

## RETURN BIDS TO:

## RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Telus Plaza North/Plaza Telus Nord  
10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave. Jaspe  
5th floor/5e étage  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6  
Bid Fax: (780) 497-3510

## 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

Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Telus Plaza North/Plaza Telus Nord  
10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave Jasper  
5th floor/5e étage  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Architectural Consulting Services,	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EW038-140014/A	<b>Date</b> 2013-10-10
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EW038-140014	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWU-3-36081 (909)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWU-909-9934	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> 2013-09-06	
<b>Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale</b>	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-10-21</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Mountain Daylight Saving Time MDT	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Mayhew (RPC), Sylvia	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwu909
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (780) 497-3645 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (780) 497-3510
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA  VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN ALBERTA, SASKATCHEWAN AND MANITOBA AS DETAILED IN THE CALL-UP DOCUMENTS	
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> 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

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b> <b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No - Non</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
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)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

The following clarifications are being provided in response to questions received:

Q1. In SRE 3, sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5, when submitting the maximum of two c.v.'s for Proponent's personnel, are you requesting c.v.'s for Architectural personnel only?

A1. This is for Architectural personnel only.

Q2. If the previous question is limited to Architectural personnel only, please confirm that we do NOT need to identify our sub-consultant team (i.e., disciplines, firms, personnel), as there does not seem to be a stated requirement in the SRE section.

A2. There is no need to identify sub-consultants.

Q3. In SRE 3, what is the difference between 3.2.1.2(i) and 3.2.2.2(e)? Both seem to be asking the same thing (i.e., Quality Management methods).

A3. In 3.2.1.2(i) we are looking at how the firm approaches Quality Management and in 3.2.2.2(e) is how Quality Management is executed by the firm's project teams.

Q4. In reference to section SRE 3, 3.2.3 (1) Past Experience, can you clarify if it is a Mandatory Requirement that Proponents have "at least" 7 years experience. Section 3.2.3(2) states that Proponent should provide a description of three projects completed and undertaken within the last seven years for which we have, but our practice was established in 2009.

A4. We are asking for them to demonstrate " ...that over at least the past seven years..." They have participated in a range of projects requiring a full scope of services ....

We are not asking for them to demonstrate that they have been in business for at least seven years.

Q5. GI 1.1 of the RFP states that "Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) is inviting Architectural consulting firms with a team of sub-consultants which may include cost specialists, mechanical, electrical, structural and civil engineering expertise to submit proposals for Standing Offers." However, as the term "Proponent" is defined by section GI 20, there does not appear to be any section in the proposal submission that allows an Architectural firm to list its sub-consultants and their qualifications (ex: there is no table for engineering sub-disciplines to list hourly rates, and sections 3.2.4. & 3.2.5 refer only to proponent's "in-house" personnel). Can you please indicate how the sub-consultant disciplines listed above are to be included in the submission?

A5. This is for Architectural personnel only. There is no need to identify sub-consultants.