

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC
Suite 1650
635 - 8th Ave. S.W.
Bureau 1650
635 - 8e avenue, SO

Calgary
Calgary
Alberta
T2P 3M3
7137 (403) 292-5786

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Public Works and Government Services
Canada/Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux
Canada
Suite 1650
635 - 8th Ave. S.W.
Bureau 1650
635 - 8e avenue, SO
Calgary
Calgary
Alberta
T2P 3M3

Title - Sujet Environmental Support Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EW702-132575/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EW702-132575	Date 2013-03-26
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$GMP-006-6064	
File No. - N° de dossier GMP-2-35118 (006)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-04-29	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Mountain Standard Time MST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pahl, Nathaniel	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur gmp006
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (403) 292-5410 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (403) 292-5786
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Amendment 001

This amendment is separated into 2 sections.

- A. Question & Answer
- B. Changes to the Request For Proposal document

A. Question & Answer

Q1. Several companies have had significant involvement in the Giant Mine project to date that could:

- give them an unfair advantage in bidding this work or
- put them in a conflict of interest because of work they have previously completed.

Could PWGSC please provide an explanation of the criteria that will be used to identify which companies meet either of the above 2 scenarios and list those companies that will not be allowed to bid for this contract because past work either gives them an unfair advantage or puts them in a conflict of interest? The response to the above will influence our decision to prepare a bid for this RFP.

A1. A Giant Mine Procurement Strategy Update will be available to industry on MERX in early April 2013. The update includes a section that addresses conflict of interest and unfair advantage. In this section, PWGSC identifies how a conflict of interest and/or unfair advantage is assessed and identifies areas where it has been determined a conflict of interest could exist between contracts.

As a result of the conflict of interest and/or unfair advantage assessment, PWGSC identified companies that may be in a situation of conflict of interest and/or unfair advantage with future GM contracts. PWGSC will not publicly publish the names of these companies. If a company has been identified to be in a situation of conflict of interest and/or unfair advantage for a specific Giant Mine contract, they will be notified as such in writing.

In the event a bid is received from a company in a situation of conflict of interest and/or unfair advantage, the bid will be handled in accordance with Standard Instructions 2003, section 18 (2012-03-02) Conflict of Interest - Unfair Advantage. Refer to Part 2, Bidder Instructions, Article 1. Standard Instructions, Clauses and Conditions.

It's important to note, in the technical evaluation of bids for this tender, refer to Annex F, Technical Evaluation Criteria, previous experience specific to the Giant Mine site will not be given special consideration.

B. Changes to the Request For Proposal document**In: Part 2 – Bidder Instructions****Under: 2. Submission of Bids****Add:****2.1 Limitation of Submissions**

1. A Proponent may not submit more than one proposal. This limitation also applies to the persons or entities in the case of a joint venture. If more than one proposal is received from a Proponent (or, in the case of a joint venture, from the persons or entities), all such proposals shall be rejected and no further consideration shall be given.
2. A joint venture is defined as an association of two or more parties which combine their money, property, knowledge, skills, time or other resources in a joint business enterprise agreeing to share the profits and the losses and each having some degree of control over the enterprise.
3. An arrangement whereby Canada contracts directly with a consultant who may retain sub-consultants or specialist consultants to perform portions of the services is not a joint venture arrangement. A sub-consultant or specialist consultant may, therefore, be proposed as part of the consultant team by more than one Proponent. The Proponent warrants that it has written permission from such sub-consultant or specialist consultant to propose their services in relation to the services to be performed.
4. Notwithstanding paragraph 3. above, in order to avoid any conflict of interest, or any perception of conflict of interest, a Proponent shall not include in its submission another Proponent as a member of its consultant team, as a sub-consultant or specialist consultant.
5. Any joint venture entered into for the provision of professional services or other services must be in full compliance with the requirements of any provincial or territorial law pertaining thereto in the Province or Territory in which the project is located.

In: Part 2 – Bidder Instructions
Delete: 6. Optional Site Visit and Bidder's Conference
Replace with:

6. Optional Site Visit and Bidder's Conference

It is recommended that the Bidder or a representative of the Bidder visit the work site. Arrangements have been made for a tour of the work site. The site visit will be held on **April 10, 2013 at 9:00 AM, C-Dry Boardroom, Giant Mine Site, Yellowknife NT.**

A bidders' conference will be held after the site visit at **1:30 PM** at the **Greenstone Building, 2nd Floor Boardroom, Yellowknife NWT.**

The scope of the requirement outlined in the bid solicitation will be reviewed during the conference and questions will be answered. It is recommended that bidders who intend to submit a bid attend or send a representative.

Bidders are requested to communicate with the Contracting Authority before the scheduled visit and conference to confirm attendance. Bidders are to notify whether they will attend both the site visit and bidder's conference or only one of the events.

Bidders should provide, in writing, to the Contracting Authority, the names of the person(s) who will be attending and a list of issues they wish to table at least 5 working days before the scheduled conference.

Any clarifications or changes to the bid solicitation resulting from the bidders' conference will be included as an amendment to the bid solicitation. Bidders who do not attend or send a representative will not be given an alternative appointment but they will not be precluded from submitting a bid.

It is mandatory that all persons attending the site visit have the proper safety footwear (CSA approved green patch) . Hard hats, safety glasses and high visibility vests are also required. Consultant personnel/individuals who do not have the proper safety attire will be denied access to the site.

Non-registered bidders may not be allowed on the site.

All travel and living costs associated with travel to Yellowknife for the purpose of attending the Site Visit / Bidder's Conference will be borne by the Bidder or their representative.

In: **Part 4 - Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection**
 Delete: **2. Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price**
 Replace with:

2. Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

1. To be declared responsive, a bid must:
 - (a) comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation;
 - (b) meet all mandatory criteria; and
 - (c) obtain the required minimum points specified for each section of Annex F - Technical Evaluation Criteria;
2. Bids not meeting (a), (b) and (c) will be declared non-responsive.
3. The evaluation will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 70 % for the technical merit and 30 % for the price.
4. To establish the technical merit score, the total technical score (including Aboriginal Opportunities Consideration) for each responsive bid will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained divided by the maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 70 %.
5. To establish the pricing score, each responsive bid will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and multiplied by the ratio of 30%.
6. When there are three or more responsive proposals, an average price is firstly determined by adding all the price proposals together and dividing the total by the number of price proposals considered. All price proposals which are greater than twenty-five percent (25%) above the average price will then be set aside and receive no further consideration.

All price proposals which are thirty percent (30%) or more below the average price may be required to submit documentation demonstrating, to the satisfaction of Canada, that the bidder is capable of providing the services at the proposed amounts throughout the contract term. If a bidder cannot provide such documentation, the price proposal will be set aside and receive no further consideration.

This documentation may include the following:

- 1) paid invoices from other clients confirming that the same rates for the same individuals proposed have been utilized within the last year,
 - 2) a price breakdown showing costs which include, but are not limited to: direct labour, direct materials, purchased items, engineering and plant overheads, general and administrative overhead, transportation, profit, and
 - 3) any other supporting documentation that may be requested by Canada.
7. For each responsive bid, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.
 8. Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract.

The table below illustrates an example where four of the five bids are responsive and the selection of the consultant is determined by a 70/30 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively.

The total available points is 340.

The lowest evaluated price is \$1,650,000.00 for Bidder C. Therefore, Bidder C gets the full 30 points available for price.

Firm Name	Technical Proposal (168 Pass Mark)	Aboriginal Opportunities Consideration (No Pass Mark)	Total Overall Points Awarded	Evaluated Price Proposal	Weighted Score = 70%	Weighted Price = 30%	Total Score
Bidder A	260/280	50/60	310/340	\$1,800,000.00	63.82	27.5	91.32
Bidder B	280/280	20/60	300/340	\$1,700,000.00	61.76	29.12	90.88
Bidder C	192/280	30/60	222/340	\$1,650,000.00	45.71	30	75.71
Bidder D	203/280	25/60	228/340	\$2,400,000.00	46.94	N/A	N/A
Bidder E	139/280 Non - compliant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4 bids met the minimum pass mark in the technical evaluation portion of the bid evaluation. As a result, all evaluated price proposals were added together and divided by 4 in order to reach the average bid price which was determined to be \$1,887,500.00. Bidder D's price proposal was greater than twenty-five percent (25%) above the average price and was set aside and received no further consideration.

Bidder E did not achieve the minimum pass mark for the technical proposal and was not considered any further.

Bidder A was deemed the Best Overall Proposal.