

List of Respondents to RSO ON-008771

Advertising Research

- Ipsos
- Environics
- Insights West
- R.A. Malatest
- Viewpoints Research
- Strategic Communications
- Mustel Research Group
- Innovative Research
- NRG Research Group
- Justason Market
- Media Comm

Advertising

- Camp Pacific L.P.
- Captus Advertising
- DDB Canada
- GREY Vancouver
- NOW Communications Group Inc.
- Point Blank Creative
- Saint Bernadine Mission Communications Inc.
- Suburbia Studio
- Traction Creative Communications
- Trapeze Communications Inc.
- Hogan Millar Media Inc.
- Media Com
- Hamazaki Wong Marketing Group Ltd.
- cStreet Campaings Inc.
- KIMBO Design Inc.
- Spring Advertising
- Hot Tomali
- Latitude Agency Ltd.

Evaluation Workbook

RSO ON-008771 Advertising Research Services

Date: December 5th, 2017

Evaluator: Robb Gibbs, Kathryn LeSueur, Dan Pollock

RSO ON-008771 - Advertising Research Services

1 Introduction

Respondents spend a significant amount of time preparing and supporting the offers they submit to provide professional and technical services to the British Columbia Government. The Government benefits from this investment since it contributes both quality and choice to government's plans. In return for this effort, Respondents are entitled to a full and fair evaluation. Since evaluation is inherently judgement, significant care is required to manage the objective and subjective dimensions of the process. This guide is intended to help address this requirement.

1.1 Proposal Evaluation Process and Rules

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of evaluators that will represent the **Province**.

These rules will guide the evaluation:

1. Purchasing Services shall be responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation and may establish such rules or procedures as it may reasonably determine are required. An evaluation chair person will be established.
2. The evaluators shall be the same people from the beginning to the end of the evaluation. Further, each evaluator will remain consistent in the section(s) they evaluate from each proposal.
3. Evaluators shall not discuss any aspect of the evaluation or share any information submitted, including proposals and other documents, with anyone other than other members of the evaluation team.
4. Purchasing Services will be the custodian of all documents received by the Province. Proposals and related documents will be returned to Purchasing Services at the completion of the process.
5. Prior to detailed evaluation of the proposals, one or more members of the evaluation team will review the submissions to ensure that all mandatory criteria have been met. If all mandatory criteria are not met, this will be documented and the proposal will not be
6. For each proposal that meets the mandatory criteria, the evaluators will review that submission without reference to any other of the proposals made, with the exception of price.
7. Drawing solely upon the information specified within the RSO, each evaluator will assign a score to each criterion and that score will be discussed with evaluators. A final score will be determined by consensus.
8. All efforts will be made to achieve consensus. In the event that consensus cannot be reached, the final score will be the whole number from the evaluation scoring system closest to the average of the evaluators' scores.
9. Any comments pertinent to the assessment of the criteria will be entered into the guidebook for review with the Respondent at the
10. All questions about the evaluation made, during or following the evaluation, by persons who are not part of the evaluation, shall be referred to the evaluation chair.
11. Questions for Respondents arising as part of the evaluation process will be documented. The evaluation chair will handle all communication between Respondents and the evaluation team.

Scoring Methodology

This RSO is structured to solicit a response from Respondents that will provide evaluators sufficient information to assess a firms or individuals experience against the criteria that was defined in the RSO

Due to the subjective nature of this assessment, it is essential that evaluators enter into the appropriate place in this evaluation workbook any comments, which qualify the score awarded.

Each requirement has been assigned a weight prior to the evaluation commencing. This weight is displayed in column D in the following worksheet. Evaluators will make an assessment of the Response's ability to satisfy a requirement and will assign a score by consensus according to the following scale:

Description	Description	Score
Response clearly Exceeds Requirements: several exceptional features are offered that exceeds the requirements qualitatively.	Strongly Exceeds	5
Response somewhat exceeds Requirements	Somewhat Exceeds	4
Response meets Requirements: the majority of the factors for this requirement are acceptable	Meets requirements	3
Response contains minor deficiencies, or only arguable meets the requirements	Some deficiencies	2
Response contains several deficiencies	Several deficiencies	1
Response is unacceptable: or requirement was not addressed in the proposal	Unacceptable	0

		Media Comm	
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
MANDATORY CRITERIA			
a) The Response must be received at the closing location by the specified closing date and time on the title page of this Request for Standing Offer.	Yes or NO	Yes	Media Comm responded to both RSO's. Samples for Advertising Services have been included with this one. 3 copies submitted of hard copy response.
b) The Response must be in English and must not be sent by facsimile or e-mail.	Yes or NO	Yes	
c) Three (3) complete paper copies and 1 electronic copy USB media (MS Word or .PDF format) of the written Response, plus three (3) USB media devices each containing same copies of all work samples must be submitted.	Yes or NO	Yes	
d) A separate complete Response applicable to the service area must be submitted under each service area should Respondents choose to respond to more than one service area.	Yes or NO	Yes	
e) The Response must include a cover letter substantially similar to the cover letter set out in Section 6.1 and the cover letter must be signed by a person authorized to sign on behalf of the Respondent.	Yes or NO	Yes	
DESIRABLE CRITERIA		s.17	
6.2.2 Corporate Capability & Capacity			
Respondent must provide a completed Respondent Profile.	FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY - NOT EVALUTED		
1. State your ability and method of attendance at any meeting originating in Victoria or Vancouver BC called by GCPE at reasonably short notice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrated ability to occasionally attend meetings in Victoria or Vancouver - have offices within a 2-3 hr travel to Victoria or Vancouver - provide assurance of appropriate individuals availability to attend meetings with little notice 		
2. Outline your firm's policies and procedures concerning dispute resolution with clients. A clearly identified document may also be attached to your response.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - formal dispute resolution policies and procedures have been identified - demonstrates that policies and procedures have been formalized and proven effective - clear reporting structure is identified - demonstrates dispute resolution process can achieve results 		
3.State the names of any BC located advertising/marketing industry firms with key contact name, phone and e-mail with which you have or could have established business relationships.	- demonstrated experience working with the BC advertising/marketing industry		
4. State your agency's approach to a small, low budget project and contrast that to an extensive research project.	approach is client focused, demonstrates flexibility, scalability and streamlines approach to meet budget and timeline while meeting expectations		
7. Corporate information overview of the Respondent firm, e.g. types of service, length of time in business and accomplishments.	should have been in business for at least three years providing Research Services as stated in the RSO.		
Provide an organizational chart.	FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY - NOT EVALUTED		
6.3.2 Personnel Experience and Qualifications			
Account Manager - fully describe how this individual meets or exceeds GCPE's expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a single key individual who is proposed to be the Account Manager for the term of the Standing Offer 		
	-Account Manager will have overall responsibility for the Contract, the authority required to make decisions regarding service delivery		

		Media Comm	
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
	- Account Manager should be easily accessible to GCPE to resolve issues that may arise during the term of the Contract	s.17	
State your firm's contingency plan should the account manager named become unexpectedly unavailable.	Plan should be available and reasonable		
Supporting Personnel	personnel proposed complement the services the Offeror would be required to perform. (see section 5.4)		
6.4.2 Unique Offering			
Provide a statement on how your agency would be able to provide a unique offering and how this unique offering would differentiate your company from the competition in providing research services to GCPE.	for example: 'may include online tools (i.e. survey), statistical data repositories or rapid access to large or specific market information. s.17		
6.5.2 Portfolio / Work Samples			
10. Please provide a case study that demonstrates your work experience and the ability to produce optimal and cost-effective advertising research while being results-focussed. The case study should be a recent example (within the past two years) of a research project that was planned and executed by your organization (including members of the team proposed for our business). The case study should demonstrate your ability to conduct and integrate both qualitative and quantitative research with preference being given to an example related to a social marketing campaign. Evaluators should review the case study and determine how the example satisfies requirements.	- Provided a case study that demonstrates work experience and the ability to produce optimal and cost-effective advertising research while being results-focussed. Research objectives are clearly stated. - The case study is a recent example (within the past two years) of a research project that was planned and executed by the organization (including members of the team proposed for our business). - The case study demonstrates ability to conduct and integrate both qualitative and quantitative research with preference being given to an example related to a social marketing campaign.		
6.6.2 Pricing			
CLIENT SERVICES		s.21	
Account Services (Primary day-to-day contact – Account Manager)			
Account Services (Alternate to Account Manager)			
Junior Personnel			
Research Director or Management			
Data Analysis			
Questionnaire Design Hours			
Writing Services			
Moderator Guide Development			
Call Centre Services			
Note Taking			
Report Writing Services			
Focus Group Moderation			

		Media Comm	
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Weights Total		TOTAL	s.21
Rank		s.17	

R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd.		Mustel research Group Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope contains 1 USB.	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope contains 1 USB.
Yes		Yes	
68.6		s.17	
10.4			
4	Comments: Location in Victoria, able to attend meetings within short notice. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Too complex. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
0	Comments: Not addressed. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3.5	Comments: Different approaches for different size project and composition vs Contingency planning. VP is assigned as project advisor. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Met requirements Strengths: Weaknesses:		
12.5			
3.5	Comments: Personnel identified has 20 years experience. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Met requirements. Strengths: Weaknesses:		

R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd.		Mustel research Group Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21
4	Rank	s.17	
	No demonstrated experience with Advertising Research. Missed connection with advertising. Lowest pricing.		

NRG Research Group Inc.		Viewpoints Research Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope, 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope contains 1 USB.
Yes		Yes	
		68.3	
		15.4	
		3	Comments: Based in Winnipeg and, willingness to use technology to communicate with clients. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		4	Comments: Follows government dispute resolution processes. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		4	Comments: Provided several examples, and also provided some contact information. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		4	Comments: Listed several strategies to maximize value on small projects. Actually stated what they can do. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		4	Comments: In business since 1986. Clearly demonstrated their ability to get to the core of behaviour change. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		13.8	
		4	Comments: Leslie Turnbull 26 years Strengths: Weaknesses:
		3.5	Comments: Co-owner as back-up. Strengths: Weaknesses:

s.17

NRG Research Group Inc.		Viewpoints Research Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21
s.17		5	Rank
			Answers were clearly and in synclly demonstrated.

Environics Research Group		Innovative Research Group Inc.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope contains 1 USB.	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope contains 1 USB.
Yes		Yes	
70.9		s.17	
13.7			
3	Comments: Strengths: Would use technology for meetings if cannot attend in person. Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Met requirements. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
4	Comments: Well demonstrated with multi firms and clients, good variety. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths: Use of IVR methodology for small projects and focus groups for others. Weaknesses:		
4	Comments: In business since 1970. Bench strength is strong and varied. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
13.9			
4	Comments: Derek Leeboosh 28 years Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Met requirements. Strengths: Weaknesses:		

Environics Research Group		Innovative Research Group Inc.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21
2	Rank	s.17	
	Answers were clearly and in syncly demonstrated.		

Justason Market Intelligence Inc.		Ipsos	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope, 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope contains 1 USB response, 1 envelope contains 3 USBs samples
Yes		Yes	
		72.0	
		15.6	
		4	Comments: Flexible, will accommodate, provided details, utilizes skype for business Strengths: Weaknesses:
		3.5	Comments: Clear reporting structure defined. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		4	Comments: Extensive list of BC partners and variety. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		3.5	Comments: Senior staff engaged with projects and they take sole ownership. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		4.5	Comments: Strengths: Since 1975, worldwide company 7 offices in Canada, 617 staff in Canada Weaknesses:
		14.4	
		4	Comments: Kyle Braid 25 years. Strengths: Weaknesses:
		3.5	Comments: Extensive government experience. Strengths: Weaknesses:

s.17

Justason Market Intelligence Inc.			Ipsos		
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
TOTAL	s.21		TOTAL	s.21	
s.17			1	Rank	

Strategic Communications Inc.		Insights West	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope, 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.	Yes	3 hard copies, 1 single USB with RSO submission, no separate samples included.
Yes		Yes	
67.3		69.3	
14.0		14.1	
3.5	Comments: Indicated they will be available and provided extensive details. Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Met requirements. Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Offer discounts. Strengths: Weaknesses:	3.5	Comments: Well documented policy Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	Comments: Extensive list provided and variety of firms. Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: No contact information provided. Strengths: Weaknesses:
3.5	Comments: Realistic, not extensive, but strong resolutions provided. Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Senior staff, appropriate involvement in projects. Strengths: Weaknesses:
3.5	Comments: Since 1991 with 8 full time and 6 senior dedicated to BC Gov't work. Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Since 2012, experienced core bench, 21 staff. Strengths: Weaknesses:
14.0		14.0	
3.5	Comments: Stephanie Lynn 20 years. Strengths: Weaknesses:	3.5	Comments: Mario Canseco 12 years. Well demonstrated. Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Account Managers extensive experience. Strengths: Weaknesses:

Strategic Communications Inc.		Insights West	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21
6	Rank	3	Rank

		Media Comm	R.A. Malatest & Mustel research Group Ltd.	NRG Research Group Inc.	Viewpoints Research Ltd.
Evaluation Criteria	Section weight				
DESIRABLE CRITERIA	TOTAL	s.17	68.6	s.17	68.3
6.2.2 Corporate Capability & Capacity	20		10.4		15.4
6.3.2 Personnel Experience and Qualifications	20		12.5		13.8
6.4.2 Unique Offering	15		9.0		12.0
6.5.2 Portfolio / Work Samples	25		16.7		18.3
6.6.2 Pricing	20		20.0		8.8
	Rank		4		5

- Ipsos 1
- Environics 2
- Insights West 3
- R.A. Malatest 4
- Viewpoints Research 5
- Strategic Communications 6

s.17

Environics Research Group	Innovative Research Group Inc.	Justason Market Intelligence Inc.	Ipsos	Strategic Communications Inc.	Insights West
70.9	s.17		72.0	67.3	69.3
13.7			15.6	14.0	14.1
13.9			14.4	14.0	14.0
12.0			13.5	12.0	12.0
18.3			19.2	16.7	16.7
13.0			9.4	10.7	12.5
2			1	6	3

Evaluation Workbook

**RSO ON-008771
Advertising Services**

Date: _____

Evaluator: _____

RSO ON-008771 - Advertising Services

1 Introduction

Respondents spend a significant amount of time preparing and supporting the offers they submit to provide professional and technical services to the British Columbia Government. The Government benefits from this investment since it contributes both quality and choice to government's plans. In return for this effort, Respondents are entitled to a full and fair evaluation. Since evaluation is inherently judgement, significant care is required to manage the objective and subjective dimensions of the process. This guide is intended to help address this requirement.

1.1 Response Evaluation Process and Rules

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of evaluators that will represent the **Province**.

These rules will guide the evaluation:

1. Purchasing Services shall be responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation and may establish such rules or procedures as it may reasonably determine are required. An evaluation chair person will be established.
2. The evaluators shall be the same people from the beginning to the end of the evaluation. Further, each evaluator will remain consistent in the section(s) they evaluate from each response.
3. Evaluators shall not discuss any aspect of the evaluation or share any information submitted, including responses and other documents, with anyone other than other members of the evaluation team.
4. Purchasing Services will be the custodian of all documents received by the Province. Responses and related documents will be returned to Purchasing Services at the completion of the process.
5. Prior to detailed evaluation of the responses one or more members of the evaluation team will review the submissions to ensure that all mandatory criteria have been met. If all mandatory criteria are not met, this will be documented and the responses will not be further
6. For each response that meets the mandatory criteria, the evaluators will review that submission without reference to any other of the responses made, with the exception of price.
7. Drawing solely upon the information specified within the RSO, each evaluator will assign a score to each criterion and that score will be discussed with evaluators. A final score will be determined by consensus.
8. All efforts will be made to achieve consensus. In the event that consensus cannot be reached, the final score will be the whole number from the evaluation scoring system closest to the average of the evaluators' scores.
9. Any comments pertinent to the assessment of the criteria will be entered into the guidebook for review with the Respondent at the
10. All questions about the evaluation made, during or following the evaluation, by persons who are not part of the evaluation, shall be referred to the evaluation chair.
11. Questions for Respondents arising as part of the evaluation process will be documented. The evaluation chair will handle all communication between Respondents and the evaluation team.

Scoring Methodology

This RSO is structured to solicit a response from Respondents that will provide evaluators sufficient information to assess a firms or individuals experience against the criteria that was defined in the RSO

Due to the subjective nature of this assessment, it is essential that evaluators enter into the appropriate place in this evaluation workbook any comments, which qualify the score awarded.

Each requirement has been assigned a weight prior to the evaluation commencing. This weight is displayed in column D in the following worksheet. Evaluators will make an assessment of the Response's ability to satisfy a requirement and will assign a score by consensus according to the following scale:

Description	Description	Score
Response clearly Exceeds Requirements: several exceptional features are offered that exceeds the requirements qualitatively.	Strongly Exceeds	5
Response somewhat exceeds Requirements	Somewhat Exceeds	4
Response meets Requirements: the majority of the factors for this requirement are acceptable	Meets requirements	3
Response contains minor deficiencies, or only arguable meets the requirements	Some deficiencies	2
Response contains several deficiencies	Several deficiencies	1
Response is unacceptable: or requirement was not addressed in the proposal	Unacceptable	0

					Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm	
Evaluation Criteria		Response Should Address	Section weight	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
MANDATORY CRITERIA						
a) The Response must be received at the closing location by the specified closing date and time on the title page of this Request for Standing Offer.		Yes or NO		Yes	2 envelopes: 1 containing e response, 1 containing 3 USBs of samples.	
b) The Response must be in English and must not be sent by facsimile or e-mail.		Yes or NO		Yes		
c) Three (3) complete paper copies and 1 electronic copy USB media (MS Word or .PDF format) of the written Response, plus three (3) USB media devices each containing same copies of all work samples must be submitted.		Yes or NO		Yes		
d) A separate complete Response applicable to the service area must be submitted under each service area should Respondents choose to respond to more than one service area.		Yes or NO		Yes		
e) The Response must include a cover letter substantially similar to the cover letter set out in Section 6.1 and the cover letter must be signed by a person authorized to sign on behalf of the Respondent.		Yes or NO		Yes		
DESIRABLE CRITERIA			TOTAL	61.9		
6.2.1 Corporate Capability & Capacity			20	12.0		
Respondent must provide a completed Respondent Profile.	FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY - NOT EVALUTED					
3. State your ability and method of attendance at any meeting originating in Victoria or Vancouver BC called by GCPE at reasonably short notice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrated ability to occasionally attend meetings in Victoria or Vancouver - have offices within a 2-3 hr travel to Victoria or Vancouver - provide assurance of appropriate individuals availability to attend meetings with little notice 		Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
4. Outline your firm's policies and procedures concerning dispute resolution with clients. A clearly identified document may also be attached to your response.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - formal dispute resolution policies and procedures have been identified - demonstrates that policies and procedures have been formalized and proven effective - clear reporting structure is identified - demonstrates dispute resolution process can achieve results 		Score 0 - 5	3	willing to abide with director at GCPE,	
5. Please describe how your agency is connected to the BC advertising/marketing industry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstrated experience (two or more years) working with the BC advertising/marketing industry in all sectors such as broadcast, print and digital 		Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths:able to demonstrate collaborative approach, has worked with other competing agencies and works to ensure success for client Weaknesses:	
6. Describe what your agency's approach could be for collaborating with the government AOR for media planning and purchasing ensuring an effective working relationship between all parties throughout the campaign process.	s.17		Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths:able to demonstrate collaborative approach, has worked with other competing agencies and works to ensure success for client Weaknesses:	
7. State your agency's approach to a small, low budget project and contrast that to an extensive campaign involving many marketing channels.	approach seems client focused, demonstrates flexibility, scalability and streamlines approach to meet budget and timeframe expectations. Describes approach to working on low budget project/campaign and provides contrast to approach for an extensive campaign.		Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths:responsive for all projects and budget ranges Weaknesses:	
8. Corporate information overview of the Respondent firm, e.g. types of service, length of time in business and accomplishments.	should have been in business for at least three years providing Advertising Services as stated in the RSO.		Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
Provide an organizational chart.	FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY - NOT EVALUTED					
6.3.1 Personnel Experience and Qualifications			20	14.1		

			Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm	
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Account Manager - fully describe how this individual meets or exceeds GCPE's expectations.	- a single key individual who is proposed to be the Account Manager for the term of the Standing Offer	Score 0 - 5	4	Comments: Strengths:Mike Krafczyk 20+ Weaknesses:
	-Account Manager will have overall responsibility for the Contract, the authority required to make decisions regarding service delivery	Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	- Account Manager should be easily accessible to GCPE to resolve issues that may arise during the term of the Contract	Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	- demonstrated experience (5 or more years) managing contracts for public sector and/or corporate clients; managing provincewide advertising campaigns; managing multi-media campaigns	Score 0 - 5	4	Comments: Strengths:had lots of gov't and corporate experience. Strong account service. Weaknesses:
State your firm's contingency plan should the account manager named become unexpectedly unavailable.	Plan should be available and reasonable. Back up should be available at all times the Account Manager is not.	Score 0 - 5	3	Comments:16 personnel only listed 10...of the 10, 4 experienced and 6 others less than 10 yrs Strengths: Weaknesses:
Supporting Personnel	personnel proposed complement the services the Offeror would be required to perform. (see section 5.2)	Score 0 - 5	4	Comments: Strengths:three of the personnel proposed for gov't business have 20+ yrs of experience and cover all aspects of services. Weaknesses:
6.4.1 Unique Offering		15	6.0	
	s.17			
Provide a statement on how your agency would bring a unique offering, understanding, experience or approach to government-driven advertising or social marketing and how this unique offering would differentiate your company from the competition in providing creative services to GCPE.		Score 0 - 5	2	Comments:flat structure, senior partners involved Strengths: Weaknesses: did not fully address the government or social marketing aspects
6.5.1Portfolio / Work Samples		25	13.9	
10. Please provide two case studies that demonstrate work experience and the ability to produce advertising and/or social marketing that demonstrates superior creative excellence and production values while being results-focussed. The two case studies should be recent examples (within the past two years) of campaigns planned and executed across multiple channels that your organization (including members of the team proposed for our business) has been responsible for. For the two examples, please ensure that a	- provided two case studies that demonstrate work experience and the ability to produce advertising and/or social marketing that demonstrates superior creative excellence and production values while being results-focussed. Provided three or more creative samples which align with strategy including media chosen and target audience identified and call to action.	Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: digital WorkBC /Blueprint builder - social media - Evergreen Weaknesses:

Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm				
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
<p>minimum of one example demonstrates work that is of a multi-channel digital marketing campaign. And a minimum of one example should demonstrate experience working on a social marketing campaign to shift personal behaviour.</p> <p>Evaluators should review both case studies and determine how the examples satisfy requirements.</p>	- two case studies are recent examples (within the past two years) of campaigns planned and executed across multiple channels - TV, radio, print, digital - (including members of the team proposed for our business) has been responsible for	Score 0 - 5	2	Comments: Strengths:WorkBC used multiple channels Weaknesses:radio scripts presented did not match up to creative
	- one example demonstrates work that is of a multi-channel digital marketing campaign s. 17	Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:did not optimize campaign
	one example should demonstrate experience working on a social marketing campaign to shift or influence personal behaviour;does campaign involve policy around why a behaviour should change	Score 0 - 5	3	Comments: Strengths: Evergreen line did not show to shift or influence personal behaviour
6.6.1 Pricing		20	15.8	
CLIENT SERVICES				
Account Services (Primary day-to-day contact – Account Manager)				s.21
Account Services (Alternate to Account Manager)				
Creative Director or Agency Head				
Junior Account Personal				
Art/Creative Direction				
Copy Writing Services				
Broadcast Development				
Concept Development				
Digital Design Services				
Promotional Planning Services				
Research/Strategic Planning Services				
PRODUCTION SERVICES				
General Production				
Print Production				
Broadcast Production				
Digital/Online Production				
Web Development				
Trafficking				
Promotional Executions				
Weights Total		100	TOTAL	s.21

Hogan Millar Media		Media Comm.		Hamazaki Wong Marketing	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	4 hard copies provided 2 USBs containing RSO and samples.	Yes	Media Comm responded to both RSO's. Samples are with Advertising Research Services. 3 hard copies submitted of hard copy response.	Yes	3 hard copies 2 envelopes containing response and Samples.
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			

s.17

Hogan Millar Media		Media Comm.		Hamazaki Wong Marketing	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

S.17

Hogan Millar Media		Media Comm.		Hamazaki Wong Marketing	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

s.17

s.21		s.21		s.21	
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21

Point Blank Creative Inc.		Suburbia Studios		cStreet Campaigns Inc.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies, 1 envelope containing 4 USBs; 1 Response, 3 Portfolio	Yes	3 hard copies; 2 envelopes; 1 containing response; 3 containing samples	Yes	3 hard copies. 1 envelope containing 3 USBs
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
61.3		61.5			
12.4		13.7			
4	Comments: Strengths:dedicated account person in Victoria - Ash Arden Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths:based in Victoria Weaknesses:		
3	described an established process to resolve disputes	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
2	Comments: founded in 2009 Strengths: Weaknesses:stated agency had connections to industry but did not demonstrate. Indicated connections to the BC film community.	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: thoughtful approach to working with AOR and therefore demonstrated understanding of the role of the AOR. Strengths: Weaknesses:	3.5	Comments: Strengths:Listen first and collaborate affirmately and build upon ideas in a positive, respectful manner. Weaknesses:		
3	Strengths:well articulated process for managing campaigns big/small	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
9.9		14.1			

Point Blank Creative Inc.		Suburbia Studios		cStreet Campaigns Inc.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
2	Comments:Ash Arden Strengths: Weaknesses: did not demonstrate 5 yrs experience in advertising	4	Comments: Strengths:Jacquie Arnatt 21+ yrs Weaknesses:	s.17	
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:did not demonstrate 5 yrs plus ad contracts, but had lots of public sector experience	4	Comments: Strengths: many years with clients (20) Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:bench strength of supporting personnel is less experienced in advertising. Comments:17 FTEs ...12 listed for our business...a lot of jr experience Weaknesses:	4	Comments: all supporting personnel demonstred experience of over 20 yrs in advertising.		
9.0		6.0			
3	Comments::demonstrated an innovative approach to creative development with strategic approach to optimized ad spending and targeting a campaign's ladder of engagement. Willing to run multiple variations of online creative and test for best results. Strengths: Weaknesses:	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses: Listed their clients, campaigns and process but did not clearly demonstrate how their unique offering would differentiate their company from the competition.		
16.3		15.0			
3	Comments: Digital HAS -retainment of members / Social Mayors Council - Cure Congestion Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	"Comments:Social - Hillside Mall - Save the Salish Sea and Coquitlam Centre Strengths: Weaknesses:"		

Point Blank Creative Inc.		Suburbia Studios		cStreet Campaigns Inc.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
3	Comments: Strengths: HAS TV "It Takes Everything" for HSA Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	s.17	
4	Comments: Strengths:strong digital example and optimized campaign ads HSA Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths Cure Congestion campaign demonstrated results Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
13.6		12.8			
s.21					
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21

KIMBO Design Inc.		Spring Advertising		Captus Advertising Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies. 1 envelope containing 2 USBs.	Yes	3 hard copies. 1 envelope containing 3 USBs; 1 response and 3 samples	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope containing: 1 responses and 3 samples
Yes		Yes		Yes	
Yes		Yes		Yes	
Yes		Yes		Yes	
Yes		Yes		Yes	

s.17

60.9

12.6

3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3.5	Comments: Strengths:will provide advice and insight to the AOR regarding the ethnic media market Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

11.3

KIMBO Design Inc.		Spring Advertising		Captus Advertising Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
s.17					
				3	Comments:Yuii Leung 7 yrs Strengths: Weaknesses:
				3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				3	Comments:demonstrated experience in managing contracts for corporate clients ad agency and ethnic newspapers Strengths: Weaknesses:
				3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:organizational chart shows 10 staff with 3 staff assigned to business. Proposal did not clearly demonstrate how personnel proposed would complement all services requested.
6.0					
				2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:Provided a statement only that company provides ethnic communications but did not clearly demonstrate approach and did not address social marketing.
11.1					
				2	"Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:Canadian Chinese Military Museum and Reliance Home Comfort. Reliance Home Comfort is a retail campaign and did not demonstrate superior creative work.

KIMBO Design Inc.		Spring Advertising		Captus Advertising Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
s.17				3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				1	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:One case study was a retail campaign and other was not deemed a strong example of social marketing.
				20.0	
s.21					
TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21

Traction Creative Communications		Hot Tomali Communications Inc.		NOW Communications	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 USB for response, 1 envelope containing 3 USBs	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope containing 1 USB response, 2 USBs samples	Yes	3 hard copies; 2 envelopes; 1 USB response; 3 USBs samples.
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
Yes		Yes			
61.7		s.17		61.0	
13.6				12.9	
3	Comments: Strengths:will use technology Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths:demonstrated the ability to meet client in person or via technology Weaknesses:
3	Comments:use the ICA framework Strengths: Weaknesses:			2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses: 10 days to fix a problem and then suggest cancelling the drawdown
4	Comments:demonstrated experience in all broadcast, print and digital Strengths: Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Has a basic understanding of working with AOR. Strengths: Weaknesses:			4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:t
4	Comments:described a flexible, responsiveness and access to senior staff for all projects Strengths: Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	Comments:been in business 20+ yrs Strengths: Weaknesses:			4	Comments: Strengths:able to draw links to four streams of business Weaknesses:
14.6				12.8	

Traction Creative Communications		Hot Tomali Communications Inc.	NOW Communications		
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
4	Comments:Jeff Lucas 25+ yrs Strengths: Weaknesses:	s. 17		4	"Comments:Michele Della Mattia Strengths:23 years in business Weaknesses:"
4	Comments: Strengths:Demonstrated that Account Manager will have responsibility to make decisions. Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	Comments: Strengths:demonstrated experience working on public sector, corporate clients and provincewide campaigns. Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	Comments:Backup was owner(partner) Strengths: Back up plan lists the three partners if Account Manager unavailable. Weaknesses:			2	addressed how it would be handled but a person was not identified. Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:none identified
3	Comments: 9 FTEs Strengths: Weaknesses:			4	Comments: Strengths:Half of the team proposed to work on account have 20 yrs or more experience working on all aspects of services. Weaknesses:
6.0				6.0	
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:Provided a statement on how they would be a true partner but did not provide detail on the how to achieve this. No mention of social marketing approach.			2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:Provided a general statement on knowledge of public policy but did not differentiate their agency from competition in providing creative services.
16.1				17.6	
3	Comments:multi-channel - Opioid awareness campaign/ social marketing Yukon Rideshare			4	"Comments:MPI - Changing Driving Behaviour Strengths:campaign to stop young drivers from texting and driving Weaknesses:HEU - Care Can't Wait - more of an awareness campaign"

Traction Creative Communications		Hot Tomali Communications Inc.		NOW Communications	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
4	Strengths:Both case studies were executed across multiple channels. Especially the Opioid awareness campaign which integrated traditional and digital media.	s.17		3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Weaknesses:			3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:			4	Comments: Strengths:The MPI case study demonstrated a marketing campaign to influence personal behaviour. Well executed creative to deter young drivers from texting and driving. Weaknesses:
11.5				11.7	

s.21

TOTAL		s.21	TOTAL		s.21	TOTAL		s.21
--------------	--	------	--------------	--	------	--------------	--	------

DDB Canada		Camp Pacific L.P.		Trapeze Communications	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope; 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.	Yes	3 hard copies; 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples (attached to card)	Yes	3 hard copies; 2 envelopes; 1 USB response; 3 USBs samples.
Yes		Yes		Yes	
Yes		Yes		Yes	
Yes		Yes		Yes	
Yes		Yes		Yes	
63.3		62.9		60.1	
13.3		13.8		12.7	
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths:based in Victora Weaknesses:
3	Comments:policy/procedures identified Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	Comments:well established in the BC marketing/advertising sector Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments:connected through various boards, advertising associations, councils, print measurement and research resources. Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	Comments: Strengths:Well demonstrated approach for working with AOR. Uses the RACI model to ensure effective relationship for AOR, creative agency and client when planning a campaign. Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths:respect, collaboration and communication Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses: recommends junior talent for smaller budget projects, with senior oversight. Not clearly articulated how that would work.	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
5	Comments: Strengths: Demonstrated a good understanding of Gov't business and working with Crown Corp Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths: Provided services for over 15 years as Dare Digital. Company was renamed in 2015 when ownership change. Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths:in business since 1997 Weaknesses:
13.4		13.4		13.2	

DDB Canada		Camp Pacific L.P.		Trapeze Communications	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
3	Comments:Roger Nairn Strengths:10 yrs experience Weaknesses:	3	Comments:Mican 10+ Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments:Brigitte karnilavicius 10 yrs experience Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths:10yrs Weaknesses:	3	Comments:demonstrated experience working for public sector. Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths:Well documented back up plan with agency partner and planning director filling in if necessary. Weaknesses:
5	Comments:275 in Canada...70 in Vancouver Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments:50 FTEs Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	Comments: Strengths: Experienced personnel proposed to work on business with over 30 yrs experience in advertising. Weaknesses:
9.0		6.0		9.0	
3	Comments: Strengths: Interesting innovative approach with tools such as Standford University Persuasive Technology Lab and Google 'test and learn' programs. Weaknesses:	2	"Comments: Strengths Weaknesses:" Made general statements on experience and diversities of team and how they approach creative development (such as collaboration and how they deal with feedback) but did not clearly demonstrate a unique offering that differentiated their company from the competition.	3	"Comments:good understanding of gov't policy and position with putting people first ...its all about people...humanizing the communications approach...added value via collaborator within agency Strengths: Weaknesses:"
18.7		20.0		13.9	
4	Comments: Strengths: one case study moderately strong in social marketing Crime Stoppers - World without Crime Weaknesses:Destination Canada strong as an example of digital marketing	4	Comments:Destination BC - BC Explorer and BC Children's Hospital we've run out of space Strengths:superior quality for the BC Explorer campaign Weaknesses:	3	Comments:Royal Oak Burial Park (reen Burial) social marketing/digital example/ Comox Valley Regional District Rus Ridership social marketing Strengths: Weaknesses:

DDB Canada		Camp Pacific L.P.		Trapeze Communications	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
4	Comments: Strengths:very good campaigns Weaknesses:	4	Both case studies provided strong examples of campaigns executed across multiple channels.	2	missing radio, video (TV) Comments: Strengths:magazine/FB/OOH transit/ Weaknesses:no TV no pre-roll
4	Comments: Strengths:Its' all found in Canada...ininstagram feed from real Canadian posts and then created 17 short films (peer to peer) Weaknesses:	5	Comments: Strengths:BC Explorer app very innovative Weaknesses:	3	Comments:used general channels for digital campaign. Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
8.9		9.7		11.2	

s.21

TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21
--------------	------	--------------	------	--------------	------

GREY Vancouver		Latitude Agency Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope; 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.	Yes	3 hard copies; 4 envelopes; 1 response in 1 envelope, 3 samples in 3 envelopes.
Yes		Yes	
61.9		s.17	
10.9			
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
4	Comments: Strengths:Over 30 years in BC's advertsing and marketing industry and involved in many aspects of the industry from research to award shows. Weaknesses:		
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:not feasible for GCPE the suggestion that agencies see the creative plan before client and vice versa		
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
4	Comments: Strengths:Documented over 30 yrs providing these services in BC. Weaknesses:		
12.7			

GREY Vancouver		Latitude Agency Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
3	Comments:Maureen Atchison 17 yrs experience Strengths: Weaknesses:	s. 17	
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
4	Comments: Strengths:Has public sector and corporate experience and has been experience on both the client and agency side of business. Weaknesses:		
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	Comments:220 across Canada with only 12 staff in BC - have identifeid 9 people assigned to BC Gov't account. Strengths: Weaknesses:		
6.0			
2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:Described their creative process with clients and used a lot of jurgon such as Social Impact Journey, Social Impact Model, the circular model and its three points of intersection. How this creates tension, creates proximity and provides an outlet.This may be unique but did not leave you with a clear understanding of how this would be applied to developing creative materials.		
17.6			
3	"Comments:social BC Used Oil Management Association - digital BC Ferries Vacations Strengths: Weaknesses:"		

GREY Vancouver		Latitude Agency Ltd.	
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	s.17	
4	Comments: Strengths:Both case studies provided a multi-channel digital campaign and use of consumer-generated content. Weaknesses:		
4	Comments: Strengths:The BC Used Oil Management Association campaign demonstrated how to effectively shift and influence behaviour of DIY car mechanics. Weaknesses:		
14.7			

s.21

TOTAL	s.21	TOTAL	s.21
--------------	------	--------------	------

Saint Bernadine M Hogan Millar M Media Comm. Hamazaki Wor Point Blank Cr Suburbia Stud cStreet Campa KIMBO Design

Evaluation Criteria	Section weight						
DESIRABLE CRITERIA	TOTAL	61.9	s.17			61.3	61.5
6.2.1 Corporate Capability & Ca	20	12.0				12.4	13.7
6.3.1 Personnel Experience and	20	14.1				9.9	14.1
6.4.1 Unique Offering	15	6.0				9.0	6.0
6.5.1 Portfolio / Work Samples	25	13.9				16.3	15.0
6.6.1 Pricing	20	15.8				13.6	12.8

Spring Adverti	Captus Advert	Traction Creat	Hot Tomali Co	NOW Commur	DDB Canada	Camp Pacific I	Trapeze Comn	GREY Vancou	Latitude Agen
s.17	60.9	61.7	s.17	61.0	63.3	62.9	60.1	61.9	s.17
	12.6	13.6		12.9	13.3	13.8	12.7	10.9	
	11.3	14.6		12.8	13.4	13.4	13.2	12.7	
	6.0	6.0		6.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	
	11.1	16.1		17.6	18.7	20.0	13.9	17.6	
	20.0	11.5		11.7	8.9	9.7	11.2	14.7	

Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm									
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Rel. weight					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
MANDATORY CRITERIA									
a) The Response must be received at the closing location by the specified closing date and time on the title page of this Request for Standing Offer.	Yes or NO							Yes	2 envelopes: 1 containing e response, 1 containing 3 USBs of samples.
b) The Response must be in English and must not be sent by facsimile or e-mail.	Yes or NO							Yes	
c) Three (3) complete paper copies and 1 electronic copy USB media (MS Word or .PDF format) of the written Response, plus three (3) USB media devices each containing same copies of all work samples must be submitted.	Yes or NO							Yes	
d) A separate complete Response applicable to the service area must be submitted under each service area should Respondents choose to respond to more than one service area.	Yes or NO							Yes	
e) The Response must include a cover letter substantially similar to the cover letter set out in Section 6.1 and the cover letter must be signed by a person authorized to sign on behalf of the Respondent.	Yes or NO							Yes	
DESIRABLE CRITERIA		TOTAL						49.6	
6.2.1 Corporate Capability & Capacity		20						13.1	
Respondent must provide a completed Respondent Profile.	FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY - NOT EVALUTED			KL	KH	RH	Sdev		
3. State your ability and method of attendance at any meeting originating in Victoria or Vancouver BC called by GCPE at reasonably short notice.	- demonstrated ability to occasionally attend meetings in Victoria or Vancouver - have offices within a 2-3 hr travel to Victoria or Vancouver - provide assurance of appropriate individuals availability to attend meetings with little notice	Score 0 - 5	3	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm									
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Rel. weight					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
4. Outline your firm's policies and procedures concerning dispute resolution with clients. A clearly identified document may also be attached to your response.	- formal dispute resolution policies and procedures have been identified - demonstrates that policies and procedures have been formalized and proven effective - clear reporting structure is identified - demonstrates dispute resolution process can achieve results	Score 0 - 5	3	3	3	3	0.0	3	willing to abide with director at GCPEJ,
5. Please describe how your agency is connected to the BC advertising/marketing industry.	- demonstrated experience (two or more years) working with the BC advertising/marketing industry in all sectors such as broadcast, print and digital	Score 0 - 5	1	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
6. Describe what your agency's approach could be for collaborating with the government AOR for media planning and purchasing ensuring an effective working relationship between all parties throughout the campaign process.	s.17	Score 0 - 5	5	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
7. State your agency's approach to a small, low budget project and contrast that to an extensive campaign involving many marketing channels.	approach seems client focused, demonstrates flexibility, scalability and streamlines approach to meet budget and timeframe expectations. Describes approach to working on low budget project/campaign and provides contrast to approach for an extensive campaign.	Score 0 - 5	4	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
8. Corporate information overview of the Respondent firm, e.g. types of service, length of time in business and accomplishments.	should have been in business for at least three years providing Advertising Services as stated in the RSO.	Score 0 - 5	2	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm									
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Rel. weight					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
Provide an organizational chart.	FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY - NOT EVALUTED								
6.3.1 Personnel Experience and Qualifications		20						13.4	
Account Manager - fully describe how this individual meets or exceeds GCPE's expectations.	- a single key individual who is proposed to be the Account Manager for the term of the Standing Offer	Score 0 - 5	5	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	-Account Manager will have overall responsibility for the Contract, the authority required to make decisions regarding service delivery	Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	- Account Manager should be easily accessible to GCPE to resolve issues that may arise during the term of the Contract	Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	- demonstrated experience (5 or more years) managing contracts for public sector and/or corporate clients; managing provincewide advertising campaigns; managing multi-media campaigns	Score 0 - 5	5	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
State your firm's contingency plan should the account manager named become unexpectedly unavailable.	Plan should be available and reasonable. Back up should be available at all times the Account Manager is not.	Score 0 - 5	4	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
Supporting Personnel	personnel proposed complement the services the Offeror would be required to perform. (see section 5.2)	Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
6.4.1 Unique Offering		15						9.0	

Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm									
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Rel. weight					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
	s.17								
Provide a statement on how your agency would bring a unique offering, understanding, experience or approach to government-driven advertising or social marketing and how this unique offering would differentiate your company from the competition in providing creative services to GCPE.		Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
6.5.1Portfolio / Work Samples		25						13.9	
10. Please provide two case studies that demonstrate work experience and the ability to produce advertising and/or social marketing that demonstrates superior creative excellence and production values while being results-focussed. The two case studies should be recent examples (within the past two years) of campaigns planned and executed across multiple channels that your organization (including members of the team proposed for our business) has been responsible for. For the two examples, please ensure that a minimum of one example demonstrates work that is of a multi-channel digital marketing campaign.	- provided two case studies that demonstrate work experience and the ability to produce advertising and/or social marketing that demonstrates superior creative excellence and production values while being results-focussed. Provided three or more creative samples which align with strategy including media placement.	Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	- two case studies are recent examples (within the past two years) of campaigns planned and executed across multiple channels - TV, radio, print, digital - (including members of the team proposed for our business) has been responsible for	Score 0 - 5	4	2	2	2	0.0	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm									
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Rel. weight					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
<p>And a minimum of one example should demonstrate experience working on a social marketing campaign to shift personal behaviour.</p> <p>Evaluators should review both case studies and determine how the examples satisfy requirements.</p>	<p>- one example demonstrates work that is of a multi-channel digital marketing campaign and includes a minimum of three ads including creative for a banner ad, social media and pre-roll video posts, demonstrates strategic use of digital media, creative message is clear, rationale for digital media channels chosen aligns with strategy, budget and results. Clearly demonstrated taking steps to test and optimize their campaign delivery.</p>	Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	<p>one example should demonstrate experience working on a social marketing campaign to shift or influence personal behaviour; does campaign involve policy around why a behaviour should change</p>	Score 0 - 5	5	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
6.6.1 Pricing		20						0.2	
CLIENT SERVICES									
Account Services (Primary day-to-day contact – Account Manager)			1						s.21
Account Services (Alternate to Account Manager)			1						
Creative Director or Agency Head			1						
Junior Account Personal			1						
Art/Creative Direction			1						
Copy Writing Services			1						
Broadcast Development			1						
Concept Development			1						
Digital Design Services			1						
Promotional Planning Services			1						
Research/Strategic Planning Services			1						
PRODUCTION SERVICES									

						Saint Bernadine Missioin Comm	
Evaluation Criteria	Response Should Address	Section weight	Rel. weight	Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		
General Production			1	s.21			
Print Production			1				
Broadcast Production			1				
Digital/Online Production			1				
Web Development			1				
Trafficking			1				
Promotional Executions			1				
Weights Total		100		TOTAL	s.21		
Rank				14	Rank		

				Hogan Millar Media								Media Comm.					
				Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score						Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			
				Yes	4 hard copies provided 2 USBs containing RSO and samples.								Yes	Media Comm responded to both RSO's. Samples are with Advertising Research Services. 3 hard copies submitted of hard copy response.			
				Yes									Yes				
				Yes									Yes				
				Yes									Yes				
				Yes									Yes				

s.17

				Hogan Millar Media								Media Comm.											
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score						Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score													
s.17																							

				Hogan Millar Media								Media Comm.					
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score						Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score							

s.17

				Hogan Millar Media					Media Comm.	
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

s.17									
------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Hogan Millar Media				Media Comm.			
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score	
s.21							
TOTAL		s.21		TOTAL		s.21	
s.17							

				Hamazaki Wong Marketing				Point Blank Creative Inc.			
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
				Yes	3 hard copies 2 envelopes containing response and Samples.					Yes	3 hard copies,1 envelope containing 4 USBs; 1 Response, 3 Portfolio
				Yes		Yes					
				Yes		Yes					
				Yes		Yes					
				Yes		Yes					
										71.1	
										13.8	
				KL	KH	RH	Sdev				
				4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		

s.17

				Hamazaki Wong Marketing								Point Blank Creative Inc.				
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		
s.17				3	3	3	0.0	3	process does not provide result statistics or evidence of effectiveness							
				3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							
				4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							

Hamazaki Wong Marketing				Point Blank Creative Inc.			
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		
3	3	3	0.0	3	contrast to an extensive campaign was not discussed.		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
				12.0			
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:		

s.17

Hamazaki Wong Marketing				Point Blank Creative Inc.		
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
				9.0		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
				16.3		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	

s.17

Hamazaki Wong Marketing				Point Blank Creative Inc.		
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
s.17	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
					20.0	
					\$1.00	
					\$1.00	
s.21						

				Suburbia Studios				cStreet Campaigns Inc.					
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		
				Yes	3 hard copies; 2 envelopes; 1 containing response; 3 containing samples					Yes	3 hard copies. 1 envelope containing 3 USBs		
				Yes						Yes			
				Yes						Yes			
				Yes						Yes			
				Yes						Yes			
				74.7					s.17				
				13.7									
KL	KH	RH	Sdev										
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:								

Suburbia Studios					cStreet Campaigns Inc.				
Evaluator Score					Comments Rationale for Score				
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	s.17			
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:				
3.5	3.5	3.5	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:				

Suburbia Studios					cStreet Campaigns Inc.							
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	s.17						
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							
12.0												
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							
15.0												
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							

Suburbia Studios					cStreet Campaigns Inc.							
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses: s.17							
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:							
				20.0								
				\$1.00								
				\$1.00								
				\$1.00								
				\$1.00								

				KIMBO Design Inc.				Spring Advertising			
				Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score	
				Yes	3 hard copies. 1 envelope containing 2 USBs.					Yes	3 hard copies. 1 envelope containing 3 USBs; 1 response and 3 samples
				Yes						Yes	
				Yes						Yes	
				Yes						Yes	
				Yes						Yes	

s.17

				KIMBO Design Inc.					Spring Advertising
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		

s.17

				KIMBO Design Inc.					Spring Advertising	
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

s.17

				KIMBO Design Inc.					Spring Advertising
--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--	--	--	---------------------------

Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score	
------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--	------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

s.17							
------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				KIMBO Design Inc.					Spring Advertising	
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

s.17

	\$1.00				\$1.00		
	\$1.00				\$1.00		

Captus Advertising Ltd.					Traction Creative Communications						
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score				
				Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelop containing: 1 responses and 3 samples				Yes	3 hard copies; 1 USB for response, 1 envelope containing 3 USBs	
				Yes					Yes		
				Yes					Yes		
				Yes					Yes		
				Yes					Yes		
				67.6					73.2		
				12.6					13.6		
KL	KH	RH	Sdev		KL	KH	RH	Sdev			
3	3	3	0.0	3	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	

Captus Advertising Ltd.					Traction Creative Communications						
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score				
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3.5	3.5	3.5	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	should have cited approval understanding, i.e. client and AOR

Captus Advertising Ltd.					Traction Creative Communications						
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
12.0					14.6						
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Captus Advertising Ltd.					Traction Creative Communications						
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
12.0					9.0						
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
11.1					16.1						
2	2	2	0.0	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Captus Advertising Ltd.					Traction Creative Communications						
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
1	1	1	0.0	1	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				20.0						20.0	
				\$1.00						\$1.00	
				\$1.00						\$1.00	

				Hot Tomali Communications Inc.								NOW Communications																	
				Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score				Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score													
				Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope containing 1 USB response, 2 USBs samples												Yes	3 hard copies; 2 envelopes; 1 USB response; 3 USBs samples.											
				Yes																									Yes
				Yes																									Yes
				Yes																									Yes
				Yes																									Yes
s.17																75.3													
																12.9													
				KL				KH				RH				Sdev													
				3				3				3				0.0													
												3				Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:													

Hot Tomali Communications Inc.				NOW Communications		
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
2	2	2	0.0	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	

s.17

Hot Tomali Communications Inc.				NOW Communications			
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		
s.17	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
	4	4	4	0.0	4	able to draw links to four streams of business.	
				12.8			
	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	

Hot Tomali Communications Inc.				NOW Communications			
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		
s.17	2	2	2	0.0	2	addressed how it would be handled but a person was not identified.	
	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
	12.0						
	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
	17.6						
4	4	4	0.0	4			

		Hot Tomali Communications Inc.				NOW Communications		
		Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		
s.17			3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
			3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
			4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
							20.0	
		\$1.00					\$1.00	
		\$1.00					\$1.00	

				DDB Canada								Camp Pacific L.P.					
				Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score						Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			
				Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope; 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.								Yes	3 hard copies; 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples (attached to card)			
				Yes									Yes				
				Yes									Yes				
				Yes									Yes				
				Yes									Yes				
				80.4					78.5								
				13.3					13.1								
KL	KH	RH	Sdev					KL	KH	RH	Sdev						
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:				3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:			

DDB Canada					Camp Pacific L.P.						
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score				
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3.5	3.5	3.5	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3.5	3.5	3.5	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

DDB Canada					Camp Pacific L.P.						
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
2	2	2	0.0	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
5	5	5	0.0	5	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
13.4					13.4						
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

DDB Canada					Camp Pacific L.P.						
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
5	5	5	0.0	5	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
15.0					12.0						
5	5	5	0.0	5	lots of publicsector,	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
18.7					20.0						
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

DDB Canada					Camp Pacific L.P.							
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score			
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	5	5	5	0.0	5	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	
				20.0					20.0			
				\$1.00					\$1.00			
				\$1.00					\$1.00			

DDB Canada			Camp Pacific L.P.		
Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score		Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score	
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
\$1.00			\$1.00		
TOTAL			TOTAL		
	\$18.00			\$18.00	
1	Rank		2	Rank	

Trapeze Communications					GREY Vancouver						
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score				
				Yes	3 hard copies; 2 envelopes; 1 USB response; 3 USBs samples.					Yes	3 hard copies; 1 envelope; 1 USB response, 3 USBs samples.
				Yes		Yes					
				Yes		Yes					
				Yes		Yes					
				Yes		Yes					
				71.9					72.6		
				12.7					10.9		
KL	KH	RH	Sdev		KL	KH	RH	Sdev			
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Trapeze Communications					GREY Vancouver						
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score			Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score				
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	2	2	2	0.0	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	2	2	2	0.0	2	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Trapeze Communications					GREY Vancouver						
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	very perscriptive approach, approach added streamlining.
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
13.2					12.7						
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	17 years cited,
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Trapeze Communications					GREY Vancouver						
Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score	Evaluator Score				Comments Rationale for Score		
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
12.0					9.0						
4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	3	3	3	0.0	3	very marketing based response. Services offered, seemed quite generic,
13.9					20.0						
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:

Trapeze Communications					GREY Vancouver						
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score					Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
2	2	2	0.0	2	missing radio, video (TV)	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
3	3	3	0.0	3	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:	4	4	4	0.0	4	Comments: Strengths: Weaknesses:
				20.0						20.0	
				\$1.00						\$1.00	
				\$1.00						\$1.00	

				Latitude Agency Ltd.	
				Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score
				Yes	3 hard copies; 4 envelopes; 1 response in 1 envelope, 3 samples in 3 envelopes.
				Yes	

s.17

				Latitude Agency Ltd.
			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

s.17

				Latitude Agency Ltd.
	Evaluator Score			Comments Rationale for Score

s.17

				Latitude Agency Ltd.
			Evaluator Score	Comments Rationale for Score

s.17

				Latitude Agency Ltd.
Evaluator Score		Comments Rationale for Score		

s.17

	\$1.00	
	\$1.00	

