

Question 7

“Each sample must be preceded by a separate presentation page on which the bidder must specify the name of the resource who carried out the translation, the date of the translation (month and year) and the name, title and contact details of the client. In addition, the resource who performed the translation must sign and date the cover page to confirm that the translation is their work. Electronic signatures are accepted.”

Client name, title and contact information? Name of bidder or company name? Bidder’s contact information and email or company address?

Answer 7

Name of the translation requestor, title (name of department, organization or business and person’s title) and requestor’s contact information (email or telephone number) must be included on the cover page.

Question 8

Can you please let us know approximately how many words were translated last year?

Answer 8

Approximately 900,000 words were translated internally and externally between April 1, 2022 and March 31, 2023.

Question 9

If more than one (1) bidders is selected, how will the volume of work be distributed among the selected bidders?

Answer 9

Up to three (3) contracts can be awarded on a rotation basis first right of refusal. Each contract value will be divided equally.

Question 10

How many suppliers does NSERC currently work with?

Answer 10

NSERC currently has contracts with two (2) suppliers for the provision of translation services from English into French. It also has a Master Agreement for Linguistic Services with Public Works and Government Services Canada through the Translation Bureau.

Question 11

What is your internal team comprised of? (i.e. Translators, Revisers, Project Managers, Coordinators, etc.)

Answer 11

The internal team is comprised of a manager, a coordinator, four (4) translator-editors (English-French) and a senior Web copy editor.

Question 12

Is the objective of this RFP to downsize the internal team?

Answer 12

The objective is not to downsize the internal team.

Question 13

The way the new pricing tables (following the March 19 modifications) are presented does not make it possible to realistically and fairly compare prices between suppliers without rate weighting by text type and service level. Having to calculate an average rate per word for each year over a five-year period without taking that weighting into account will always yield a skewed result.

Moreover, you ask that the financial offer taken into account be the sum of the average rates per word and the average hourly rates, which is even less meaningful.

Can you revise your tables by weighting them, by not using the averages as currently defined, or by not adding together the rates per word and hourly rates?

Answer 13

The pricing tables will remain the same.

Question 14

Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Bid Evaluation Criteria (p. 15) reads “Experience must be demonstrated by citing specific **examples of work** performed that relate to the specific evaluation criteria.”

Can you please clarify what is meant by an “example of work”? Is that a description of an individual document that has been translated by the bidder? I.e. when the RFP states “the page and **project numbers** as indicated in the resume of each of the resources,” is it correct that NSERC would like to see specific project examples that have individual project numbers assigned by the client referenced? We want to reconcile these statements with R2, for example, which

asks bidders to demonstrate experience “in text or table format, a **summary** of each proposed resource’s experience, including the number of years of experience providing services,” and M1, which does not specifically state the way in which the bidder should demonstrate the resources’ experience, nor does M2 in its request for a CV for each resource. Could the Project Authority could clarify that they are indeed looking for specific project examples/examples of work in discussing the resources’ experience that are individual translated documents **or** if a summary of proposed resources’ experience is sufficient?

Answer 14

Bidders are free to present the information as they desire. However, this information must be structured, intelligible and sufficiently supported to allow the proposal to be evaluated in accordance with the specified criteria. For example, cross-references may be made to a relevant section or page of the proposal.

Question 15

To what depth of explanation would the evaluators like the description of the answer in the matrix? To clarify: Attachment 1 to Part 4 writes that “Bidders are requested to indicate beside each of the criteria the relevant page number(s) in their bid where the requirement identified in the criterion is addressed,” and “answers are to be entered directly into the matrix.” We understand the stipulation that, “Copy/Cutting and pasting wording from the RFP or from a project description into the tables does not constitute a demonstration of compliance with the requirement,” and it is clear that bidders must identify the appropriate page number for the complete information; however, to what extent should the bidder place responses into the matrices themselves? We ask, because we would like to be judicious with providing enough information for the reader 1) not to find redundant the fully elaborated information in the proposal document, and 2) to avoid overcrowding the matrices with information that is better left in the body of the proposal. Is this concern one that is left up to the bidder to discern?

Answer 15

Bidders are free to present the information as they desire. However, this information must be structured, intelligible and sufficiently supported to allow the proposal to be evaluated in accordance with the specified criteria. For example, cross-references may be made to a relevant section or page of the proposal.

Question 16

Regarding the Samples, our initial understanding is that Section IV should be submitted as one (1) file containing all samples and signatures. However, M4 states the following “The source text (English) and the target text (French) must be submitted in a separate attachment.” Please clarify.

Answer 16

The source text (in English) and the translation (in French) of the samples must be submitted in **A SINGLE** attachment.

Question 17

At page 17, it states “The answers are to be entered directly into the matrix, explaining how each criterion has been met, while referencing both the page and project numbers as indicated in the resume”. Please confirm that bidders can provide page references in the Matrix but offer complete responses to the requirements in the main body of the proposal.

Answer 17

Bidders are free to present the information as they desire. However, this information must be structured, intelligible and sufficiently supported to allow the proposal to be evaluated in accordance with the specified criteria. For example, cross-references may be made to a relevant section or page of the proposal.

Question 18

NSERC states that it intends to award up to three (3) contracts. Please confirm how work would be divided between suppliers. Will it be pre-determined or based on NSERC’s overall satisfaction with each supplier?

Answer 18

The work will be assigned to each supplier in turn (with right of first refusal). The amount of each contract will be divided into equal parts.

Question 19

When filling out the new tables in your Request for Proposal, I cannot understand the structure of the new Basis of Payment.

- 1) NSERC is asking me to add the rate per word for the first year to the rates for the following four option years, in four categories at once, which gives an arbitrary figure many times higher than it should be, if NSERC wants to know what rate I am proposing on average. Shouldn't I instead be showing the annual average of the proposed rates per word?

- 2) Next, NSERC asks for an hourly rate for changes, but here again, by adding five years of hourly rates, in four categories at once, I get an arbitrary figure many times higher than it should be. Shouldn't I instead be showing the average of the proposed hourly rate for each year?
- 3) Lastly, NSERC is asking me to add five years of translation rates per word to five years of hourly rates for changes, whereas normally a bidder separates these two figures in the proposal. Also, a bidder normally calculates the financial proposal on the basis of a given number of words to translate for the year and number of hours of changes to be made. But nowhere in the request for proposals do I find even an approximate estimate of the work to be done. Without that, how can the proposed cost be evaluated?

I hope to receive some clarifications on this subject.

Answer 19

The pricing tables will remain the same.

Approximately 900,000 words were translated internally and externally between April 1, 2022 and March 31, 2023.