the proposal includes <b>less than 5 grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors</b>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve all (100%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work. Additionally, the proposal includes <b>5 or more grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors</b>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to <b>effectively achieve most (&gt;75-99%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>The proposal's approach is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve many (50-75%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>The proposal's approach is clear, realistic, and is deemed to be effective in <b>achieving less than half (&lt;50%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.</td> </tr> </table>			25	The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve all (100%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work. Additionally, the proposal includes <b>less than 5 grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors</b> .	20	The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve all (100%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work. Additionally, the proposal includes <b>5 or more grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors</b> .	15	The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to <b>effectively achieve most (&gt;75-99%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.	10	The proposal's approach is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve many (50-75%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.	5	The proposal's approach is clear, realistic, and is deemed to be effective in <b>achieving less than half (&lt;50%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.
	25			The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve all (100%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work. Additionally, the proposal includes <b>less than 5 grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors</b> .									
	20			The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve all (100%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work. Additionally, the proposal includes <b>5 or more grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors</b> .									
	15			The proposal's approach and methodology is clear, realistic, and is deemed to <b>effectively achieve most (&gt;75-99%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.									
	10			The proposal's approach is clear, realistic, and is deemed to effectively <b>achieve many (50-75%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.									
5	The proposal's approach is clear, realistic, and is deemed to be effective in <b>achieving less than half (&lt;50%) of the objectives and tasks</b> of this Statement of Work.												
<b>Total Points</b>		<b>/100</b>											
<b>Total Points needed to be Considered Compliant (60%)</b>		<b>60</b>											

## 2. Financial Criteria

### 2.1 Mandatory Financial Criteria

Bidders must provide financial details as requested in this appendix. Proposals which do not contain pricing details as requested below shall be considered incomplete and non-responsive.

#### 2.1.1 Funding Limitation

The maximum funding available for the Contract resulting from the bid solicitation is **\$100,000.00 (Applicable Taxes Excluded)**. Bids valued in excess of this amount will be considered non-responsive. This disclosure does not commit Canada to pay the maximum funding available.

This maximum **included a) the Price to perform the Work, b) any Travel and Living and c) Miscellaneous Expenses that may be required.**

Any bids received in excess of this maximum funding will be automatically deemed non-responsive and will not be evaluated

**ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**