

ANNEX D

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.).

The Bidder must submit one (1) electronic version of their technical bid, PDF is the preferred format.

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	Proposed Team: Proposed team members, qualifications, and roles. <i>Evaluated against Mandatory Technical Criteria 2.1.1 through 2.1.3. Further evaluated against additional criteria under Point Rated Technical Criteria section 3.1 and 3.2.</i>			
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Met / Not Met		Remarks / Notes
		To Be Completed by Evaluation Team		
2.1.1	The Bidder must identify all members of the team proposed to work on the project, including employees and subcontractors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.1.2	The Bidder must clearly outline the qualifications of each member of the team proposed to work on the project, including employees and subcontractors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Solicitation No.:
5P420-21-0167/B

Amendment No.:
00

Contracting Authority:
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:
PW-22-00987266

Title:
Bison Movement Feasibility Study – Wood Buffalo National Park

Proposed Team				
2.1.3	The Bidder must clearly outline the role of each member of the team proposed to work on the project, including employees and subcontractors	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria			
2.2	<p>Portfolio:</p> <p>2.2.1 Habitat Assessment Projects: The Bidder must provide a portfolio of two (2) previous habitat assessment projects that have been completed by the Bidder within the last ten (10) years</p> <p>2.2.2 Literature Review Projects: The Bidder must provide a portfolio of two (2) previous literature review projects that have been completed by the Bidder within the last ten (10) years</p> <p>Note: The month and year of completion should be indicated – e.g. Completed July 2016.</p> <p><i>Evaluated against Mandatory Technical Criteria 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Further evaluated against additional criteria under Point Rated Technical Criteria section 3.3.</i></p>			
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Met / Not Met		Remarks / Notes
		To Be Completed by Evaluation Team		
2.2.1	Habitat Assessment Projects: The Bidder has submitted two (2) previous habitat assessment projects completed by the within the last ten (10) years at time of solicitation closing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Met / Not Met		Remarks / Notes
		To Be Completed by Evaluation Team		
2.2.2	Literature Review Projects: The Bidder has submitted two (2) previous literature review projects completed by the Bidder within the last ten (10) years at time of solicitation closing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria			
2.3	Proposed Approach and Schedule:			
	Proposed project approach and schedule meeting all of the objectives and deliverables outlined in <i>Annex A – Statement of Work</i> . <i>Evaluated against Mandatory Technical Criteria 2.3.1 through 2.3.4. Further evaluated against additional criteria under Point Rated Technical Criteria section 3.4.</i>			
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Met / Not Met		Remarks / Notes
		To Be Completed by Evaluation Team		
2.3.1	The Bidder must provide a proposed <u>approach</u> for the project.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.3.2	Proposed <u>approach</u> meets all of the objectives and deliverables outlined in <i>Annex A – Statement of Work</i> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.3.3	The Bidder must provide a proposed <u>schedule</u> for the project.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
2.3.4	Proposed <u>schedule</u> meets all of the objectives and deliverables outlined in <i>Annex A – Statement of Work</i> .	<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.

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.

All Point Rated Technical Criteria 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). The PCA Evaluation Board may award an odd number for evaluation criterion once consensus has been reached.

Solicitation No.:
5P420-21-0167/B

Amendment No.:
00

Contracting Authority:
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:
PW-22-00987266

Title:
Bison Movement Feasibility Study – Wood Buffalo National Park

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.1	Proposed Team – Qualifications and Experience: The submissions demonstrates previous experience (depth and diversity) of team members and subcontractors in key areas such as habitat assessment, ArcGIS, working with Indigenous Knowledge, and literature review.	1.0	/10
3.1 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	Reference(s):		
	Strengths:		
	Weaknesses:		
Total Points Score Criteria 3.1 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>			/10
Minimum Points Required Criteria 3.1			6
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.2	Proposed Team – team members: The proposed team members include Indigenous member(s) from communities with knowledge of Wood Buffalo National Park and the Indigenous team member(s) plays a critical role in the completion of the project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full points (10) for meeting this criterion. - No points (0) for not meeting this criterion. 	1.0	/10
3.2 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	Reference(s):		
	Strengths:		
	Weaknesses:		
Total Points Score Criteria 3.2			/10
Minimum Points Required Criteria 3.2			0

Solicitation No.:
5P420-21-0167/B

Amendment No.:
00

Contracting Authority:
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:
PW-22-00987266

Title:
Bison Movement Feasibility Study – Wood Buffalo National Park

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria		
3.3	<p>Portfolio: The submission demonstrates relevant experience in line with the breadth of requirements described in <i>Annex A – Statement of Work</i>. The submission clearly demonstrates experience of the project team having successfully completed products of similar scope and budget.</p> <p>The submission should include the following project information for each of the two (2) examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project title, description, duration and location; Budget, project goals, scope, planning methodology and delivery strategy; Bidder's role in the project, its process and project outcomes and outputs; and Names, roles and relationship to bidder (employee or subcontractor) who worked on the project. <p>Overall creativity, innovation, technical skills, and quality of work will also be evaluated.</p>		
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.3.1	Habitat Assessment Projects: Both habitat assessment projects will be evaluated against the elements identified under evaluation criteria 3.3.	1.0	/10
3.3.1 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	Reference(s):		
	Strengths:		
	Weaknesses:		
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.3.2	Literature Review Projects: Both literature review projects will be evaluated against the elements identified under evaluation criteria 3.3.	1.0	/10
3.3.2 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	Reference(s):		
	Strengths:		
	Weaknesses:		
Total Points Score Criteria 3.3 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>			/20
Minimum Points Required Criteria 3.3			12

Solicitation No.:
5P420-21-0167/B

Amendment No.:
00

Contracting Authority:
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:
PW-22-00987266

Title:
Bison Movement Feasibility Study – Wood Buffalo National Park

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria		
3.4	Proposed Approach and Schedule:		
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points Awarded <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>
3.4.1	Proposed Approach: The proposal outlines a clear, comprehensive and effective approach for the project that includes details related to: project management; content development; writing; client communication; and revisions / review periods for different phases of the project.	1.0	/10
3.4.1 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	Reference(s):		
	Strengths:		
	Weaknesses:		
3.4.2	Proposed Schedule: The proposal outlines a clear, comprehensive and effective schedule for the project that is realistic and appropriate to the project. Significant activities, milestones and deliverables, the expected points of client and stakeholder input, reviews and approvals, and required meetings are identified. Clear and measurable timelines should be provided.	1.0	/10
3.4.2 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>	Reference(s):		
	Strengths:		
	Weaknesses:		
Total Points Score Criteria 3.4 <small>**To Be Completed by Evaluation Team**</small>			/20
Minimum Points Required Criteria 3.4			12
Maximum Points Available for Point Rated Technical Criteria			60
Minimum Points Required for Point Rated Technical Criteria			30

Bids that do not obtain the required minimum points specified for each criteria of the technical evaluation and the required minimum **30** points overall will be given no further evaluation.

Solicitation No.:
5P420-21-0167/B

Amendment No.:
00

Contracting Authority:
Andrea McGraw-Alcock

Client Reference No.:
PW-22-00987266

Title:
Bison Movement Feasibility Study – Wood Buffalo National Park

4. Point Rated Technical Criteria Summary Table

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Weight Factor	Maximum Weighted Rating
3.1	Proposed Team – Qualifications and Experience:		10
3.1	Qualifications and Experience	1.0	10
3.2	Proposed Team – Team Members:		10
3.2	Members from communities with Indigenous Knowledge of WBNP	1.0	10
3.3	Portfolio:		20
3.3.1	Portfolio Example 1	1.0	10
3.3.2	Portfolio Example 2	1.0	10
3.4	Proposed Approach and Schedule:		20
3.4.1	Proposed Approach	1.0	10
3.4.3	Proposed Schedule	1.0	10
Maximum Points Available for Point Rated Criteria			60
Minimum Points Required for Point Rated Criteria			30

Bids that do not obtain the required minimum points specified for each criteria of the technical evaluation and the required minimum **30** points overall will be given no further evaluation.

5. Generic Evaluation Criteria

PCA Evaluation Board members will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Proponent's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) using the generic evaluation table below.

At the final consensus evaluation meeting, the PCA Evaluation Board members will assign both even and odd numbers in determining the final score for each evaluation criteria.

Non Responsive	Inadequate	Weak	Adequate	Fully Satisfactory	Strong
0 Point	2 Points	4 Points	6 Points	8 Points	10 Points
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	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 does not possess qualifications and experience	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
	Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements	Team does not cover all components or overall experience is weak	Team covers most components and will likely meet requirements	Team covers all components - some members have worked successfully together	Strong team – has worked successfully together on comparable projects
	Sample projects not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Leads in sample projects directly related to this requirement
	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, should ensure adequate results	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results