



*For Your Safety*

January 6, 2009

**Re: RFP # ESA-01-2008 - Building a National System for the Management of Electrical Product Safety in Canada.**

Attached are the responses to questions submitted regarding the RFP #ESA-01-2008 – Building a National System for the Management of Electrical Product Safety in Canada.

1. It appears from the Request for Proposal that the focus of the work is to be directed towards the management of consumer electrical product safety nationally. However, the Canadian Electrical Code includes standards for other products such as electrical medical devices covered by the *Food and Drugs Act*, electrical radiation emitting devices covered by the *Radiation Emitting Act* and electrical industrial products. In identifying the issues related to the current system, and in developing options to manage electrical product safety in Canada, is it the intention of the NPSAC Product Safety Working Group that the analysis include these other types of electrical products that may not be intended for use by consumers? Or should they be excluded from consideration?

The intent of the RFP is to explore/consider relevant issues related to the current electrical product safety management system, including issues related to potential overlapping jurisdictions and issues amongst different government departments and levels of governments currently managing this issue. It is not the intention of the project to make recommendations regarding particular types of electrical devices where a specific regime is already in place to manage those areas nationally (i.e. radiation emitting devices and electrical medical devices) however; industrial electrical products would be in scope for the project.

2. In regard to page 5 of 14, paragraph 4.1 “Elements of the Proposal”, items 1 and 11, should this paragraph not be titled “Elements of the Final Report” since the elements you are asking for can only be provided after the work is at the completion stage, not part of the proposal itself?

The intent is for the proposal to identify at a high level the major challenges and potential options for consideration. The intent of this criteria is to allow the selection committee to evaluate the familiarity of the potential contractor

with the subject matter so as to facilitate the decision making process. It is to be expected that potential issues and/or options may change as the project progresses.

3. Does the last bullet under PART B (page 5 of 14) “*Cost and benefit analyses of a national approach and risks to various stakeholders.*” not belong under PART C after a range of alternatives has been developed and the cost/benefit analyses would apply to all the alternatives being proposed. Would it not fit just above the clause referring to other countries?

The intent is to undertake a cost/benefit analysis of maintaining the status quo versus adopting a national approach rather than a cost/benefit analysis of each alternative for managing the issue at a national level. A separate cost/benefit analysis may also be proposed regarding the range of alternatives in addition to the cost/benefit of creating a national approach to managing the issue.

4. In this same PART C (page 6 of 14), last bullet, various countries are mentioned (USA, Australia, Japan) but no mention is made of the European Union (EU). Should the EU be included?

These countries were included as examples because it was felt their systems were comparable to the product safety regime in Canada. Potential contractors should focus their attention on countries with similar conformity assessment regimes to ensure that comparisons are as relevant as possible.

5. In item 9 section 2 Insurance (page 12 of 14), did you wish to revise the RFP so that the original certificate of insurance is submitted on awarding the contract and prior to signing?

The RFP should be interpreted as meaning that an original certificate of insurance is submitted on awarding of the contract and prior to signing an agreement. No bid will be refused due to lack of an insurance certificate.

Thank you for your interest in the RFP. I look forward to receiving submissions.



Maria Lafano  
Regulatory Affairs Analyst  
Electrical Safety Authority