

**RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

**Bid Receiving
PWGSC
33 City Centre Drive
Suite 480
Mississauga
Ontario
L5B 2N5
Bid Fax: (905) 615-2095**

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

Regional Individual Standing Offer (RISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle régionale (OCIR)

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
Ontario Region
33 City Centre Drive
Suite 480
Mississauga
Ontario
L5B 2N5

Title - Sujet Environmental Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ447-141528/A	Date 2014-05-16
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EQ447-141528	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
File No. - N° de dossier TOR-3-36210 (304)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$TOR-304-6588	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2014-04-24	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-06-04	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Shaw, Marian	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur tor304
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (905) 615-2065 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (905) 615-2060
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: See Herein	
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 Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <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		

Amendment No. 004 is being issued to make the following revisions to the RFSO and provide answers to bidders' questions received to date.

At ANNEX "D" FORMS

Delete: Form 1C in its entirety.

Replace with: Form 1C (Rev. 1) attached.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Part 4 – Evaluation Procedure and Basis of Selection

a. 1.1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria

i. Item 3 under this criteria indicates "All individuals must be in-house". Under Part 1, Item 2, "it is possible for Offerers to Joint Venture". If Offerers elect to Joint Venture, does the in house requirement apply to any employees of the firms who elect to Joint Venture?

ii. Under Item 3, are there any restrictions on individuals filling a role in more than one Stream?

b. 1.1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria

i. Part 3. Can PWGSC confirm that Form 3B is required for all individuals except Key Personnel whose experience is including in Form 4?

ii. Part 3 (c) Accreditation. Can PWGSC clarify which accreditations are considered acceptable to address this requirement as many of the specializations do not have a specific accreditation. For instance, a Senior Environmental Assessment Specialist under Stream 1 or a Senior Risk Assessor under Stream 3. Is a Qualified Person (QP) designation for ESA or Risk Assessment (RA) work in Ontario acceptable as a form of accreditation? Is a Certified Canadian Environmental Practitioner (CCEP) designation acceptable?

iii. Part 3 (c) Accreditation. The RFP indicates that "Full accreditation is expected for Senior and Intermediate Professionals". Can PWGSC clarify what "full accreditation" means. Also, if a Senior or Intermediate Professional does not have an applicable accreditation, are they still eligible for this specialization, but rated lower? Or are they ineligible for this specialization?

A1. a. i. See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A2.b).

ii. See RFSO Amendment No. 003, Q & A4.

b. i. Yes, confirmed.

ii. Scoring is based on whether the individual has a license to practice in the relevant jurisdiction and has relevant professional accreditation or not. For all specializations the relevant jurisdiction is Ontario, except for those accreditations that are not issued regionally. QP is not considered an accreditation by a professional association and is therefore not considered acceptable. Certified Canadian Environmental Practitioner

(CCEP) is considered acceptable. Relevant professional accreditations considered acceptable include:

Professional Geoscientist (PGeo)
 Professional Engineer (PEng)
 Professional Biologist (PBio or RPBio)
 Chartered Chemist (C.Chem)
 Certified Technician (C.Tech)
 Certified Engineering Technologist (C.E.T)
 Applied Science Technologist (A.Sc.T)
 Certified Health Physicist – (CHP or DABHP)
 Registered Professional Planner (RPP)
 Professional Agrologist (PAg)
 Diplomate of the American Board of Toxicology (DABT)
 Project Management Professional (PMP)
 Certified Environmental Professional (EP)*
 LEED Green Associate
 LEED AP
 Registered Occupational Hygienist (ROH)
 Registered Occupational Hygiene Technologist (ROHT),
 Certified Industrial Hygienist (CIH)

*On August 1, 2010, Canadian Certified Environmental Practitioner (CCEP) was merged under the credential EP – Environmental Professional

<http://www.cecab.org/public/content.aspx?display=background>

- iii. Full accreditation means professional designation has been attained (please refer to answer A.1 b. ii. above). If a Senior or Intermediate Professional does not have an applicable accreditation, they are still eligible for the specialization. Individuals with full accreditations may obtain additional points.
- Q2. Part 5 – CERTIFICATIONS. This section of the RFP indicates that “Offerers must provide the required certifications and associated information to be issued a standing offer”. In part 2, the RFP indicates that “certifications listed below should be completed and submitted with the offer”. However, the information below refers to a SACC manual clause. In what form does PWGSC intend that Offerers use in submitting these certifications? For instance, should Offerer’s repeat the certification clauses in their Section III: Certifications submission?
- A2. Yes.
- Q3. Part 6 – Security and Financial Requirements, can PWGSC clarify which members of the Offerers’ team require security clearances. (b) indicates “individuals requiring access to classified or protected information, assets or sensitive sites”. How does this apply to, for instance, administrative staff who may support document preparation, editing or copying?
- A3. All individuals identified in the Offerer’s offer must hold a valid Reliability Status granted or approved by CISD/PWGSC before issuance of a Standing Offer. Any additional staff proposed to work on a call-up contract and not included in the Offerer’s offer must hold a valid Reliability Status prior to award of the call-up. Administrative support staff generally are not required to hold a security clearance but may be required based on the scope of work prior to the award of a call-up.

-
- Q4. Part 6 – Security and Financial Requirements, can PWGSC clarify how this security requirement applies to the range of subcontractors or suppliers that may not be specifically listed as individuals in the Corporate Capability Table, but who may support the work completed under the call-up. This includes drilling subcontractors, analytical labs, surveyors, utility locators, snow removal contractors, excavation contractors/operators.
- A4. Security requirements for subcontractors or suppliers will be determined based on the scope of work prior to the award of a call-up.
- Q5. Part 6 – Security and Financial Requirements, where in the proposal submission is documentation to substantiate the security clearances to be included? Should, for instance, this be included in Section II: Financial Offer of Section III: Certifications?
- A5. See RFSO Amendment 002 regarding revisions to the Security Requirement.
- Q6. Please clarify maximum page limitations for Forms 3B and Form 4.
- A6. See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A9. Revised Form 3B.
See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A10. Revised Form 4.
- Q7. Form 1C: One of the requirements states: "*how the team intends to meet the 'Project Response Time Requirements' defined in RS 1.4 of the Required Services*". Section RS 1.4 does not exist within the RFP. Can you clarify this requirement?
- A7. Delete the "'project response time requirements' defined in RS 1.4 of the Required Services" and replace it with "the required services in a cost effective and timely manner."
- Q8. Under Bill Pr25 1998, "An Act Respecting the Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists", the Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists (OACETT) was approved to provide certification to technicians and technologists meeting minimum education, experience and registration requirements (including Law, Ethics and Professional Practice Exams) in Ontario. Please confirm whether the following certifications awarded through the OACETT would meet the full accreditation expectations for Senior and Intermediate Professionals as per paragraph 3(c) of the RFSO document: Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.), Certified Technicians (C.Tech.), and Applied Science Technologist (A.Sc.T.).
- A8. Please refer to answer A 1.b.ii. above.
- Q9. A note on Annex "D" - Form 4 states "One form per person/specialization. Maximum 2 pages (8.5 x 11") one side of page, 4 pages total per stream. If each form per person can be 2 pages maximum, would not the total pages per stream be 8? (4 specializations x 2 max page per specialization).
- A9. See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A.10. Revised Form 4.
- Q10. Section 3c) states that a professional association must be provided for each person that is listed in the Corporate Capability Table. Will PWGSC accept an EP designation (Environmental Professional) certification through Eco Canada as meeting the requirements?
- A10. Please refer to answer A 1.b.ii. above.

Q11. Will evaluation points be deducted if an individual has a professional association that applies to a different province other than Ontario?

A11. Points will not be deducted. Individuals with the relevant jurisdiction may obtain additional points. Please refer to answer A 1.b.ii. and A 1.b.iii. above.

Q12. The TOR in Part 3 Section 1(a) [page 6 of 56] states: "use maximum 1 page, 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper, one side of page on all forms" and then Form 4 – Detailed Qualifications of Key Personnel states: "One form per person/specialization. Maximum 2 pages (8.5" x 11") one side of page. 4 pages total per stream."

A portion of the instruction on Form 4 seems to imply that each Form 4 can be two pages long (single sided). However, there is a requirement for four Form 4s and this would exceed the instruction on Form 4 that there can be only 4 pages total per stream.

Should the instruction on Form 4 have read 8 pages total per stream? Please advise/clarify.

A12. See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A10.

Q13. Is an Environmental Professional (E.P.) designation through the Canadian Environmental Certification Approvals Board (CECAB) satisfactory accreditation to satisfy Section 1.1.2 clause 3 (c) of the RFSO (accreditation)?

Q13. Please refer to answer A 1. b. ii. above.

Q14. What designations are acceptable for risk assessors in accordance with Section 1.1.2 clause 3(c) of the RFSO (accreditation)? Is a QPra designation from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment acceptable? Is a Diplomate of the American Board of Toxicology (DABT) acceptable? Is a Certified Industrial Hygienist (CIH) from the American Board of Industrial Hygiene acceptable? Is membership in the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry acceptable?

A14. Please refer to answer A1.b.ii. above. Memberships are generally not an accreditation by a professional association and are therefore not considered acceptable.

Q15. Is it possible to use subconsultants for various categories? Risk assessment is a specialized field, and there are a number of specialist firms that provide these services. Given the relatively low frequency of RA work versus the other general work categories within stream 3, we do not see the need to have the RA expertise in-house.

A15. Please refer to RFSO Amendment 003, A2. b) and Q & A13.

Q16. Is it possible to retain Specification writers (for Streams 3 and 4) and certified industrial hygienists (for Stream 4) when necessary, on a subconsultant basis? According to the Construction Specifications Canada (CSC) on-line membership directory, there are only 70 Registered Specification Writers (RSWs) and only 12 Construction Specification Practitioners across the country. According to the American Board of Industrial Hygiene (ABIH) Public Roster, there are only 65 CIHs registered within Ontario. Given the relative rarity of these classifications of personnel, is it necessary to have to provide these personnel "in house"?

A16. See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A8 and A12 and refer to answer A 1.b.ii. above.

- Q17. The groupings of charge-out rates makes it very difficult to accommodate the specialized expertise necessary to respond to the RFSO with uniform rates. For example, Senior Risk Assessors typically command a much higher charge-out rate than a Senior Environmental Engineer, however both would have to be charged out as a "Senior Professional". Similarly, a Specification Writer is a specialized field (according to the Construction Specifications Canada (CSC) on-line membership directory, there are only 70 Registered Specification Writers (RSWs) and only 12 Construction Specification Practitioners (CSPs) across the country) who would typically be billed out at a much higher rate than an Intermediate Scientist/Engineer, yet both would have to be charged out as an "Intermediate Professional". Again, an intermediate Risk Assessor would typically be charged out at a much higher charge-out rate than an intermediate "scientist/engineer". Is it possible for PWGSC to re-visit the charge-out categories to allow all individual specialists to have unique charge-out rates?
- A17. PWGSC will not be re-visiting the categories of personnel referred to in Part 4, section 1.2 of the RFSO.
See RFSO Amendment No. 003, A8.
- Q18. The Corporate Capability Table Form 3A(3) identifies categories for Scientist/Engineer and Scientist/Analyst/Engineer, however, aside from Professional Agrologists (P.Ag.) and Professional Biologists (RPBio.), no other scientist categories are listed in Section 1.1.2 clause 3(c) of the RFSO (accreditation). Given that stream 3 would involve the utilization of numerous staff with expertise in the sciences other than agronomy and biology, can non-professional staff be utilized for the scientist/engineer and scientist/analyst/engineer categories?
- A18. Staff meeting the criteria as per Part 4 of the RFSO and fulfilling the qualifications applicable to the stream will be eligible for evaluation. Professional staff may obtain additional points.
- Q19. The Corporate Capability Table Form 3A(4) identifies categories for Environmental Consultant, however, all categories listed in Section 1.1.2 clause 3(c) of the RFSO (accreditation) refer to professional engineers, geologists, planners, scientists and project managers. Given that stream 4 would involve the utilization of staff with expertise outside of these listed professions, can non-professional staff be utilized for the Environmental Consultant categories in Stream 4?
- A19. Staff meeting the criteria as per Part 4 of the RFSO and fulfilling the qualifications applicable to the stream will be eligible for evaluation. Professional staff may obtain additional points.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

ANNEX "D" (Rev. 1) - FORMS

Form 1C - TEAM APPROACH AND MANAGEMENT OF SERVICES

Name of Firm:

PROVIDE *(On one sheet of paper, single-sided 8.5"x11")*:

- the firm's approach to responding to the individual call-ups;
- the firm's depth of resources;
- quality assurance and quality control techniques;
- budget control techniques;
- schedule control techniques; and
- how the team intends to meet the required services in a cost effective and timely manner.