

Canadian Evaluation Society, National Capital Chapter

Student Evaluation Case Competition 2005

First Round Case:

Summative Evaluation of the Department of Canadian Heritage's Canada Traveling Exhibitions Indemnification Program (INDEM)

The Student Evaluation Case Competition is organized by the National Capital Chapter of the Canadian Evaluation Society. The organizing committee gratefully acknowledges the Department of Canadian Heritage for providing the information that underlies this case. The material is intended solely for educational purposes.

The members of the 2005 organizing committee are:

Michael Goodyer
Carleton University
Student Board Member
CES National Capital Chapter
mgoodyer@rogers.com

Botsalano Mosimakoko
University of Ottawa
Student Board Member
CES National Capital Chapter
bmosi043@uottawa.ca

François Dumaine
Partner
Prairie Research Associates
dumaine@pra.ca

Jennifer Palmer-Pugh
Masters Candidate
Carleton University

Rules for the First Round of the Competition:

1. For the Competition each team must organize: a place to work, an Internet connection to enable downloading of the case and a printer to produce copies of the case for each team member.
2. Teams must select a contact person and a time between 9:00 a.m. and 12 noon (Ottawa time) to receive a telephone call from the Organizers revealing the hidden location of the case file on the web.
3. Teams will be given 1 hour to download the case and make photocopies for each team member.
4. Teams may spend no more than five hours on the case. Submissions must be sent by e-mail to the designated addresses with copies to the list of designated addresses in Word or WordPerfect format no later than 6 hours after the call from the Organizers revealing the location of the case on the web.
5. Submissions should be concise. Judges will look for quality, rather than quantity, in the advice from teams.
6. Judges must not know the real identity of the teams. Thus, throughout their submission, teams should identify themselves only by an imaginative, non-revealing code name, such as Noble Consultants.
7. In the e-mail message to which their submission is attached, teams must provide the following information. (This information will be removed when submissions are sent to the judges.)
 - a. Code name for the team
 - b. University or College of the team
 - c. School, Department or Program
 - d. Team Coach (if applicable)
 - e. Names of team members
8. Judges may take up to one month to select the best three submissions and draft feedback for all teams.

Judging Criteria for First Round Cases:

The criteria by which submissions are assessed are included below. In addition, in previous competitions the judges reported that they found it very useful to ask: “How effectively did the team answer the questions that were raised in the scenario?”

AREAS	CRITERIA	WEIGHTS
CONTENT	Relevance of material selected for case submission	10
	Presented evidence: supporting points made	15
	Presented evidence: awareness of limits of evidence	5
	Innovation regarding methods/techniques proposed	10
	Rationale of recommendations	15
	Clarity of submission	10
PRESENTATION	Organization of points (cohesive idea flow)	15
	Persuasive strength of argument	15
OTHER	At the discretion of judges, to award teams for ideas or detailed practical suggestions that go above and beyond the questions	5
TOTAL		100

February 19, 2005

Dear CES Team 2005,

Thank you for participating in the 2005 CES Student Evaluation Case Competition! Also, congratulations on the establishment of your new consulting practice! We thought that your team would be interested in the following opportunity.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is tendering a Request for Proposal (RFP) entitled Summative Evaluation of the Department of Canadian Heritage's Canada Traveling Exhibitions Indemnification Program (INDEM). The attached document contains the Breakdown of the RFP and the original RFP. The Breakdown of the RFP outlines each section of the Request for Proposal and indicates each section's relevance for your evaluation plan. The original RFP provides you with background information on the INDEM program, lists the evaluation questions, and the evaluation methodology.

The proposal that you will submit must present a coherent plan for the evaluation of INDEM. The program manager and her staff are interested in knowing how you would evaluate this program if you were hired to do this. The following elements should be addressed in your team's proposal:

1. Develop a concrete evaluation plan. Describe each of the evaluation activities that you would undertake, in chronological order.
2. Describe each of your chosen data collection tools in more detail. Explain what they are, how you would use them in this evaluation, and why you would use them.
3. Briefly discuss the challenges and opportunities that your plan presents, to highlight its strengths and weaknesses.

We look forward to receiving your submission by email later today.

Good luck!

Mike, Tsala, François, and Jenn
The 2005 CES Student Evaluation Case Competition Organizing Committee

Breakdown of Request for Proposal:

1. Request for Proposals: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
2. Requirements:
 - 2.1 Project Title: Self explanatory.
 - 2.2 Background of Program: Self explanatory.
 - 2.3 Purpose of the Evaluation: This section outlines the specific evaluation questions that should be addressed by the summative evaluation. Your proposal must address the nine specific evaluation questions but does not have to address the Treasury Board Evaluation Policy questions or the Government of Canada's seven tests for expenditure review.
 - 2.4 Evaluation Methodology: This section outlines the proposed methodology for the summative evaluation. Your team is not strictly bound to this evaluation methodology; however, your proposal should provide a rationale for omitting or changing the methodology. Wherever possible, your proposal should identify the limitations of these methods and techniques and suggest alternate methods that could improve the findings of the evaluation.
 - 2.5 Description and Scope of Work: This section outlines the activities to be carried out by the contractor. Your proposal is not strictly bound to these activities; however, your proposal should provide a rationale for omitting certain activities or engaging in different activities.
 - 2.6 Responsibilities: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
 - 2.7 Travel: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
 - 2.8 Security Requirements: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
 - 2.9 Deliverables: Your team will need to incorporate the deliverables and timeline into your evaluation plan.
 - 2.10 Meetings: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
 - 2.11 Official Languages: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
 - 2.12 Intellectual Property: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
 - 2.13 Green Procurement and Services: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
3. Communications: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.
4. Project Inquiries: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.

5. Length of Contract: For planning purposes, the contract length remains the same; however, the start and ends have been adjusted accordingly. For the purposes of the competition, the project will begin on **February 19, 2005** and end on **June 28, 2005**.

6. Offer of Service: Your proposed evaluation does not have to specifically include the aspects outlined for the technical proposal and financial proposal.

6.1 Technical Proposal: Undoubtedly, your evaluation plan will necessarily have to include some of the issues outlined in the technical proposal; however, you can safely disregard the following aspects: mandatory requirements, rated requirements, level of effort by team members and relevant experience, CV's and references.

6.2 Financial Proposal: As for the financial proposal, you need only provide a **rough** breakdown of the costs for various aspects of your evaluation plan (e.g. implementation of methodology, fees for professionals, supplies and administrative costs). Disregard the passage relating to travel expenses being subject to Treasury Board Travel Directive.

7. Budget: For the purposes of the competition, and simplicity, the budget has been rounded to \$ 50,000 (plus GST and HST). As above, the point is not to test your budgeting skills rather to ensure a consistent financial framework for all teams.

8. Selection:

8.1 Mandatory Requirements: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.

8.2 Rated Requirements: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition, your team will be assessed according to the **Judging Criteria for the First Round** posted on the Case Competition website.

8.3 Cost Proposal: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.

8.4 Selection: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.

9. Submission of Proposals: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition. Your proposals must be submitted according to the following guidelines:

The document must be emailed either as an MS Word file or a WordPerfect file (preferably in a zip file format) to casecomp@evaluationcanada.ca, mgoodyer@rogers.com and dumaine@pra.ca no later than 6 hours after the call from the organisers revealing the location of the case on the web.

For information on how to download and use winzip, please refer to the following website: <http://www.winzip.com/ddchomea.htm>

Judges **must not** know the real identity of the teams, so teams should identify themselves throughout their submission using the imaginary team name entered on the registration form.

In the e-mail message to which their submission is attached, teams must provide the following information. (This information will be removed when submissions are sent to the judges.)

- Code name for the team
- University or College of the team
- School, Department or Program
- Team Coach (if applicable)
- Names of team members

10. Bidders Information: Not applicable for the purposes of the competition.

DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

1. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Contrary to a request to tender, this is a request for proposals, with the objective of developing and submitting to the Minister of Canadian Heritage proposals that would make it possible to meet technical, performance and time frame objectives. The Minister may agree to award a contract to carry out the most acceptable proposal, as evaluated using the evaluation factors given in this request.

In addition, acceptance of the General Conditions - Services, DSS-MAS 9676 (2004-05-14) set out in the Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC), under which the bidder would be prepared to carry out the work shall be subject to the conditions set out in this request.

The SACC Manual may be obtained from the Government of Canada, Canadian Government Publishing, telephone (819) 956-4800, and may also be viewed on the Public Works and Government Services Canada website "<http://www.pwgsc.gc.ca/sacc/choice-e.html>". A copy of the said conditions can also be obtained from the contact identified on page 1.

All reference to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services should be deleted and replaced with the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Also all reference to the Department of Public Works and Government Services should be deleted and replaced with the Department of Canadian Heritage.

2. REQUIREMENTS

2.1 PROJECT TITLE

Summative Evaluation of the Department of Canadian Heritage's Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program (INDEM)

2.2 BACKGROUND OF PROGRAM

The Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program was introduced in 2000 following passage of the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Act and Regulations.

It succeeded the Insurance Program for Travelling Exhibitions, in effect from 1985 to 1996, through which the federal government contributed to insurance costs for major

travelling exhibitions in Canada. (During fiscal years 1985-86 and 1986-87, almost \$800,000 was spent on insurance).

Unlike commercial insurance, indemnification is a process whereby the government assumes financial risk for loss or damage to objects in eligible travelling exhibitions and provides compensation for damage or loss should they occur. Exposure to risk is reduced by the application of a deductible and by stringent criteria, which allow indemnification only for museums that apply the highest professional standards.

The Indemnification Program has two objectives¹:

- to increase access for Canadians to Canada's and the world's heritage through the exchange of artifacts and exhibitions in Canada; and
- to provide Canadian art galleries, museums, archives and libraries with a competitive advantage when competing for the loan of prestigious international exhibitions.

The program theory is that by assuming a major share of the financial risk, the government reduces insurance costs for travelling exhibitions, enabling institutions to present domestic and international exhibitions which otherwise might not have been possible. It is also thought that indemnification by the Canadian government makes some national governments more willing to lend works for travelling exhibitions.

Both international and domestically organized exhibitions with a minimum value of \$500,000 are eligible for indemnification. Maximum indemnification is \$450M per exhibit, and the total maximum liability for the program is \$1.5B. The deductible on indemnity coverage for each travelling exhibition is based on its total fair market value, from \$30,000 for an exhibition with total market value between \$500K and \$3M, to \$500,000 for an exhibition with fair market value between \$300,000,001 and \$450,000,000.

Expected outcomes of the program are: increased capacity of Canadian institutions to host travelling Canadian exhibitions, facilitation of the hosting of major international exhibitions, and access for Canadians to significant cultural property that might not otherwise be available to them².

Overall, Department of Canadian Heritage programs are expected to achieve two outcomes: (a) Canadians express and share their diverse cultural experiences with each other and the world, and (b) Canadians live in an inclusive society built on intercultural understanding and citizen participation.

¹Audit of the Canada Travelling Exhibition Indemnification Program, June 23, 2004

²Governing documents (1998)

Some major exhibitions indemnified by the program since 2000 include *Gustav Klimt (1862-1918) : Modernism in the making* (National Gallery of Canada), *Voyage into Myth: French Painting From Gauguin to Matisse from the Hermitage Museum* (Art Gallery of Ontario), *Treasures from a Lost Civilisation : Ancient Chinese Art from Sichuan* (Royal Ontario Museum), *Carr, O'Keefe, Kahlo: Place of Their Own* (McMichael Canadian Art Collection) and *World's Oldest Gold : Ancient Secrets, A Collection from the Varna Museum, Bulgaria* (Pointe-À-Callière, Montreal Museum of Natural History).

INDEM is delivered by the Department's Heritage Policy Branch at a cost of \$200K/year for salaries (3 FTEs) and administration (reduced from \$300K/year in 2000).

Institutions submit indemnification applications on behalf of all Canadian institutions that will host the exhibition for which indemnification is requested. PCH program officers assess applications, using external expert advice as required. The indemnification agreements are signed by the Minister and by the owners of the artifacts (often governments of other countries).

Institutions hosting travelling exhibitions must have their facilities approved for security, fire safety and preventive conservation, including environmental controls. The Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI), a special operating agency of the Department of Canadian Heritage with a mandate to promote the proper care and preservation of Canada's cultural heritage and to advance the practice, science and technology of conservation, undertakes this review of controls on behalf of the INDEM program.

As of September 2004, the facilities of 22 Canadian institutions had met the requirements for indemnification, and 41 exhibitions had been indemnified to travel to 83 venues, at which there were five million visitors. Total indemnification was approximately \$6.2B. No claims have been submitted.

From May 2000 to September 2004, the number of indemnification applications and approved indemnifications were as follows:

Year	# applications	# applications withdrawn/rejected	# applications approved/indemnified	# indemnified venues	# venues not indemnified	# indemnified exhibits with fair market value > \$450M	# claims
1999-00	6	2	0	0	0	0	0
2000-01	11	2	11	22	3	1	0
2001-02	10	3	7	14	2	1	0
2002-03	15	3	14	26	5	1	0
2003-04	10	4	6	8	0	0	0
2004-05	5	0	3	3	0	0	0
Total	57*	14	41	73	10	3	0

*two applications were under review at the time this document was prepared

2.3 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

A summative evaluation of the Canada Travelling Exhibition Indemnification Program (INDEM) is required for a Departmental report to the Parliamentary Committee that will review administration of the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Act, five years after its coming into force on December 15, 1999.

The Contractor is required to provide evidence-based answers to the Treasury Board Evaluation Policy questions relating to program relevance (*i.e. Is the program still consistent with departmental and government-wide needs and does it realistically address an actual need?*), success (*i.e., Is the program effective in meeting objectives, within budget and without unwanted consequences?*), and cost-effectiveness (*i.e., Are the most appropriate and efficient means being used to achieve objectives relative to alternative design and delivery approaches?*), and to take account of the seven tests for expenditure review announced by the Government of Canada on December 16, 2003.

Specific evaluation questions are:

Relevance

1. To what extent is there still a need for the indemnification of travelling exhibitions in Canada?
2. Is indemnification of travelling exhibitions still consistent with federal objectives/priorities?

Success

3. What results has the program had since 2000 in terms of:
 - providing access for Canadians to Canada's and the world's heritage through the exchange of artifacts and exhibitions in Canada?
 - providing Canadian art galleries, museums, archives and libraries with a competitive advantage when competing for the loan of prestigious exhibitions?
4. Would travelling exhibitions have been possible without INDEM?
5. Have there been other positive or negative impacts of the program, e.g. improved collection care standards?

Cost-effectiveness/Alternatives

6. Are there ways the *design* of the INDEM Program could be improved or made more cost effective? Would legislative changes be required?
7. Are there ways the *implementation* of the INDEM Program could be improved or made more cost-effective? Would legislative changes be required?
8. Is/are there any other programs that overlap with or duplicate INDEM?
9. Is output and outcome information being collected by the department sufficient to support impact measurement and reporting?

2.4 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Contractor is expected to use multiple lines of evidence. The following methodology is proposed, however bidders have the option of suggesting improvements in their proposals.

1. Document and Literature Review:

A thorough review of Cabinet documents, TB submissions, the Act and Regulations, program guidelines, policies and procedures documents, the draft program RMAF, program data on applications and approved projects since 1999-2000, information about travelling exhibitions indemnification programs in four other countries (U.S., U.K. New Zealand and Australia), project files, and a summary of International Indemnity Programs prepared by the Mori Arts Centre Summary in 2002.

2. Survey of Eligible Institutions (n = 100)

Program staff estimate that there are approximately 100 Canadian institutions that develop travelling exhibitions large enough to be considered for indemnification by the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program, including 22 that have submitted indemnification applications. The 100 organizations will be surveyed. For those that did not apply, the survey will explore reasons for not applying.

3. Analysis of institutions' insurance savings on indemnified exhibitions

A calculation of financial savings to indemnified institutions as a result of indemnifications by the INDEM Program by an individual with actuarial experience/expertise.

4. Key Informant Interviews

Fourteen to sixteen in-depth key informant interviews with: representatives of PCH (n=2-3), umbrella service organizations for museums, art galleries, etc., that are potential applicants (n=2-3), representatives of indemnification

programs in four other countries (N=4), representatives of museums/galleries whose projects were not indemnified and museums/galleries with exhibitions that could have been considered for indemnification but did not apply (n=5), and a representative of CCI (n=1).

2.5 DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF THE WORK

The contractor is expected to carry out the following activities:

1) Planning:

- Attend a meeting with the Project Authority and the Evaluation Project Working Group
- Review strategic program and policy documents, including Cabinet Documents and the Act, the Mori report, and a sample of program files
- Interview the Program Manager, the Program Director, and the Executive Director of the Branch (n=3)
- Develop and submit for approval a project work plan that includes:
 - a list of indicators for the evaluation questions
 - evaluation tools, including interview guides, a grid to be used to compare INDEM to other countries' programs, and a grid to measure insurance savings of indemnified institutions
 - a detailed time frame for the completion of all activities

2) Document Review:

- Review, in addition to documents listed above, an evaluation report on Programme d'assurance pour les expositions itinérantes (1987), general program information, application guidelines, a draft program RMAF (2003-04), a 2004 audit report on the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program (2004), Department of Canadian Heritage reports provided twice annually to Department of Finance on the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program, project files, and any other relevant documents identified through the research
- Provide a report presenting data collected (organized around evaluation questions)

3) Key Informant Interviews:

- Conduct 12 to 13 key informant interviews with: umbrella service organizations for museums, art galleries, etc. that are potential applicants (n=2-3); representatives of indemnification programs in four other countries (n=4); representatives of museums/galleries with exhibitions eligible for INDEM that did not apply (n=5); and a representative of CCI (n=1)
- Provide a report presenting information collected (organized around evaluation questions)

4) Analysis of indemnified institutions' insurance savings:

- Calculate savings to indemnified institutions resulting from indemnifications provided by the program
- Provide a report presenting information collected

5) Preliminary Findings

- Analyse information, resolve contradictions, and provide a deck giving preliminary findings
- Present preliminary findings to PCH representatives (senior management and the evaluation working group)

6) Draft Report

- Prepare and submit a draft report, including recommendations

7) Final Report

- Revise the draft report and submit a final report, including an executive summary.

2.6 RESPONSIBILITIES

A working group has been established for this evaluation. It includes the Project Authority from the Corporate Review Branch (Evaluation Services Directorate) and a representative of the Heritage Programs Branch.

2.7 TRAVEL

Depending on the location of the contractor's offices, travel may be required for meetings with the project authority and program representatives. Travel arrangements and expenses are the responsibility of the contractor, and shall be included in the price of the contract.

2.8 SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

At least one team member who will do the document review must have a valid government security clearance at the 'Secret' level at the time of submitting the bid and throughout the period of the project.

The rest of the members of the consultant's team for the project must have at least a Reliability Status prior to commencing work.

For proposed team members, bidders should provide the following information as part of their proposal, for each team member proposed:

- a) Name of individual as it appears on security clearance application form;
- b) Date of birth;
- c) Level of security clearance obtained;
- d) Valid period of security clearance obtained;
- e) Security Screen Certificate and Briefing Form file number;
- f) Name of federal government department from which security clearance was obtained.

2.9 DELIVERABLES

The contractor will be required to:

- provide a detailed work plan and supporting documents ten working days after the contract is awarded
- provide weekly status reports to the project authority
- provide separate reports presenting data obtained from each line of inquiry (document review, survey of eligible institutions, key informant interviews, analysis of indemnified institutions' insurance savings)
- provide a deck with and presentation of preliminary findings
- provide a draft report including a presentation of the methodology and evidence-based answers to the research questions
- provide a final report including conclusions, recommendations and an executive summary

The contractor will develop documents in MS-Word (compatible with Windows 2000) and provide both electronic and hard copies. The final report will be in a format provided by PCH, with no company logos.

The timelines below provide information on due dates for deliverables and payments:

Milestones	Deadlines	Payments
Detailed workplan and supporting documents	February 3, 2005	25%
Line of inquiry reports	April 20, 2005	40%
Preliminary results presentation	April 27, 2005	n/a
First draft report	May 5 or 6, 2005	n/a
Final report	May 28, 2005	35%

2.10 MEETINGS

The Contractor must personally meet with the Evaluation Working Group for the project at the headquarters of the Department of Canadian Heritage in Gatineau for initiating the project. This first meeting will allow the consultant and the evaluation working group to have a common understanding of the project parameters and to review the proposed time frame. The Contractor may be required to attend other meetings for the project if necessary due to special or unforeseen circumstances.

2.11 OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Canadian Heritage is under the obligation to respect the spirit and the letter of the *Official Languages Act*. It is, therefore, imperative that the bidder's team include individuals with proficient abilities in both official languages in order to communicate verbally and in writing in the preferred official language of the participants.

The work will be conducted in English and French, and tools for collecting information must be produced in both official languages. The draft and final reports will be produced in English. During the presentation of the preliminary conclusions, the firm must be able to answer all questions in either official language.

2.12 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Canadian Heritage has determined that any intellectual property arising from the performance of the Work under the Contract will vest in Canada, on the following grounds: The main purpose of the deliverables contracted for is to generate knowledge/information for public dissemination (exception 6.4.1). The full policy is available at the Treasury Board of Secretariat website at the following address: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca> under Policies in the Contracting Policy Section.

2.13 GREEN PROCUREMENT AND SERVICES

The Contractor should make every effort to ensure that all documents prepared or delivered are printed double-sided on Ecologo certified recycled paper or on paper with equivalent post-consumer recycled content, to the full extent to which it is procurable.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

During the contract period the Contractor must remain in regular contact with the Project Authority from Corporate Review Branch in Canadian Heritage, either by telephone or in person, to ensure that the project is progressing well.

4. PROJECT INQUIRIES

All enquiries concerning this RFP must be submitted to the Contract Advisor named on page 1 as early as possible within the bidding period. Enquiries must be received no less than five (5) working days prior to the bid closing date to allow sufficient time to provide a response. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered prior to bid closing date. Questions and responses will be provided via the MERX Service to all Bidders requesting bid packages from the MERX Service. To ensure confidentiality, names of firms/individuals submitting questions will not be divulged.

No questions will be answered for the period between December 25, 2004 and January 3, 2005.

All enquiries and other communications with government officials throughout the solicitation period are to be directed ONLY to the Contract Advisor named on page 1. Non-compliance with this condition during the solicitation period may (for that reason only) result in disqualification of your bid.

5. LENGTH OF THE CONTRACT

The project will begin on or around January 20, 2005 and be completed by May 28, 2005.

6. OFFER OF SERVICE

Bidders are invited to draft concise proposals. Proposals can be submitted in the preferred official language of the bidder. **Any offer of service must be submitted in two separate envelopes:**

6.1 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (Envelope 1)

The technical proposal shall deal with the following aspects:

- Mandatory requirements
- rated requirements
- work plan and timetable
- proposed work methods
- progress reports
- level of effort by team members
- relevant experience , CV's and references

6.2 FINANCIAL PROPOSAL (Envelope 2)

Bidders must provide:

- A fixed fee, inclusive of all expenses, except travel expenses, and;
- An estimated cost for travel expenses. Travel expenses are subject to Treasury Board Travel Directive which can be viewed on the Treasury Board website http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/hr-rh/gtla-vgcl/index_e.asp , and will be reimbursed upon submission of original receipts.

While bidders must submit their bid on a firm price basis, they must also provide breakdowns of costs such as per diem fees for professionals, administrative costs, supplies and other project-related costs.

The price quoted is to be exclusive of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) or the Harmonized Sales Tax (HST). (Please indicate separately.) Please provide your GST/HST Registration, if applicable.

7. BUDGET

The maximum budget available for this project is \$ 46,500 (plus GST or HST). Any financial proposal over this amount will result in the bid being deemed non-compliant.

8. SELECTION

8.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

In order for proposals to be accepted for further evaluation, all of the following mandatory requirements **must** be met.

M 1	Financial proposal: The maximum budget available for this project is \$46,500 (plus GST or HST). Any financial proposal over this amount will result in the bid being deemed non-compliant and the technical proposal will be not evaluated.
M 2	Security: At least one team member who will perform the document review must have a valid government security clearance at the Secret level.
M 3	Official Languages: Bidders must demonstrate the capacity to conduct interviews, surveys, review documentation, and provide preliminary results in either official language. The proposal must clearly indicate the bilingual capability of each team member.
M 4	Provide 3 copies of a final report (value of at least \$40 000) of a <u>summative</u> evaluation project directed by the proposed Project Manager within the last three years.
M 5	Certification must be provided that information with respect to the above mandatory requirements is true and accurate, and that the personnel referred to in the proposal are available to perform the tasks described within the allotted time. This certification would be in the form of a letter signed by the principal.

8.2 RATED REQUIREMENTS

The successful proposal shall be chosen on the basis of the information requested. Bidders must provide detailed information addressing each of the evaluation criteria subject to a point rating as set out in below. Criteria not addressed will be given a score of 0.

An overall minimum score of 70%, and minimum scores of 70% in approach and methodology (R2), qualifications and experience (R3), and work plan and quality control (R4) will be required for the proposal to be judged valid and responsive.

	REQUIREMENTS	Max. Score	Min. Score
R1	<p>Content Knowledge The proposal demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program and its context. The proposal will be assessed for knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) travelling exhibition indemnification programs in general and the potential clientele for the Canadian program (15 points); b) the policy context in which the program is delivered (5 points). 	20	n/a
R2	<p>Approach and Methodology The proposal outlines the approach and specific tasks to be undertaken to complete all aspects of the project, including the analysis and resolution of any contradictions between line of inquiry reports. This information is presented in sufficient detail and is related specifically to the requirements of the project to allow a complete understanding of the approach to the work and the characteristics of the deliverables to be produced. Information will cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A detailed approach to each part of the project (15 points) b) Expected degree of success of each line of inquiry (strengths, weaknesses, possible alternatives/improvements), and overall challenges in answering evaluation questions (15 points). 	30	21
R3	<p>Qualifications and Experience The proposal includes a CV for each proposed team member and information on the contribution this person would make. Note that the example of final report (see M4) of a summative evaluation also will be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Education and training of each team member, including actuarial education/training (10 points); b) Experience of each team member and the firm as a whole in the evaluation of federal programs (10 points); c) Experience of team members and the firm as a whole in evaluation or research relating to heritage programs (10 points). 	30	21
R4	<p>Work Plan and Quality Control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is a master work plan for completion of work phases and tasks that shows the bidder's capacity to complete work 	30	21

	REQUIREMENTS	Max. Score	Min. Score
	within the expected timeframe (10 points); b) The work plan includes a table showing how the team is structured (e.g., names, titles, roles, levels of responsibility) and the planned level of effort for each individual, and senior team members are actively involved (10 points); c) The proposal demonstrates the bidder's capacity to ensure completeness, accuracy and overall high quality of deliverables (10 points).		
R5	Quality of the Technical Proposal The proposal is clear, concise, well-written and easy to understand (10 points).	10	n/a
TOTAL		120	84

8.3 COST PROPOSAL

All proposals will be rated on technical acceptability before the price is considered. The best-value-for-money proposal will be chosen, which may not necessarily be the lowest overall cost proposal.

8.4 SELECTION

The best-value-for-money will be determined as follows:

80% will be given to technical merit and 20% will be given to price. The compliant bidder with the highest rating, combining technical merit (**80%**) and price (**20%**) shall be selected as the successful bidder (see Table 1 for example)

	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
STEP 1 Technical Score (R1 to R5)	99	95	88
STEP 2 Price Quoted	\$46,300	\$42,800	\$40,000

STEP 3 CALCULATION			
	Rated Technical Points (80%)	Rated Financial Points (20%)	Total Points
Bidder 1	$\frac{99}{*99} \times 80 = 80$	$\frac{**40,000}{17.26 \times 46,300} \times 20 =$	97.26
Bidder 2	$\frac{95}{*99} \times 80 = 76.8$	$\frac{**40,000}{18.68 \times 42,800} \times 20 =$	95.48
Bidder 3	$\frac{88}{71.12 \times *99} \times 80 =$	$\frac{**40,000}{40,000} \times 20 = 20$	91.12
<p>* Represents the highest technical score ** Represents the lowest price proposal</p>			
<p>ASSUMPTION: Three valid bids have been received. The maximum technical score that can be obtained is 120 points. The highest technical score will receive full rated technical points (80) and the lowest price proposal will receive full rated financial points (20), other proposals are prorated accordingly.</p> <p>The winner is the bidder scoring the highest Total Points established by adding the rated technical and the rated financial points. Based on the above calculation, a contract would be awarded to Bidder 1.</p>			

9. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Bidders are requested to submit 4 copies of their technical proposal and 2 copies of their financial proposal (**using the 2 envelope system**) to (see page 1 for complete address) no later than

It is the **responsibility of the bidders to ensure that proposals are received at the required address before the closing date and time.** A signed covering letter is to accompany your proposal.

PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED AFTER Friday, January 14, 2005 2:00 P.M., EASTERN TIME AND WILL BE RETURNED UNOPENED TO THE SENDER.

10 **BIDDERS INFORMATION**

- 10.1 The Minister of Canadian Heritage reserves the right to choose the firm that best meets the requirements, as described above, without incurring any obligation to any other firms having responded to this request for proposals. The proposal that is lowest in cost shall not necessarily be chosen.
- 10.2 It is essential that **item 6** of the present document be fully described in the proposal. Any failure to provide information shall work to the disadvantage of the bidder.
- 10.3 The bidder's proposal must conform to the stipulated format. If bidders feel that certain items restrict them in some way, they must indicate this in their proposals. Any deviation from the conditions laid down in this document must be described in detail with supporting arguments.
- 10.4 The person responsible for the contract reserves the right to accept any proposal without negotiating with the bidder. It is the responsibility of the bidder to obtain all information on the project before bidding.
- 10.5 No proposal jointly submitted by two or more candidates will be accepted. However, a proposal submitted by one candidate as project lead who subcontracts part of the work to another candidate will be accepted, provided that the potential sub-contractor withdraws from the competition by not submitting a proposal.
- 10.6 Bids remain valid for *90 days* after the closing date.
- 10.7 Canadian Heritage has committed itself to increase contracting actions between the federal government and Aboriginal businesses in accordance with The Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business. In order to assist Canadian Heritage in reporting contracting activities with Aboriginal businesses, it is important that Aboriginal bidders identify themselves as such by completing and providing appropriate Certification Requirements which have been developed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. For additional information on the Strategy and the forms to be completed, please contact the Senior Contracting Officer identified on Page 1.