

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC  
11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier  
Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0A1/Noyau 0A1  
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5  
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**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**  
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY  
REQUIREMENT

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Consultant Services Division/Division des services  
d'experts-conseils  
11 Laurier St./11 Rue Laurier  
3C2, Place du Portage  
Phase III  
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> GCC Rehabilitation	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EP764-140495/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20140495	<b>Date</b> 2013-08-21
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$FE-104-63138	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fe104.EP764-140495	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-08-30</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Leach, Lynn	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fe104
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-0533 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-3160
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> Government Conference Centre (GCC) 2 Rideau Street Ottawa, Ontario	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

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

---

**This amendment will form part of the contract documents.**

**The following is in response to inquiries received in relation to this solicitation.**

**Question 1**

As a guide to helping proponents in the selection of sub-consultants, please clarify the preliminary work done on this project. The RFP describes schematic design and a feasibility study by others. Presumably this work was assigned to a consultant team under a Standing Offer with PWGSC. It is our understanding that firms who have completed certain pre-design services for this project under the Standing Offer Agreement are not permitted to compete for services under this RFP. We further understand that this restriction extends to those corporate entities in general, and that if those firms operate under multiple disciplines, they are restricted from submitting for services under this RFP, regardless of the discipline under which those firms provided services in a Standing Offer capacity.

**Answer 1**

Refer to R1110T GI 25 (2011-05-16) Conflict of Interest - Unfair Advantage. In addition, a Consultant providing services under a call-up against a PWGSC Standing Offer for the Government Conference Centre Rehabilitation project that included a clause which restricts a Consultant from bidding on the follow-on work if they provided certain services would not be eligible to compete as a Consultant or Sub-consultant for this RFP, regardless of the discipline, if they provided such services under that call-up.

**Question 2**

Does previous participation in studies and/or investigations of the Government Conference Center disqualify an architect or engineer from this RFP?

**Answer 2**

Refer to the Answer 1 to Question 1 above.

**Question 3**

Will section divider pages be considered part of the page count?

**Answer 3**

Refer to SRE 2.2 item (g) and SRE 2.3 item (f).

**Question 4**

We respectfully would like to request a 2 week extension to closing date for Solicitation No. EP764-140495/A - GCC Rehabilitation?

**Answer 4**

At this time, the closing date will not be extended.

**Question 5**

Under section SRE 3.2.2 Achievements of Key Sub-Consultants and Specialists on Projects, if a proposed Sub-Consultant is providing both Mechanical and Electrical Engineering services on this project and is able to demonstrate both disciplines in one exemplary project, are they allowed to do so and submit a total of 3 projects showcasing both disciplines in this section? Or must they demonstrate 3 separate projects for each discipline for a maximum total of 6?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP764-140495/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

20140495

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

004

File No. - N° du dossier

fe104EP764-140495

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fe104

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

**Answer 5**

Either would be acceptable.

**Question 6**

Are proponents required to submit the signed front pages of the RFP documents and addenda under SRE 3.1 Mandatory Requirements as in previous PWGSC Submission?

**Answer 6**

The Front Page of the RFP can be submitted at Phase One or Phase Two. The Front Page of revision(s) to the RFP can be submitted at Phase One or Phase Two.

**Question 7**

A decision to formulate a Joint Venture is most often based on creating the right project-specific team. Because each project is unique, it seems unusual that Joint Venture proponents are expected to "demonstrate past experience working in this same joint venture capacity," with projects completed within the last 10 years (Article SRE 3.2.1.). We ask that the Contracting Authority elaborate on the intent of this requirement. Also, if the J/V team does not have a substantially completed project together as a Joint Venture, is there an acceptable alternative to this criterion?

**Answer 7**

Past experience working in the same joint venture capacity should be demonstrated but it is not a mandatory requirement. All projects submitted will be evaluated against the rated requirements identified in the RFP.