



Procurement Hub – Ottawa Office,  
Station 9W084, 9th Floor,  
200 Kent Street,  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E6

December 23, 2013

**ADDENDUM NO. 3**

Subject: Request for Supply Arrangement No. FP802-130005  
**Supply Arrangements for Contaminated Sites Management and Technical  
Advisory Services for Environmental Management**

Dear Sir/Madam:

Further to the above-mentioned Request for Proposal, this Addendum (#3) is to advise potential bidders of the question(s) received during this tender call to date. Both the question(s) and the response(s) are indicated in the attached Annex A.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

**Tenderers are to acknowledge this Addendum by signing in the space provided below and enclosing a copy of this document with their tender submission.**

Yours truly,

(Original signed by)

**Beverly Shawana**  
Senior Contracting Officer,  
Financial & Materials Management Operations

**RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGED**

**Name of Company**

**Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Canada**



*Annex A-1*

Q1. Our company is interested in submitting a proposal service within your supply arrangements (No. FP802-130005). However, we would like item 16.0 (Workplace) of Appendix "C" (page 57) clarified. It is listed in the first paragraph in item 16, "Streams 1 and 2 will be used in the regions of Newfoundland and Labrador, Central and Arctic, Maritimes and Gulf." So our understanding is that Quebec IS NOT COVERED by Streams 1 and 2.

A1. Quebec and Pacific are now EXCLUDED from all streams.

Q2a. Does DFO want to have each of the 5 consultants selected for each Stream to be able to respond to call-ups in every DFO Region?

A2a. No. However, please be reminded that the regional requirements will be stated at the competitive call up stage and it will then be the responsibility of the successful Supply Arrangement holders to bid or not bid on the given region.

Q2b. If we have resources and relevant experience in 3, but not all (Example Central/Arctic), how will that impact the scoring within each Stream?

A2b. Suppliers are bidding on Streams, not regions. Inability to work in any one region will not result in the submission being screened out.

Q3. Within the Technical Evaluation Rated Criteria for each Stream, is DFO expecting that we provide copies of reports prepared for other clients within our response within the various work categories, or just to provide written descriptions of relevant projects with client references? Confidentiality requirements would limit what reports we might be able to provide.

A3. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has revisited the Evaluation Criteria which will be addressed in Addendum #4. The complete Request for Supply Arrangement document is being amended to address not only the changes/corrections under this question but also to the security requirements for this proposal call.

Q4. There seems to be differing requirements from a timing perspective (bid closing vs. contract award), as follows:

a) On page 70 of 96 in the RFSA, criteria M2 states: "The Bidder must hold a valid Facility Security Clearance (FSC) level with a Document Safeguarding Capability (DSC) at the Secret level issued by the Canadian and International Industrial Security Directorate (CISD) of Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) effective on the date on contract award."

b) On page 1 of 96 in the RFSA, it states: "The SA Supplier working under these potential Supply Arrangements must hold a valid Facility Security Clearance (FSC) level with a Document Safeguarding Capability (DSC) at the Secret level issued by the Canadian and International Industrial Security Directorate (CISD) of Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) effective at the time of bid closing."



Given that it will only be necessary for the firm to have the security requirements in place at the initiation of an actual services contract, can you please confirm that it will be sufficient for the successful firm to have the required security clearance prior to performing the work arising from the SA contract?

A4a, 4b. Refer to Addendum #2 on Security Requirements.

Q5. Item 3, Page 42 - Estimated Value

Please clarify if the estimated amounts given for each stream exclude fees for specialized services such as drillers and laboratories. This is especially pertinent for Stream 2 which includes site remediation work.

A5. The estimated value of each stream includes ALL costs associated with the potential requirements.

Q6. Item 6, Page 45 - Scope

Please indicate if there is any advantage that a Bidder would have if presenting proposals for all three streams.

A6. No. Potential Bidders have the option to present proposals for one or all three streams.

Q7. Item 23.4, Page 60 - Bid Format

This section includes a suggested format for presenting our proposal responses. In it, some items are requested twice – approach & methodology; understanding; service capability. As a result, please clarify the requirement for Bid Format.

A7. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q8. Security Requirements

Will DFO accept resources who may not have gained their Secret level security clearance at bid submission time but do have it in place at call-up time?

A8. Refer to Addendum #2 on Security Requirements.

Q9. Certifications

Please provide examples of licences or certifications that are requested here. Will we be judged non-compliant if we do not have any resources with these licences or certifications, even though we may meet all other criteria for this stream?

A9. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q10. Company Experience - We understand that DFO is requesting 15 projects here – five projects for each of the three relevant areas a), b), and c). Please confirm this interpretation.

A10. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q11. Page 72 – Certifications - For Stream 3, will DFO accept the Lead Auditor certification EP (EMSLA) as given by CECAB, as an alternative to EP (CEA)?



A11. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q12. Point-Related Criteria

For many point-rated criteria in Streams 1 and 3, DFO is requiring that “the Bidder must demonstrate that their resources have experience in...” a particular specialization. We understand this to mean experience gained by the resource with any employer, current or past. Please confirm this interpretation.

A12. Experience gained can be from any employer, past or current. Refer to Addendum #1 Question #4, Answer #4 for more information on experience.

Q13. As it relates to the security clearances, it is stated that “*the SA Supplier must hold a valid Facility Security Clearance level with a Document Safeguarding Capability at the Secret Level.....effective at the time of bid closing and that the SA Supplier’s assigned resources working on the contract much each hold a valid clearance at the secret level*”. These clauses have been identified as a MANDATORY requirement. Would it be sufficient if the firm and its resources are in the process of applying for these clearances at the time of bid close? Will Addendum #2 (as indicated in Addendum #1) be issued shortly to clarify this requirement?

A13. Refer to Addendum #2 on Security.

Q14. Addendum 1 states the proportions of estimated expenditure by region over the 2 years of the SA. Is this estimate consultant fees only or does it include subcontractors (ie drilling and laboratory costs) if applicable?

A14. As per Question #5 Above

Q15. The RFP asks for the submission of pricing for 6 resources (project manager, project team leader, junior, intermediate and senior consultant, field supervisor/manager) in each of the 3 streams.

Q15a. Are we allowed to provide more than 1 person in each category to show that we have resources across the country to provide services within each of the regions DFO operates in?

A15a. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q15b. If we can provide more than 1 person, how will you evaluate the resources (will you just assess the first person in each category or do an average weighting of all in the various categories)?

A15b. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q16. It is noted that in Phase 1 - mandatory criteria (as outlined on pages 70 – 73) Stream 1 asks for company experience, 3 project examples and resumes but Stream 2 asks only for company experience, certifications and resumes.

a) Is that an oversight – should we also be providing 3 project examples for Stream 2?

A16a. Please refer to Answer A3 above.



- b) Additionally for stream 3, are we correct in understanding that in the mandatory criteria we need to provide 15 project examples in the company experience (5 within each of the 3 areas of expertise)?

A16b. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q17. Could you clarify where we are to show the project examples for Phase 2 – Point rated criteria? Are all of these project examples expected in the resumes? If so, does each resource provided need to provide the maximum amount of reports or is this experience divided up between all resources (for example in Stream 1 – R1 there is a total of 200 points available – 60 points for providing examples of RBIL and SSC reports (6 in total) and an additional 140 points for the description of work. Does each resource need to provide 6 examples or is 6 between the 6 resources sufficient?

A17. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q18. In addendum 1, Q2 you state that suppliers should provide summaries of the reports as well as copies of the reports. Do you really want copies of reports attached to the submission or is a summary of the report sufficient?

A18. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q19. Is it DFO's intention to award 5 SA for each of the 3 streams (15 in total)?

A19. Up to 5 SAs will be awarded under each stream for a total of up to 15.

Q20. Are we permitted to include a rate escalation on our fees when including our rates for option years?

A20. The tendered prices submitted for the initial period and all option periods are to be determined solely by the bidders.

Q21. In the absence of Addendum #2, is it safe to presume that the security requirements for Secret Level clearance are to be provided for the corporation only at the time of closing, and that clearance for individuals can be provided upon contract award or prior to the commencement of any work? If this is the case, are we required to complete form F-1 (Personnel Identification Form) still with the names and dates of birth for personnel that may not currently hold a valid Secret level clearance?

A21. Refer to Addendum #2 for security questions.

Q22. As per Appendix B-1 7. Meals and Allowances, will these be fixed rates for the duration of the contract or will they be updated annually or otherwise in accordance with the Treasury Board travel policy?

A22. Appendix "B-1", Maximum Allowances for Travel that is attached to the Request for Supply Arrangement package will be updated in accordance with the quarterly directive received from Treasury Board to be used in the resulting agreements for this proposal call.



Q23. In the categories of labor, will DFO consider adding additional categories to cover Admin, GIS/CAD Technician and Field Technicians or are these to fit into an already existing category of labor?

A23. No. There will be no further additions of categories of labour. Should additional types of resources be required for each project, then this will be assessed at competitive call-up time.

Q24a. Could you please clarify if DFOs intention is to award 5 Supply Arrangements in total to cover the 3 streams or if in fact up to 15 separate supply arrangements could be established.

A24a. Please refer to A19 above

Q24b. If 5 per stream are awarded, does this mean that for all call ups over \$25K (in fees)?, competitive bids will be required from all holders of arrangements?

A24b. Yes, within the given stream.

Q24c. If this is the case, due to costs incurred and the level of effort surrounding competitive submissions, would DFO consider increasing this amount to call ups over \$75K?

A24c. Treasury Board guidelines decide the thresholds for sole source and/or competitive requirements. The department does not have the delegation to increase the sole source limit of \$25K.

Q25. Are you requesting one proposal submission for all of Canada or individual proposals for each of the 6 Regions?

A25. Potential suppliers are bidding on Streams of work, not regions. One proposal submission is requested regardless of how many streams are included. Location of work (i.e. region) will be determined on a case by case basis when specific contracts are awarded.

Q26. How many SA awards will be provided by Stream?

A26. As per Statement of Work. Up to 5 per Stream.

Q27. Are the dollar value estimates by stream shown on Page 42, Appendix C, the estimated amount to be spent year 1 or for Year 1 plus the additional option years? Will the contract value be increased for the additional option years?

A27. See Addendum #1, Question 1A, 1B, 1C and Answer for 1A, 1B and 1C.

Q28. Also, is this value (Page 42, Appendix C) to be divided among more than one Standing Offer?

A28. The value of the Supply Arrangement (not Standing Offer) is divided between Streams as listed in the Statement of Work. The value indicated for each Stream will be divided between up to 5 Suppliers (as per Question #2 above).



Q29. Column F (Average per Diem Rate) shows a formula that would result in a sum value not an average. Should this be divided by 4? Or is a sum desired?

A29. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q30. In the row for the Project Team Leader, Column G indicates a weight of 0.15, however Column H has a formula of  $Q = .05 \times K$  not  $Q = .15 \times K$  - Should the weight factor be 0.05 or 0.15?

A30. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q31. Stream One – Technical Evaluation (R1):

- a. With regard to the Risk Based Intervention Level (RBIL) reports and Soil Screening Criteria (SSC) reports, please provide the reference to applicable Canadian publications, such as CCME, Heath Canada and Environment Canada documents, documents that discuss the relevance of these tools as part of the 10 Step Federal Approach to Contaminated Sites, or other publications that elaborate both approaches.

A31a. Documentation can be found at the following links:

[http://www.ccme.ca/publications/ceqg\\_rcqe.html](http://www.ccme.ca/publications/ceqg_rcqe.html)

<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/contamsite/docs/index-eng.php>

<http://www.ec.gc.ca/lcpe-cepa/default.asp?lang=En&n=E9DBBC31-1#s2>

<http://www.federalcontaminatedsites.gc.ca/8DF3AC07-5A7D-483F-B263-6DE03104319A/fa-af-eng.pdf>

- b. Please clarify which types of “other existing ecological tools” mentioned in the RFP are acceptable alternatives.

A31b. As DFO is a Federal Department, the links above are to documents containing Federal Guidelines and policy. Other existing ecological tools exist at the provincial level and could be applicable to a specific project. If a potential supplier has experience at the provincial level using other tools they can be highlighted here. The acceptance of such tools will be dictated by the Project Authority or Regional equivalent at competitive call-up time.

Q32. Stream Two – Technical Evaluation:

- a. Remediation of Sites (R2): Should the bidder document the oversight of contractors conducting the excavation of contaminated sites or dredging of contaminated sediment or should the bidder document the completion of excavation/dredging work as the main contractor?
- b. Construction or demolition (R3): Should the bidder document the oversight of contractors involved in demolition and construction related to contaminated sites or document the completion of demolition and construction work as the main contractor?
- c. Encapsulation of Contaminated Media or Sources of Contamination (R4): Should the bidder document the development of procedures, specifications, oversight of contractors involved in encapsulation of contaminated media or document the completion of encapsulation work as the main contractor?

A32a, A32b, A32c.





Ensuring that all personnel, and/or companies as a whole, are in compliance with environmental procedures and/or best management practices is a shared responsibility of both the potential supplier and the Project Authorities. Therefore, all aspects of work should be documented by anyone who becomes aware of it. This includes oversights on the part of the contractor as well as progress reports or notification of completion.

Q33. Resource Requirements:

- a. Appendix C (Statement of Work), Section 10, p. 53: This section lists the required resource categories, and refers to Appendix "D" Evaluation Methodology and Criteria for a description of the minimum qualifications associated with each of these categories. However, there is no description of the minimum qualifications in Appendix D or elsewhere, aside from the number of years of experience for Junior Consultant, Intermediate Consultant and Senior Consultant.

A33a. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

- b. It appears in the wording of this section that the Project Team Leader, Project Manager and Field Supervisor/Manager can be neither a Junior Consultant, Intermediate Consultant nor Senior Consultant. Given the categories defined according to number of years of experience, this would imply that the Project Team Leader, Project Manager and Field Supervisor/Manager must not fit into any of the defined categories on the basis of years of experience (i.e. they cannot have less than five years, 5-10 years or 10+ years of experience). Please clarify.

A33b. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

- Q34.
- a) An extension to the closing date of this submission to January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014 is requested.
  - b) Would like to request a two week extension for DFO's request for supply arrangement No. FP802-130005.
  - c) **Extension:** Having further reviewed the RFP we would like to request an extension until Friday, January 17, 2014 given the level of effort required to prepare 3 separate proposals.
  - d) An extension to the closing date of this submission to January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014 is requested

A34. The deadline is amended to Friday January 24<sup>th</sup> no later than 11 AM. As per Addendum #2.

Q35. For Stream 1: Consulting services for assessing contamination at sites, it is stated in Section 6 of the RFSA (p. 45) that "Bidders should have access to technical facilities capable of performing tests on samples obtained from contaminated media. Various media will be examined for a multitude of substances to determine levels of contamination." Since all bidders could be expected to have access to the services of accredited laboratories capable of performing most types of analysis that are normally undertaken for contaminated site work, this specification seems to imply that non-standard forms of testing might be required. If so, what types of testing are implied, and what level of "access" is considered acceptable (i.e. does the SA Supplier need to have a lab on its premises)?

A35. DFO did not intend to imply that non-standard forms of testing would or should be required. The only requirement is that potential suppliers have access (on-site or through sub-contacting) to an accredited laboratory that would be capable most types of analysis that are normally undertaken for contaminated site work.





Q36. Can you provide any additional information on the types of site under assessment for this SA?

A36. DFO property types are listed under Annex D of the following document.

Evaluation of the Asset Management Services: Real Property and Materiel Management and Procurement Services.

[http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/ae-ve/evaluations/11-12/AMS-eng.htm#annex\\_d](http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/ae-ve/evaluations/11-12/AMS-eng.htm#annex_d)

Q37. Will there be any regional division of the projects?

A37. Yes. Projects will be divided amongst the regions referred to under Addendum #1, Question 1A, 1B, 1C and Answer 1A, 1B and 1C. At this time the number of contracts (projects) is unknown. Hence the estimate for value of the supply arrangement.

Q38. We are interested in submitting on the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Request for Supply Arrangement No. FP802-130005. Our company and proposed staff currently have a valid PWGSC reliability status and a RCMP reliability status security clearance (issued in 2013). We have also initiated the Secret Level status as required for this solicitation through NCR Security. However, they have indicated it will likely take longer than a month to get cleared, especially due to the holiday break.

Could you please comment if it would be acceptable for this solicitation to state that upon award of the contract, we will complete our requirement for the secret level clearance?

A38. This question has been addressed under Addendum #2 which is specific to Security.

Q39. The Terms of Reference for the above noted supply arrangement notes a requirement for the Company and employees to hold a "Secret" level security clearance for this arrangement. Secret level security is a completely different requirement that is quite onerous and expensive to implement and manage (document and electronic file management in particular). Is this a mandatory requirement that is new to the supply arrangement? Is there consideration to have this level of security decreased to the "reliability" level for this submission?

A39. This question has been addressed under Addendum #2 which is specific to Security.

Q40. On Page 53 (Section 10.0 Resource Requirement) there is a list of 6 categories of Required Consultants. This Section refers to Appendix D for a description of the minimum qualifications associated with each of these resource categories. I cannot find any reference to these Resource categories in Appendix D – it does ask for Resumes for all Project Members. Is it required that each team have a minimum of 6 people – at least one in each of the six categories?

A40. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q41. **Clarification, Location of Work, Section 16.0, p. 56:** Could you please clarify the regions that are included for Stream 1 and Stream 2. The first paragraph of Section 16.0 suggests that Stream 1 and 2 will be used in Nfld, Central & Arctic, Maritimes & Gulf (i.e. excluding Quebec and Pacific). However the second paragraph suggests that Stream 1 and Stream 2 will be used by all



regions excluding the Pacific only (i.e. including Quebec). Please clarify if Quebec region is included or excluded from Streams 1 and 2?

A41. Quebec and Pacific are now EXCLUDED from all streams.

Q42. **Clarification, “# of projects/reports” for Stream 1 and 2, p. 75-78:** Could you please clarify how the “# of projects”, or “# of reports” in the Technical Evaluation section (Stream 1: R1, R2, R3, R4; Stream 2: R2, R3, R4) will be scored (e.g. 20 points per project for a total of 60 points?, etc.) and what the scoring criteria for these projects will be? Is there a template available showing how you would like these projects presented?

A42. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q43. The rated criteria under Stream 3 reference Bidder experience with federal facilities and federal government departments. In our experience, there are many valuable lessons learned and comparators with environmental compliance assessments for **large provincial and municipal clients**. Would the Department broaden the rated criteria for Stream 3 to accept other relevant public sector experience, such as provincial and municipal?

A43. No, as the department needs to ensure that the bidder has experience with federal environmental regulations. The provincial and municipal clients do not follow federal environmental legislation.

Q44. R4 and R6 of Stream 3 reference Bidder resource experience in developing environmental management plans, standard operating procedures, and/or other compliance tools for one or more of the following. For purposes of evaluating these rated requirements, would assistance provided to clients to **review, co-ordinate on or advise on** plans and procedures be acceptable?

A44. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q45. R7 of Stream 3 is scored based on number of projects. Specifically, 10 points per project to a maximum of 5 Project is allocated for conformance with the ISO14001 standard for a Federal Department or Agency. The source of the other 50 points in terms of nature of projects is not specified. Could the Department please clarify the scoring for R7?

A45. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q46. Stream One R1 states “Description of work related to RBILs – 70 points”. Similar worded criteria are found in R2 (ie. Details on ESA experience – 70 points), R3, and R4, as well as in Stream 2, R1, R2 (ie. Diversity of Experience – 100 points), R3 (ie. Diversity of Experience – 75 points), and R4. The question a proponent must ask themselves, without further detail, is just how much information is needed to obtain maximum points?

- a) Is it a number of projects/reports?
- b) Is it a number of years of experience preparing them?
- c) Is it 2 pages of narrative text?



- d) Is it to be addressed within the text of the 5, 6 or 7 projects or reports submitted in fulfillment of the first part of the criteria?

A46a, A46b, A46c, A46d. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q47. Page 83 of the RFSA item 4.1 states “Tenders must be submitted in the format provided...and submitted as instructed. Tenders not submitted in the format provided will not be considered.”

However, the RFSA addresses information required in multiple places within the RFSA document, and each requests different information and different formats, please see;

- a. Page 3, “**PROPOSAL-ANNEX2** *Your proposal must include:*”
- b. Page 60 item **23.4 Bid Submission Format** provides a “sample table of content for the RFP response”
- c. Page 63 states “Proposals will be based on the highest total point score and evaluated on the basis of understanding of the subject matter, management of the work, proposed methodology, quality of the proposal, and cost.”
- d. Pages 69 to 80 provide the mandatory and point-rated criteria, which tends to be the method the evaluators follow to grade submissions

Each of these sections addresses information that is expected to be represented within the proposal, and 3 of them present formats that vary. To ensure we submit a proposal that will be considered, please clarify the format.

A47. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q48. Page 63 states “Proposals will be based on the highest total point score and evaluated on the basis of understanding of the subject matter, management of the work, proposed methodology, quality of the proposal, and cost.” Is this to be a general methodology; i.e. a methodology for Stream 1 – Assessing Contamination at Sites and Stream 2 – Remediating/Risk Managing Contaminated Sites, or is it to be an unique methodology addressing each of the individual rated criteria within each stream?

A48. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q49. In Appendix B-2, Financial Proposal (p.39/96), there is a formula in Column F to calculate the Average Per Diem Rates. It provides for the sum of the individual per diem rates provided for all four years of the contract (i.e.  $A1+A2+A3+A4$ ). In order to become an average, this sum should be divided by four (i.e.  $(A1+A2+A3+A4)/4$ ). Can you please confirm whether Column F should reflect the average, or the sum, of the Per Diem Rates?

A49. Please refer to Answer A3 above.

Q50. The terms of the RFP state that the proposal is to be submitted electronically in three volumes. Can you please clarify whether this electronic submission is to be via e-mail? Can you please confirm whether a PDF format is sufficient? Are the three proposal volumes to be submitted via separate e-mails, or sent in the same e-mail, but as three distinct and separate files?

A50. The submissions can be submitted via email and a PDF is acceptable. One email for all streams is fine.