

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

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle du département(OCID)

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

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

Comments - Commentaires

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

Title - Sujet General Architectural SO	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP168-130975/A	Date 2013-09-28
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20130975	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
File No. - N° de dossier fe102.EP168-130975	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FE-102-63325	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2013-08-19	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-10-07	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Boucher, Francine M.	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fe102
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6043 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Various locations National Capital Area	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

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

Question 3: Regarding SRE 3.2.1.2 (b); It asks for a “proposed typical work breakdown structure” with resources assigned, time schedule, level of effort.

There is really no such thing as a “typical” WBS. Each is created to suit the specifics of a project. The WBS is affected by the type of project (study, renovation, new construction), the skill sets needed (which engineers and specialists), the schedule (constraints, phasing) and complexity (types of efforts). This is an impossible requirement to respond to in the absence of a project and you should expect a wide range of responses and interpretations from the proponents. This would make equal evaluation difficult. Additionally, a WBS with a reasonable level of detail consumes a lot of pages.

We note that in the two hypothetical projects you already ask for a summary of the proposed WBS and that should suffice to demonstrate that the Proponents know how to develop a WBS for a specific project.

Might we suggest that you ask the proponents instead to describe their methodology for developing a WBS and determining resource assignment, time schedule and level of effort? 3.2.1.2 (b) would be revised to read "describe your methodology to develop a WBS and establish the resources assigned, time schedule and level of effort."

Answer 3:

Please refer to Amendment No. 02 for the response.

Question 4:

SRE 3.2.4.2 and 3.2.4.3: References to “proponent” should read “sub-consultants’specialists”.

Answer 4:

Please refer to Amendment No. 02 for the response.

Question 5:

Regarding SRE 3.2.7.2 (e), this is essentially a repeat of SRE3.2.1.2 (e). Could this be eliminated to reduce repetition of basic material?

Answer 5:

SRE 3.2.7.2 (e): Under this section, proponents should identify their understanding of working with PWGSC as it relates to the hypothetical projects and not their general understanding of working with PWGSC.

Question 6:

Refer to SRE 3.2.5 and 3.2.6. As written, you are only looking for information on the personnel of the Proponent and you don't want any info on the sub-consultants /specialists.

On past RFSOs the SREs required CVs for the personnel of the sub-consultants / specialists. Please confirm that you are not looking for this information.

Answer 6:

CV's for the personnel of Sub-consultants/Specialists have not been requested in this RFSO. Please refer to SRE 3.2.4 for requested information on the past experience of the Sub-consultants/Specialist.

Question 7:

3.2.5 Senior Personnel Expertise and Experience

3.2.6 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience

These sections refer to the "proponent". The definition of proponent excludes sub consultants. Is the Senior Personnel Expertise and Experience and Project Personnel Expertise and Experience of the sub-consultants part of the evaluation and if so, where is it listed in the Rated Requirements?

Answer 7:

Answer 5: SRE 3.2.5 and SRE 3.2.6 refer to proponent expertise and experience only. Please refer to SRE 3.2.4 for requested information on the past experience of the Sub-consultants/ Specialists. Past experience of the Sub-consultants/ Specialists will be rated as identified in SRE 3.3 Evaluation and Rating table.

Question 8:

Hypothetical Project #2 - Please confirm that the services required are for a feasibility study, and clarify the following sentence listed under Required Work: "Pre-design and project administration services are required from the Prime Consultant Team for all phases of the project."

Answer 8:

Please refer to the "Required Services - RS 1 Pre-Design Services" section of the RFSO document for a full description of the services required, from the consultant, for a feasibility study. Please refer to the "Description of Services - PA1 Project Administration" section of the RFSO document, for an outline of the required services for project administration from the proponent team.

Question 9:

Licensing Requirements. Professional licensing requirements vary between provinces. We ask that the RFSO be structured to award separate Standing Offers for each province.

Answer 9:

Licensing Requirements as outlined in the Architectural RFSO Section 3.1.2 to remain unchanged.

Question 10:

We note that for this Standing Offer, PWGSC has dropped its longstanding requirement to include two mechanical and two electrical firms. We would like to suggest that this be reconsidered, because having two firms for each of these disciplines is advantageous as follows:

- Since this is a very large Standing Offer, if one M&E firm should happen to be carried on several teams, this could cause that firm to be too busy to take on a given mandate.
- Our due diligence with all of our sub-consultants before committing to a project includes a review with each firm of the nature, scope and schedule. Sometimes this review has caused one M&E firm to decline.
- Some projects are highly specialized. Often one firm brings very specific expertise to match the project needs. The ability to match project needs to a firm's specialization helps both project quality and schedule.

We accordingly request that the requirements be changed to two mechanical and two electrical firms.

Answer 10:

The requirement for one mechanical sub-consultant firm and one electrical sub-consultant firm remains unchanged for this RFSO.

Question 11:

Refer to SRE 3.1.4 and SRE 3.2.4.1 (b).

Under SRE 3.1.4 the key personnel of the sub-consultants and specialists are to be identified on the Consultant Team Identification Form. This is not a rated part of the submission.

Under SRE 3.2.4.1 (b) you ask for the senior and project personnel who worked on the project to be identified. There is often a turn-over of personnel. This creates a loop-hole in which the personnel who were involved on a project are no longer with the firm; yet the project can be used. Will you accept projects in which the senior and project personnel are no longer employed by the sub-consultants and specialists? Or do you prefer projects in which the senior and project personnel are still employed and available for projects?

Consider revising SRE 3.2.4.1 (b) to read: "For the above projects, include the names of senior personnel and project personnel who were significantly involved as part of the project team and their respective responsibilities. Identify any personnel who are not currently employed by the sub-consultants and specialists. Only the experience of personnel who are listed on the Consultant Team Identification Form will be considered."

Answer 11:

Under SRE 3.2.4.2 (a) and (b) the Evaluation Board will accept projects which have senior personnel, who are still employed by the firm and who worked on those projects. Project personnel, who worked on the projects, should also be identified and their respective responsibilities listed and whether or not they are still with the firm.

Please revise SRE 3.2.4.2 (b) to read: "For the above projects, include the names of senior personnel and project personnel who were significantly involved as part of the project team and their respective responsibilities. Senior Personnel listed should still be employed by the firm. For project personnel, please indicate if they are still employed by the firm."

Question 12:

Hypothetical Project #1 - The project description states that the project is "located in a remote area of Ontario". This RFSO is for projects located in the National Capital Region. Please clarify the significance of stipulating a remote location for the hypothetical project.

Answer 12:

Please revise Hypothetical question #1 to read:

“PROJECT 1**Situation:**

A federal government tenant is vacating a two storey Government of Canada designated “Recognized” heritage building in April 2013, located in a remote area of the **National Capital Region**. The site is located **50 km** from the departmental representative’s government office. Another federal government tenant, HRSDC, with 125 FTE’s will be occupying the existing 1750m2 usable space (2200m2 gross area) but requires additional 100 m2 usable space for file storage. The existing site is large enough to accommodate the addition.

Unfortunately the stone masonry building with original wood windows has been neglected in terms of maintenance and requires some repairs. PWGSC would like to commission a heritage screening report to determine the extent of the repairs required before proceeding with the fit-up.

HRSDC has agreed to revise their office design standards to meet the Government of Canada Workplace 2.0 Fit-up Standards from 16um2/FTE to 14um2/FTE. The additional file storage space is special purpose space and requires a minimum floor loading capacity of 12.0kPA.

Scope of services required:

Your firm has been asked to submit a proposal to provide services in two stages.

The first stage is to provide a building envelope screening report evaluating the condition of the exterior of the Government of Canada building, designated “recognized” to determine the extent of repair work required to the heritage building.

The second stage is to provide basic services for the repairs of the exterior of the existing building and renovation of the interiors including base building upgrades to suit the new office space, and the design and construction of the addition. Included in the second stage, the services of your firm, sub-consultants and specialists are also required to design and implement the interior design of the office fit-up, including modifications to the mechanical and electrical systems to suit new fit-up, provide furniture layouts including high density mobile storage (HDMS) and power/data/voice requirements for the layouts. The procurement and installation of furniture, HDMS and telecommunications services will be done by the tenant but the scope of work for these contracts will be coordinated by your team for the overall project. Your firm and your team of sub-consultants and specialists will prepare contract documents for the project to be issued for tender by PWGSC, provide contract administration during the construction and provide basic field review services up to building occupancy in March 2015.

Provide list of sub-consultants and specialists required for the project team and how the firm will deal with the remoteness of the site, located 300kms from your firm’s office, deliver the two stages of services and list the scope of services provided at each phase, with the levels of effort per discipline/specialty to complete the project.

Challenge question:

Describe the risks that may impact the schedule to complete the project on time.”

Question 13:

The requirements identified under SRE 3.2.4 items 2 to 4 for Sub-consultants appear to be a repeat of those identified under SRE 3.2.3 for Proponents. Please clarify:

- .1 If the number of projects to be provided under 3.2.4.2 is for each requested discipline or in total.
- .2 If the intent is for each Proponent to carry one sub-consultant only for each of the identified categories or if it is acceptable to present more than one sub-consultant specialist for each or any discipline.
- .3 Please confirm that there is no requirement to provide c.v.'s for sub-consultant personnel as SRE 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 only refer to *Proponent* personnel.
- .4 Will Sub-consultants/Specialists with established working relationships with the Proponent be rated higher than those without, or will their past experience based solely on the projects presented be rated independent of this factor?
- .5 Please confirm if the two hypothetical projects will be weighted equally within the evaluation grid i.e. that each hypothetical represents 50% of the weighted rating, or alternatively, if one question will be weighted more than the other.

We observe that there is a potential advantage to the Crown in situations where the Proponent has the flexibility/ability to engage alternative sub-consultants/specialists to best suit any given project mandate.

Answer 13:

- .1 Three significant projects to be provided under 3.2.4.2 is for each requested discipline.
- .2 The intent is for each Proponent to carry only one sub-consultant/ specialist for each discipline.
- .3 There is no requirement to provide c.v.'s for sub-consultant/ specialist personnel.
- .4 Sub-consultants/Specialists and Proponents will be rated based solely on the projects presented in the submission. Established working relationships will not be considered.
- .5 The two hypothetical projects will be weighted equally within the evaluation grid i.e. that each hypothetical represents 50% of the weighted rating.

Question 14:

Under **SRE3**, item 3.2.4.3, is the intent that:

- a. The Sub-consultant "must possess the knowledge on the above projects"?

OR

- b. The Proponent as defined in G.I. 20, "must possess the knowledge of the projects" included in 3.2.4?

Please clarify this point.

Answer 14:

Please revise SRE 3.2.4.3 to read:

SRE 3.2.4.3: The proponent must show that the sub-consultants/specialists possess the knowledge on the above projects. Past project experience from entities other than the sub-consultants/specialists will not be considered.

Question 15:

In accordance with the clauses of the Request for Proposal documents for the above mentioned subject, I would like to ask the following questions:

- .1 In article GI 1 – INTRODUCTION of the General Instructions to Proponents, it is written in paragraph 2: "If a Proponent is licensed to practise in only one of the two provinces, then that Proponent must be eligible and willing to be licensed in the province in which they are not licensed." Concretely, what does that mean? What documents must be provided in the service offering to meet that requirement?
- .2 Under the same article, a total value for all Standing Offers of \$27 million is the value of the service contract for the contract holder, and not the value of work?

Answer 15:

1. The proponent shall be authorized to provide the necessary professional services to the full extent that may be required by provincial law in the province of the work upon issuance of a call-up. If the proponent is licensed to practise in only one of the two provinces, then you must indicate how you intend to meet the provincial requirements.
2. Please refer to SP5 Call-Up Procedure 1. a)

Question 16:

- .1 In article **GI 24 – Performance Evaluation** of the General instructions to Proponents, there is mention of the consultant's performance. Are sub-consultants and specialists also evaluated? If so, is there a list of sub-consultants having obtained an unsatisfactory performance rating that we could use? This would allow us not to use a team of sub-consultant that didn't meet PWGSC's performance criteria.
- .2 At the **Rated requirement 3.2.4.**, it is asked to demonstrate the experience of sub-consultants/specialists by providing three relevant governmental projects. Is it three projects per discipline or a total of three projects?
- .3 In the first paragraph of the description of **Hypothetical project 1** (*Part 2 of 2 / Page 100 of 123*), It is written that the building in question is located at 100 km of the departmental representative's office, whereas at the last paragraph (*Part 2 of 2 / Page 100 of 123*), it is written that it is at 300 km. Is the building located at 100 km or at 300 km of the consultant's office?

Answer 16:

- .1 Please refer to SRE 3.2.4 for requested information on the past experience of the Sub-consultants/ Specialists.

There is no list available of sub-consultants who have obtained unsatisfactory performance ratings.
- .2 Three significant projects to be provided under 3.2.4.2 is for each requested discipline.
- .3 The site is located 300km from the proponent's office. Also, please revise Hypothetical question #1 to read:

“PROJECT 1**Situation:**

A federal government tenant is vacating a two storey Government of Canada designated “Recognized” heritage building in April 2013, located in a remote area of the **National Capital Region**. The site is located **50 km** from the departmental representative's government office. Another federal government tenant, HRSDC, with 125 FTE's will be occupying the existing 1750m² usable space (2200m² gross area) but requires additional 100 m² usable space for file storage. The existing site is large enough to accommodate the addition.

Unfortunately the stone masonry building with original wood windows has been neglected in terms of Maintenance, and requires some repairs. PWGSC would like to commission a heritage screening report to determine the extent of the repairs required before proceeding with the fit-up.

HRSDC has agreed to revise their office design standards to meet the Government of Canada Workplace 2.0 Fit-up Standards from 16um²/FTE to 14um²/FTE. The additional file storage space is a special purpose space and requires a minimum floor loading capacity of 12.0kPA.

Scope of services required:

Your firm has been asked to submit a proposal to provide services in two stages.

The first stage is to provide a building envelope screening report evaluating the condition of the exterior of the Government of Canada building, designated “recognized” to determine the extent of repair work required to the heritage building.

The second stage is to provide basic services for the repairs of the exterior of the existing building and renovation of the interiors including base building upgrades to suit the new office space, and the design and construction of the addition. Included in the second stage, the services of your firm, sub-consultants and specialists are also required to design and implement the interior design of the office fit-up, including modifications to the mechanical and electrical systems to suit new fit-up, provide furniture layouts including high density mobile storage (HDMS) and power/data/voice requirements for the layouts. The procurement and installation of furniture, HDMS and telecommunications services will be done by the tenant but the scope of work for these contracts will be coordinated by your team for the overall project. Your firm and your team of sub-consultants and specialists will prepare contract documents for the project to be issued for tender by PWGSC, provide contract administration during the construction and provide basic field review services up to building occupancy in March 2015.

Provide list of sub-consultants and specialists required for the project team and how the firm will deal with the remoteness of the site, located 300kms from your firm's office, deliver the two stages of services and list the scope of services provided at each phase, with the levels of effort per discipline/specialty to complete the project.

Challenge question:

Describe the risks that may impact the schedule to complete the project on time."

Question 17:

SRE2.2 indicates a requirement for "Letters of Reference as indicated in SRE 3.2.3 and SRE 3.2.4 to be provided separately and to be restricted to eighteen (18) pages in total. However, in the amended SRE 3.2.3 and SRE 3.2.4 it only indicates " (l) An indication (letter or other) of client satisfaction.

Can you please clarify what is meant by the 'letter or other'?

Answer 17:

Please revise SRE 3.2.3.3 (l) to read:

(l) Letters of reference, to be submitted as outlined in SRE 2.2.