

RFP 87055-13-0275
R564.1 Third Party Review of PRAISE-CANDU
Probabilistic Fracture Mechanics Code

Q&A#3

Q1. The authors are not to be involved in the actual work of the review. Would it be permissible to contact them for information and clarification provided that their opinions do not come into the review?

A1. We would prefer that the contractor not contact the authors directly during the review. The review should be independent. We can give the COG report authors an opportunity to review and comment on the draft reports prepared by the contractor and invite them to attend the end of the project meeting. The goal of the review is to identify potential shortcomings or missing information in the COG reports. If the contractors identify something that isn't clear or requires further elaboration then this is a finding.

Q2. Are we expected to run test cases with several of the codes or is it sufficient to compare published cases only?

A2. No, the contractor is not expected to run test cases, only evaluate the published cases.

Q3. Can you clarify the security clearance sponsorship process?

A3. The security requirements must be met by contract award and not by bid closing. If your organization does not currently meet the security requirements set out in the RFP the CNSC can initiate a sponsorship upon request. As specified in the RFP a sponsorship can take many months to process and any delay in the award of a contract to allow the successful bidder to obtain the required clearance will be at the entire discretion of the Contracting Authority.