

## **Request for Information (RFI)**

**Analysis of Wastewater, Sludge/Biosolids, Leachate and other Complex Environmental Matrices for diethylhexyl phthalate (DEHP, CAS #117-81-7) and other priority phthalates**

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Purpose
2. Background
3. Requirements
4. Acquisition Strategy
5. Review of the RFI
6. No Obligation
7. Closing Date
8. Contracting Authority
9. Industry/Academia Engagement Questions

## **1. PURPOSE**

This Request for Information (RFI) seeks information from industry and academia on:

- a) their interest, capacity and ability to complete analytical testing for DEHP and other phthalates in Canadian environmental matrices; and
- b) to provide industry and academia with the opportunity to give feedback on the procurement strategy.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Background info – taken from the SOW

## **3. REQUIREMENTS**

The goal of this project is to . . . taken from the SOW.

## **4. ACQUISITION STRATEGY**

Canada may release a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) for the work required. The draft RFP is provided with this RFI. Following the RFP process, it is intended to award a single contract.

## **5. REVIEW OF THE RFI**

Canada reserves the right to request additional information for clarification during the review of the responses to this RFI.

No payment will be made for costs incurred in the preparation and submission of a response to the RFI. Costs associated with preparing and submitting a response, as well as any costs incurred by the respondent associated with the evaluation of the RFI, are the sole responsibility of the respondent.

## **6. NO OBLIGATION**

The issuance of this RFI does not create an obligation for Canada to issue a subsequent bid solicitation and does not bind Canada legally or otherwise, to enter into any agreement or to accept any suggestions from industry and academia.

This industry/academia consultation process is not a bid solicitation, and a contract will not result from this request.

Potential respondents are advised that any information submitted to Canada in response to this industry/academia consultation process may be used by Canada in the development of a subsequent competitive RFP. However, Canada is not bound to accept any expression of interest or to consider it further in any associated documents such as an RFP.

## **7. CLOSING DATE**

Responses to this RFI shall be submitted directly to the Contracting Authority on or before April 29, 2024 at 14:00PM.

## **8. CONTRACTING AUTHORITY**

All enquiries and other communications related to this RFI shall be directed to the Contracting Authority as follows:

Marie-Pier Dubois

## **9. INDUSTRY/ACADEMIA ENGAGEMENT QUESTIONS**

The questions contained in the Sections below are intended to elicit feedback of interest to Canada. It is not expected that all questions will elicit a response, neither should submissions be constrained by the questions.

Respondents are encouraged to submit a response to the Industry/Academia Engagement Questions in electronic format (MS Word or Adobe PDF preferable as long as copy/paste or printing of text functions are not restricted in any way) by the RFI closing date.

### **Response Format**

The Respondent's name, company, address, and contact information and the RFI number should be clearly visible in the response.

The response is to be submitted by e-mail to the Contracting Authority at the following address:

[Mariepier.dubois@ec.gc.ca](mailto:Mariepier.dubois@ec.gc.ca)

The inclusion of general marketing material is discouraged unless used to provide specific information relevant to a response. In this instance, it is requested that supporting text cross-reference the marketing material to the appropriate area of the RFI.

Responses will not be returned.

The number of pages of your response is not limited. However, the expected length should not exceed 5 pages double sided standard letter business format.

### **Language of Response**

Responses may be in English or French, at the preference of the Respondent.

### **Response Parameters**

Respondents are reminded that this is an RFI and not an RFP and, in that regard, Respondents should feel free to provide their comments and concerns with their responses. Canada reserves the right to seek clarifications from a Respondent for any information provided in response to this RFI, either by telephone, in writing or in person.

### **Confidentiality**

Respondents are requested to clearly identify those portions of their response that are company confidential or proprietary in nature. The confidentiality of each Respondent's response will be maintained. Items that are identified as proprietary will be treated as such except where Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a proprietary nature. Canada may edit the questions or may request that the respondent do so, so that the proprietary nature of the question is eliminated, and the enquiry can be answered with copies to all interested parties.

### **SECTION A: Analytical capabilities**

1. Are you currently capable of analyzing each compound and matrix in Table 1 of the Statement of Work (SOW) using validated methods? If not, which compounds/matrices are you able to analyze?
2. Are you currently capable of achieving the minimum required reporting limits for each compound and matrix in Table 1 of the SOW? If not, what reporting limits could you achieve?
3. Are there additional labeled surrogates currently available to use for quantification?

### **Statement of Work (SOW)**

4. Are any aspects of the Statement of Work unclear?
5. Are the delivery timelines detailed in the SOW reasonable?
6. Does the SOW have enough information for Bidders to submit a quality bid?
7. What additional information would you need to see included in the SOW?
8. Is it clear in the SOW how to report results for each compound and matrix in Table 1?
9. How do you recommend "reporting limit" be described/defined (see Definitions table in SOW)?

### **Evaluation Criteria**

10. Is it clear how Canada proposes to evaluate the bids?
11. Is it clear what information you must provide in your proposal to obtain the maximum points?
12. Are there any elements you believe should be included in the evaluation?
13. Are there any elements that you believe do not add value to the evaluation process?
14. Provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, could improve the evaluation.
15. Should the minimum required points for each rated criteria be increased or decreased?

### **Basis of Selection**

16. Does the Basis of Selection seem fair and reasonable?
17. Is the ratio between Technical Merit and Price reasonable?
18. Provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, could improve the contractor selection methodology.

### **Basis of Payment**

19. Is the proposed Basis of Payment reasonable?
20. Does the RFP have sufficient information for you to provide firm milestones for the work?
21. Do you have any other comments on the Basis of Payment?

### **Other**

22. Please identify any other issues, concerns, recommendations not addressed above.
23. Will you submit a proposal for this requirement? If not, why?

Thank you for your feedback and involvement in this initiative!