

THE PEST MANAGEMENT REGULATORY AGENCY

COST RECOVERY INITIATIVE

TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DECISIONS

JUNE 12, 2003

Ottawa, Ontario

**THE PEST MANAGEMENT REGULATORY AGENCY
TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE
RECORD OF DECISIONS
THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 2003**

ATTENDANCE

Members: Robert Woods (Committee Chairperson/PMRA); Brad Buxton (Health Canada); Walter Zubrycky (Health Canada); Randy Legault (Treasury Board Secretariat); Chuck A. Beach (S.C. Johnson & Son Ltd.); Len Ritter (University of Guelph); Peter McLeod (CropLife Canada)

Regrets: Nicole Howe (Canadian Federation of Agriculture)

The following was sent as an e-mail by Bob Woods to the committee members on June 16, 2003:

I am sending you by courier, a strike-out/redline version of the RFP dated June 12, 2003 reflecting the changes we agreed to. Included are revised versions of the List of Acronyms, the Data Source Summary and the Bid Selection Process reflecting the changes in 2 to 9 below. **PLEASE REMEMBER THAT THE RFP IS A CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT AND IS NOT TO BE SHARED WITH ANYONE.**

YOUR THOUGHTS PLEASE: With respect to Statement of Work 2b) where we changed from "three key cost recovered activities" to "the Agency's five business lines", I have added the words "where possible" because pre-post comparisons will likely not be possible for the Sustainable Pest Management and Business Line Improvements business lines. In light of this, I would prefer to stay with what we had and add Peter's suggestion of "one of which must be the New Products Evaluation activity". What do you think?

In addition, we agreed to the following:

1. The decision to put a dollar/budget figure in the RFP was left to Bob Woods. I will get back to you.
2. To change CMCS to CCSPA on the list of acronyms.
3. To add the following external data source to the Data Source Summary: Stakeholders such as CropLife Canada, CCSPA and specific registrants.

We agreed to make the following changes to the Bid Selection Process document:

4. Consistently use the term Cost Recovery Initiative (CRI).
5. page 1 of 13: Change the minimum points required from 70% to 80% for the Technical and Management Proposal components.

6. Page 2 of 13: Table 2, Mandatory Requirements #1a): put in at the "Canadian" federal level.
7. Page 4 of 13: Technical Proposal #1: add the words "and Charging" to the title of the TB policy on cost recovery.
8. Page 6 of 13: Technical Proposal #3a): specify where in the RFP the tasks and sub-tasks are.
9. Page 9 of 13: Management Proposal #2: specify that the evaluation will consider only the primary members of the team.
10. Peter MacLeod, Brad Buxton, Bob Woods and Jim Smeall will evaluate the bids and present a recommendation to the TSC which will in turn make a recommendation to the Executive Director of the PMRA.

Please consider this e-mail and the draft RFP dated June 12, 2003 as the record of our meeting.

Have a look at the draft RFP and the 10 points above and confirm your agreement or provide me with corrections by June 20, 2003. Please copy everyone with your reply.

The following was sent as an e-mail by Bob Woods to the committee members on July 10, 2003:

MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE

Please refer to my e-mail of June 16, 2003:

I have now received concurrence from most of you and am proceeding with the RFP and Bid Selection Process documents as you saw them in the strike-out and red-line versions, that I couriered to you on June 16, 2003, with the following 2 changes:

1. Please refer to the 4th paragraph of my June 16th e-mail which deals with Statement of Work 2b). I have decided to go with the review of the 5 business lines and to remove the words "where possible". This will provide specific instructions for the bidders and will minimize and possibly eliminate the potential of having to evaluate different bids.
2. Please refer to item #1 on my e-mail of June 16th. I have decided to put in a dollar figure of \$175,000.

Janice Hopkins and I proposed the RFP to Claire Franklin and she accepted it.

The RFP closing date will be a specific day of the week of August 25th. The precise day hinges on when the RFP is posted. There will be an opportunity for a bidder's conference which may result in an extension to the closing date. This will depend on the number and complexity of questions. Experience has shown that bidders sometimes ask for an extension for various reasons, one being staff on summer holidays. A reasonable extension is 10 days. Jim will have a good idea in mid August what the likely closing date will be. At that time I will propose some dates for the bid evaluation after which I will be able to establish a timetable for the completion of the project.

Thank you for your continued support. I will keep you apprised.