

**SOLICITATION NUMBER: 5000049085**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SERIES – 004**

**Please note that a correction has been made to Stream 2, R2.1. Please see RFSO Amendment 004.**

**Q12.** The RFSO for Stream 1 reflects that the services would be provided to Director level and above resources but the experience requirement of M1.2 states that the proposed resource must have a minimum 500 coaching hours, within the last 5 years, at the time of RFSO closing, coaching Director General (DG) and above employees in the public service or the equivalent level employee in the private sector.

Should M1.2 say Director level and above instead of Director General level and above?

**A12.** M1.2 has been revised to experience coaching at the Director level and above. See RFSO Amendment 004.

**Q13.** Under 3.0 Point Rated Technical Criteria, R1.1 states that “The Offeror should demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience, in the last 3 years at the time of RFSO closing, providing coaching services to Director General level and above employees in the Federal Public Service\*” but M1.2 indicates 5 years.

\*As defined under sections I to VI of the Financial Administration Act.

Is it 5 years or 3 years?

**A13.** For M1.2, the experience must be gained in the last 5 years at the time of RFSO closing and for R1.1, the experience must be gained in the last 3 years at the time of RFSO closing.

The main distinctions between M1.2 and R1.1 are:

1) the experience under M1.2 must have been gained in the public service which could include for example federal, provincial or municipal or the equivalent level of employee in the private sector and the experience under R1.1 must have been gained specifically in the Federal Public Service as defined under sections I to VI of the Financial Administration Act.

2) the experience under M1.2 must have been gained by coaching Director level (see RFSO Amendment 004) and above employees in the public service or the equivalent level employee in the private sector and the experience under R1.1 must have been gained coaching Director General level employees and above specifically in the Federal Public Service as defined under sections I to VI of the Financial Administration Act.

**Q14.** Could you please confirm if the resource(s) proposed for Streams 1 and 2 must be bilingual? (e.g. able to perform work in both French and English). OR do they need to fit just one of the three language profiles (English OR French OR Bilingual)?

**A14.** For streams 1 and 2 the proposed resource must meet one of the three language profiles, English or French or Bilingual in both English and French.

**Q15.** For streams 1 and 2, according to the rating system maximum points can be achieved with 125 or more hours.

Do you still require 500 hours?

If the proposed resource has more than 500 hours, do we include this?

Are there more points allocated for 500 hours and over?

**A15.** The requirements of the mandatory technical criteria and the point-rated technical criteria are requesting different experience.

Each proposed resource must meet the requirements of the mandatory technical criteria for the specific stream in order to proceed to evaluation of the point-rated technical criteria. See Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection for further information.

**Q16.** Under which stream do you consider peer coaching?

**A16.** This will depend on the specific criterion to which you are responding. Peer coaching can fall in either Stream 1 or Stream 2 depending on the level of the peer to whom the coaching was provided and the specific requirements of the criterion.

**Q17.** In Attachment 1 to Part 3, Pricing Schedule, can you provide clarification about what information we are supposed to insert in the Option 1, 2 and 3 columns and why the hourly rates are totaled? Can you provide an example of how this would be filled out if we are proposing 1 resource?

**A17.** The Standing Offers will be awarded for an initial period of 2 years and include 3, one year option periods. If all option periods are exercised, the total potential duration of the Standing Offers could be 5 years. The Offeror must insert in its financial offer its quoted firm all-inclusive hourly rate (in Cdn \$) for the proposed Resource for each of these periods. For a resulting call-up against a Standing Offer, these are the rates that will apply for the delivery of services for each of these periods.

The columns are totaled because this becomes the Evaluated Financial Offer Price that will be used in the Financial Evaluation outlined in section 4.1.2 Financial Evaluation.

For demonstration purposes only, below is an example of a completed table.

Stream 1 – Executive Coaching (Director level and above) – up to 20 Standing Offers may be awarded						
Description	Resource Name	Initial Period (2 years)	Option 1 (1 year)	Option 2 (1 Year)	Option 3 (1 Year)	Total A+B+C+D
		Firm all-inclusive Hourly Rate (CAD)	Firm all-inclusive Hourly Rate (CAD)	Firm all-inclusive Hourly Rate (CAD)	Firm all-inclusive Hourly Rate (CAD)	
		A	B	C	D	
Executive Coaching	Kelly Smith	\$1.00	\$1.25	\$1.50	\$1.75	\$5.50
Sub-total (Evaluated Financial Offer Price)						\$5.50
Applicable Taxes						\$0.72
Total						\$6.22

**Q18.** Regarding Attachment 1 to Part – Technical Evaluation Criteria, for stream 1, M1.2 requires a minimum of 500 coaching hours in the last 5 years. R1.1 indicates full points will be awarded for 125 or more hours of coaching in the last 3 years.

Will bids be accepted with fewer than 500 coaching hours within 5 years (Mandatory Tech Criteria Unmet) if Point Rated Tech Criteria are met fully — for example if the resource has 125 or more hours coaching in the last 3 years?

**A18.** Each proposed resource must meet the requirements of the mandatory technical criteria to proceed to evaluation of the point-rated technical criteria. See Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection for further information.

In the scenario presented, if the proposed resource did not meet the requirements of M1.2, the Offer would be disqualified.

Please see Question and Answer #13 for additional information regarding the distinction between M1.2 and R1.1,

**Q19.** For R1.1 for the Executive Coaching Stream, would CNSC also accept experience providing coaching to equivalent level employees in the private sector as in M1.2?

**A19.** No.

**Q20.** On page 5, it is stated: “NOTE: If an Offeror is submitting an Offer for more than one stream of Work, a separate Offer should be submitted for each stream.”

Assuming an Offeror wants to offer their services for Streams 1 and 2, does this statement mean that we must prepare two Technical Offers and place them in a single document titled “Section 1”, two Financial Offers placed in a single document titled “Section 2”, and two distinct Certifications Offers in a single document titled “Section 3”? Or does CNSC want 6 distinct documents? In this example, how does CNSC want vendors to submit their bids?

**A20.** Ideally a separate technical, financial and certification Offer for each stream / resource would be submitted to simplify and expedite the evaluation process. So, in the example provided, we would receive 6 distinct documents.

Please also refer to Question and Answer #4 and sections 1.2.2 notes and Attachment 1 to Part 3 notes outlined below.

### **Section 1.2.2**

**NOTE:** If an Offeror is submitting an Offer for more than one stream of Work, a separate Offer should be submitted for each stream.

**NOTE:** If an Offeror is proposing multiple Resources, a separate Offer should be submitted for each Resource.

### **Attachment 1 to Part 3**

**Note 1:** If an Offeror is submitting more than 1 Resource per Stream, each Resource will be evaluated against the technical evaluation criteria independently and the evaluated financial offer will also be determined independently of any other proposed resource.

**Note 2:** If an Offeror is submitting an Offer for more than one stream of Work, a separate Offer should be submitted for each stream.

**Note 3:** If an Offeror is proposing multiple Resources, a separate Offer should be submitted for each Resource.

If a separate Offer is not submitted, for the purposes of evaluation each Resource proposed will be treated as a separate Offer. The Evaluated Financial Offer Price for each Resource will be calculated by adding the rates provided in the table for the individual Resource and not all of the Resources combined.

**Q21.** On page 12, it is stated: “Section III: Certifications not included in the Technical Offer (1 soft copy via email)”.

Can you clarify as to what certifications should be in the Certification Section and what Certifications must be included in the technical offer sections? We assumed all Certifications listed under Part 5 of the RFSO would have to be in Section III but this sentence seems to indicate that there are other “certifications” that must be included in Section I.

**A21.** Section III: Certifications not included in the Technical Offer (1 soft copy via email) refers to the certifications and additional information required under Part 5.

An example of the certifications that would be included in Section I, Technical Bid are those outlined in M1.1 and M2.1 of the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**Q22.** On page 12, it is stated: “Prices must appear in the Financial Offer only. No prices are to be indicated in any other section of the Offer.”

For stream 4, we are asked to complete “ATTACHMENT 2 TO PART 4 – Stream 4 Response Table” and, we assume, add it to the Technical Offer. Yet, Column F of Attachment 2 to Part 4 requests that we add prices (titled: All-inclusive Cost per Assessment in Canadian (before taxes)). Should we include this

attachment in the Financial section, along with the tables from page 17, or in the Technical section notwithstanding the request that prices must appear only in the Financial Offer? Please advise.

**A22.** For Stream 4 only it is acceptable to have the prices included in the Technical Bid given the Basis of Selection for Stream 4 as outlined under section 4.2.2 Basis of Selection - Stream 4 - All Compliant Offers.

Please see RFSO Amendment 004.

**Q23.** Financial Offer. Ref., page 17. Stream 4. We are assuming we can have multiple tables, each for different assessment tools we are proposing?

**A23.** The list of the different assessments offered should be included on 1 table using separate rows.

**Q24.** May we submit the same resource to be evaluated for multiple streams?

**A24.** Yes.