



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Ship Refits and Conversions / Radoubss et
modifications de navires and / et
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
6C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet CCGS Griffon - VLE	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F7049-200157/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 036
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F7049-200157	Date 2023-10-30
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$MD-029-29039	
File No. - N° de dossier 029md.F7049-200157	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Standard Time EST on - le 2023-11-29 Heure Normale de l'Est HNE	
F.O.B. - F.A.B.	
Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Jeddi, Loubna	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 029md
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 455-3835 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Solicitation Amendment # 036

This amendment is hereby raised :

- 1. To add section 6.20 to the ITT – Vendor Performance Management (VPM) Pilot.**
 - 2. To add section 7.49 to the ITT – Vendor Performance Management (VPM) Pilot.**
 - 3. To add Annex T – Vendor Performance Management – Marine (Refit Vessels) scorecard.**
-

1. To add section 6.20 to the ITT – Vendor Performance Management (VPM) Pilot

- Insert section 6.20 to the ITT.

6.20 Vendor Performance Management (VPM) Pilot

The vendor performance management pilot will be initiated with this contract. See details in **section 7.49**.

2. To add section 7.49 to the ITT – Vendor Performance Management (VPM) Pilot

- Insert section 7.49 to the ITT.

7.49 Vendor Performance Management (VPM) Pilot

In addition to continuing with its existing approach to performance management under the resulting VLE refit contract, Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) is planning to pilot a standardized approach to VPM. The Contractor will be evaluated by Canada on specific aspects of its performance, as specified below. Key elements of this include the systematic assessments of Contractor performance against predetermined criteria, communicating assessment results to Contractors, and a review mechanism. Contractors may be required to collect, compile and present performance information to support these assessments. The finally evaluated scores along with reasons for awarding them will be discussed with the Contractor. The scope of the pilot includes VLEs and other refits' contracts.

Canada will evaluate the performance of the Contractor during and upon completion of the contract. The scorecard used for these evaluations will include set indicators grouped by the following 4 categories:

- a) Quality
- b) Cost
- c) Schedule
- d) Management

To evaluate the above criteria, a 5 point scale will be used, as follows:

1. Significant Improvement Needed
2. Moderate Improvement Needed

- 3. Achieved
- 4. Surpassed
- 5. Exceptional

The scorecard that will be used to evaluate the performance of the supplier as part of the performance evaluation process, can be found at Annex "T" of this document.

Use of Performance Evaluation Results. The VPM pilot will commence at the time of the contract award. Scores will be gathered during the contract to inform the development of the VPM Policy and will be used for testing and verification purposes only.

At the conclusion of the pilot contract, vendor performance scores will not be retained for future bid evaluation purposes.

Please see the following link for more information on the above and to view the pilot version of the Policy:
<https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/grf-vpm/pgrf-vpmp-eng.html>.

Please refer to Annex "T" for further information.

- 3. To add Annex T – Vendor Performance Management – Marine (Refit Vessels) scorecard.**

ANNEX T – Vendor Performance Management – Marine (Refit Vessels) scorecard

Application Guidelines

1. It is important to ensure a common understanding of how VPM will be applied in the context of the contract. Some key performance indicators (KPIs) include qualitative language such as “minor/major”, “minimal/significant”, “frequent/infrequent”, etc. These criteria are designed to provide flexibility to the evaluator to apply them in a context that is appropriate to the particularities of the contract. Where appropriate, KPIs may be linked to quantitative metrics specific to the contract. At the outset of the contract, the Technical Authority, the Contracting Authority and the Contractor to review and discuss all evaluation criteria, and the frequency and timing of interim and final performance evaluations.
2. At least one interim evaluation should be completed at the mid-point of the contract, and a frequency of every (2) two months is generally recommended for all contracts. More frequent interim evaluations may be appropriate, and are at the discretion of the Contracting Authority and/or Technical Authority based on the nature of the contract.
3. Interim and final evaluations are to be completed by the TA for the contract and the Contracting Authority or their representatives. Evaluators may wish to consult other government stakeholders involved in the contract to inform evaluations. The PSPC Contracting Authority is also responsible for reviewing scorecards completed by the designated evaluator(s) before finalizing.
4. The evaluators are expected to keep detailed records of both positive and negative Contractor performance, as well as extenuating circumstances and other considerations that should be taken into account during evaluations. This will better enable the Contractor to address performance issues and provide support for final vendor performance scores.
5. Contractors are also encouraged to complete the VPM feedback form to provide constructive input on the VPM framework, evaluation processes and scorecard, and suggestions to improve contract management practices.

Quality (Technical Compliance)

Weighting: 30%

Certain types of complex deliverables may have detailed technical specifications and performance requirements, including meeting established standards and certifications. Identified deficiencies and deviations from requirements must be addressed before final acceptance of deliverables. Deficiencies are the result of workmanship errors, as opposed to deviations which are intentional changes. Either may result in non-compliance with requirements that may or may not be acceptable.

The indicator for this category is:

1. Compliance with all technical requirements and applicable standards in accordance with the contract.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables including documents were compliant with the contract technical requirements and applicable standards and certifications. • There were no deviations or deficiencies identified. • No deficiencies reported in the warranty period
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables including documents were compliant with the contract technical requirements and applicable standards and certifications. • Some minor deviations identified that did not require correction. • No deficiencies noted in the warranty period.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables including documents were compliant with the contract technical requirements and applicable standards and certifications. • Some minor deficiencies were identified but deemed acceptable and were addressed proactively. • 2 or less than 2 minor deficiencies reported during the warranty period which had no affect on the vessel's operations.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables including documents were not compliant with either the contract technical requirements or applicable standards and certifications. • A significant deficiency or multiple deficiencies were identified and appropriate remedial action was taken. • Between 2 and 5 minor deficiencies reported during the warranty period which had little or no affect on the vessel's operations.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables including documents were not compliant with either the contract technical requirements or applicable standards and certifications. • A significant deficiency or multiple deficiencies were identified and appropriate remedial action was not taken or ineffective. • More than 5 minor deficiencies reported during the warranty period which had no affect on the vessel's operations, or major deficiencies noted (1 and above) which had an affect on the vessel's operations or the vessel had to be taken out of work.

Management (Communication and Coordination)

Weighting: 20% for refits

Evaluates the contractor's effectiveness in managing and coordinating activities needed to execute the contract, without excessive intervention or reliance on government representatives.

Indicators for this category include (as applicable):

- 1. Communication:** The contractor is consistent and proactive in their communications, provides clear and comprehensive information, and timely (as defined in the contract) progress updates.
- 2. Issue Management:** The contractor is proactive and effective in responding to and resolving any issues (e.g. shipment delays, quality defects). Contracting and project authorities are informed of risks and issues and provided with corrective action plans in a timely manner so as to have minimum effect on cost and schedule. Any issues are resolved or effectively contained by the contractor.
- 3. Delivery Management:** The Contractor maintains and delivers the vessel to the satisfaction of all stakeholders.
- 4. Relationship Management:** The contractor maintains and coordinates effective professional relationships with all contract stakeholders.
- 5. Flexibility:** The contractor demonstrates agility, openness, collaboration and cooperation in coordinating activities and in responding to inquiries and requested changes to deliverables quickly.
- 6. Reliability:** The contractor manages contract work independently, including following through on agreed upon action items, decisions and commitments, without excessive guidance, oversight or intervention required.
- 7. Continuous Improvement:** The contractor demonstrates commitment to improving contract outcomes by acknowledging performance areas of weakness, taking corrective action, and providing valuable input for process improvement, where applicable.

The contractor's performance is rated for each indicator according to the following criteria:

Succeeds +: The contractor met or exceeded performance expectations consistently with no need for improvement noted.

Succeeds -: The contractor did not always meet performance expectations. Some minor errors or shortcomings that could be improved upon were noted.

Significant Underperformance: The contractor did not consistently meet minimum performance expectations. There were repeated deficiencies noted which had a considerable impact on overall contractual outcomes, requiring significant effort to address.

Indicator	Rating	Supporting Justification
1. Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Issue Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Delivery Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Relationship Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6. Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
7. Continuous Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Based on the ratings received for all indicators, the contractor is scored according to the table below:

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Succeeds + across all applicable indicators
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Succeeds - across only 1 indicator, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Succeeds - across only 2 indicators, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Succeeds - across 3 indicators, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Succeeds - across 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against one or more indicators.

Cost (Fixed Time Rate)

Weighting: 10% for refits

Cost control is an important aspect of performance where the level of effort associated with the work is uncertain and a firm price basis of payment is not applicable. The Cost performance category evaluates aspects of contractor performance that are critical to ensuring cost economics under contracts.

Indicators for this category include:

1. Accuracy, timeliness and detailed cost breakdown of invoices.
2. Reasonableness of work hours relative to the expected level of effort for work performed. This criteria is valuated relative to actual work performed.
3. Justification and approval of additional / extra work.
4. Proactive savings and/or cost avoidance by the contractor.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invoices were always submitted promptly and in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing requirements of the contract with no errors requiring correction. • Work hours quoted for extra work were reasonable relative to the expected level of effort required for the work performed. • Notification of additional / extra work was timely to the satisfaction of the TA and had acceptable justification. • Substantial savings and/or cost avoidance as a result of early identification of issues and/or opportunities for greater efficiency in performance of the work.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invoices were always submitted promptly and in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing requirements of the contract with no errors requiring correction. • Work hours quoted for extra work were reasonable relative to the expected level of effort required for the work performed. • Notification of additional / extra work was timely to the satisfaction of the TA and had acceptable justification.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invoices were usually submitted promptly and in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing requirements of the contract with less than 2 errors requiring correction. • Work hours quoted for additional work were reasonable relative to the estimated level of effort required for the work performed. • Notification of additional / extra work was timely to the satisfaction of the TA and had acceptable justification.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated instance(s) of issues related to billing and cost control, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unreasonable delay between submission of invoices and the time the work was performed, making validation difficult. ○ Insufficient justification of work hours relative to the expected level of effort required for work. ○ Commencement of unauthorized work. • The contractor made a reasonable effort to address cost control issues and minimize recurrence.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent issues related to billing and cost control, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unreasonable delay between submission of invoices and the time the work was performed, making validation difficult. ○ Insufficient justification of billed hours relative to the expected level of effort required for work. ○ Commencement of unauthorized work. • The contractor did not make a reasonable effort to address cost control issues or corrective measures were ineffective.

Schedule (Project Management)

Weighting: 40%

Requirements for complex contracts are commonly tied to an overall project schedule. Where the project schedule is primarily managed and controlled by the contractor, the Schedule (Project Management) performance category evaluates the contractor's effectiveness in establishing and maintaining the schedule as well as the ability to mitigate potential delays, in accordance with the contract.

In certain contract situations it may not be possible to establish firm contract timelines prior to contract award, and the initial schedule may need to be adjusted as a result of post-award activities.

The contractor is solely responsible for the entire project, although, project delays can occur that are outside of the contractor's responsibility and control. Allowances should be made for excusable delays for circumstances beyond the contractor's responsibility and control, at the discretion of the evaluator.

Indicators for this category include:

1. The timeliness and effectiveness in establishing the initial schedule, including (as applicable) critical path, task orders, milestones, acceptance criteria and delivery schedule.
2. The timeliness and effectiveness of progress monitoring and notification when revisions or clarification to the schedule, including deliverables, are required.
3. The timeliness and effectiveness in addressing issues and minimizing delays within the contractor's control.
4. The contractor's ability to identify opportunities to improve efficiency throughout the contract, even if the overall timeline is delayed due to circumstances beyond the contractor's responsibility and control.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the contract, a timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor. • Proactive and collaborative improvements to project efficiency throughout the contract, significantly reducing completion time (>10%) of the overall project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the contract, timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor. • Proactive and collaborative improvements to project efficiency throughout the contract, moderately reducing completion time of the overall project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the contract, timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial schedule provided was not feasible requiring significant (more than 2) revisions and administrative effort by Canada to make it acceptable. • Progress monitoring and notification was inconsistent requiring significant administrative effort by Canada. No reasons and notification given to the client before changing the scheduled completion date. • The contractor made some effort to mitigate potential delays to the project schedule that was partially effective. The efforts made were communicated to the client.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commencement of the project was delayed as a result of late delivery of an acceptable project schedule. • Minimal or unreliable progress monitoring and notification, resulting in operational impacts to the project. • The contractor was not responsive when addressing issues leading to significant delays to the project schedule. • The contractor failed repeatedly to match their efforts with the commitment made to the client regarding mitigating potential delays.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
F7049-200157/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
F7049-200157

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
036
File No. - N° du dossier
029md F7049-200157

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
029md
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

End of Solicitation Amendment #036.