

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Environmental Services-	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EQ447-141642/A	<b>Date</b> 2014-05-23
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EQ447-141642	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> TOR-3-36209 (304)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$TOR-304-6589	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2014-04-24	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2014-06-02</b>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Shaw, Marian	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> tor304
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (905) 615-2065 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (905) 615-2060
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	
<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>Yes - Oui</b>	<b>No - Non</b>
<b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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>		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ447-141642/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

EQ447-141642

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

005

File No. - N° du dossier

TOR-3-36209

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

tor304

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

See attached document

Amendment No. 005 is being issued to extend the solicitation closing date and provide answers to bidders' questions received to date.

**At Page 1, under Solicitation Closes:**

Delete: 2014-05-28  
Insert: 2014-06-02

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

- Q1. We are a team of associates affiliated with a large environmental consulting firm and regularly provide them with all their environmental auditing services. We are typically covered by their policies, procedures, and insurance and work under their name. Page 11 of the RISO, paragraph 1.1.2.4 states that "the four [key] personnel must be in-house employees of the offeror". Since we regularly work for this firm under this arrangement, do we qualify as in-house employees, or can the RISO be amended to include this scenario? As currently written, this clause will disqualify many very able and qualified teams and we are requesting that the key personnel not have to be in-house employees.
- A1. Affiliated associates will be accepted as in-house employees provided the individuals are clearly identified and documentation is included in the proposal to demonstrate there is an established agreement with the Offeror showing that the affiliated associate(s) are covered by and work under the name of the company or firm submitting the offer. Coverage must include, at a minimum, insurance and health and safety requirements. No more than 3 affiliated associates are allowed on Forms 3(A) and 3(B) per stream and 1 affiliated associate on Form 4 per stream. The Senior Contact Representing the firm must be an employee of the firm and cannot be an affiliated associate.
- Q2. (a) 1.1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria: A total Maximum Point criteria is provided for each Point Rated Section and respective Annex D – Forms. To ensure an accurate response to each point-rated technical criteria can you provide a detailed scoring/breakdown grid of the point criteria for each section and all Forms for each Stream?
- (b) For example - ANNEX D – FORM 4: Given that the maximum score for four experts is a relatively high 124 points, could you please confirm the following: (a) will the four experts represent a maximum of 31 points each, i.e. 124 divided by 4; and (b) can you provide a detailed scoring/breakdown grid of the point breakdown?
- A2. (a) Please refer to RFSO Amendment 004, Annex G..  
(b) Please refer to RFSO Amendment 004, Annex G.
- Q3. Form 3A(2) and 3A(6): These forms require the nomination of environmental auditors having ISO or CSA certification.
- o Will PWGSC accept equivalent certification from recognized national agencies such as Eco-Canada and CECAB?
- A3. Yes, equivalent environmental auditor certification from ECO Canada and CECAB will be accepted. Please also refer to RFSO Amendment 003, A1. b. ii.
- Q4. 1.1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria: Under section 3 Corporate Capability Table, item (d) Experience, it is stated that "Years experience refers to the number of years the individual has worked in the discipline relevant to the Category Specialization, and does not include time at sc With regards to Stream 6, Sustainability is a concept applied to the built environment and hool or

time working in a different discipline.” as a standalone discipline is in its infancy and has only become a specialization since the advent and popularity of green rating tools such as LEED, which by the way only officially came to Canada in late 2004. Prior to this time, and even still today, sustainability is practiced by professionals from a variety of disciplines – architecture, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, civil engineering, energy efficiency, etc. – as the two go hand in hand. This notion is supported in the table for Stream 6 as a number of the requested specialization, such as Sustainable Building Specialist, LEED Certified professional and Energy Assessor, and speak to individuals with experience in building related disciplines.

- As very few people in the industry are likely to have 10 or more years' experience dedicated to sustainability alone and that many sustainability specialists continue to practice under their primary discipline, can their years of experience in their primary discipline count towards relevant experience?
- A4. Individuals do not have to be dedicated solely to the discipline however the experience must be relevant to the Category Specialization for the minimum period specified.
- Q5. Part 4 Section 3c) refers to accreditation requirements. We have the following questions:
- a) Is it mandatory at the time of Standing Offer (SO) closing date and/or before issuance of a SO contract, that the individual listed under the Senior/Intermediate professional category in Form 3A have full accreditation in Ontario, and under Junior/Professional/Technologist have at least "In-Training" designation in Ontario? Alternatively, is it acceptable if the individual has applied for either full accreditation or "In Training" status before the solicitation closing date, and accreditation is pending?.
  - b) If an individual has full accreditation in another province, and at the time of the Standing Offer closure date, is in the process of applying for accreditation in Ontario, will that meet the accreditation requirements?
  - c) Would a the designation of "Qualified Person" (QPESA and/or QPRA) as per O. Reg 153/04 meet Part 4, Section 3c) accreditation requirements?
- A5. a) It is not mandatory. Applications are not generally considered full accreditation. See A5. b. (below) and RFSO Part 4, 1.1.2 3. and RFSO Amendment 003, A1. b. ii and A1. b. iii.
- b) Where there is an accreditation issued in Ontario accreditations in another province will only be accepted if documentation is included in the Offer that clearly demonstrates that the candidate has applied for accreditation in Ontario and that in consideration of them having full accreditation in another jurisdiction the application is considered administrative only by the Ontario licensing body. See also RFSO Amendment 003, A1. b. ii.
  - c) No. See RFSO Amendment 003, A1. b. ii.
- Q6. Part 3 – Offeror Preparation Instructions, Section 2 Past Relevant Experience of the Firm states, in part, “Identifies past environmental projects, ....”. Please confirm whether projects must be completed. If the reference projects must be complete, please confirm it is acceptable to provide, as a reference project, a distinct phase or stage of a larger project or program where that distinct phase or stage is complete, though the larger project or program may not be complete.
- A6. Projects must be completed. A distinct phase or stage of a larger project or program will be considered a project in its own right as long as the work associated with that phase is completed and is a series of tasks that meet those described in the RFSO statement of work for the relevant stream.

- Q7. As a specialty service provider we are disappointed by the exclusions of sub-consultants from consideration for the current RFSO opportunity. We understand that only Joint-Ventures will be considered for this opportunity, we would like to enquire as to whether it is possible for an independent consulting firm to be part of multiple Joint-Ventures for this RFSO opportunity.
- A7. Yes.
- Q8. Can PWGSC confirm that a description of relevant project involvement is not required for Form 3B (Rev. 1)?
- A8. A description of relevant project involvement is not required for Form 3B.
- Q9. Can the projects referred to for the individuals in Form 4 include or be the same as the projects referred to in Form 2?
- A9. Yes.
- Q10. Please clarify the location of the requirements referenced as RS1.4 'Project Response Time Requirements' in Form 1C. This reference cannot be found elsewhere in the document
- A10. Please refer to RFSO Amendment 003. A7.
- Q11. Part1(2) Summary: The RFSO indicates that the Regional Individual Standing Offer is for the provision of professional services in Ontario region for PWGSC. Are there any specific regions of the province where the projects will be focused or could they occur anywhere within the province?
- A11. There are no specific regions in the province where the projects must be focused. Projects anywhere in Ontario may obtain additional points. Projects demonstrating rural, urban and northern areas may obtain additional points.
- Q12. Part 3(1) Offer preparation Instructions: Is there a specific font size or type that the proposals must follow?
- A12. No. However, the font and size must be readable.
- Q13. Part 4(1.1.1) Mandatory Technical Criteria – Past Relevant Experience of the Firm: Is there a specific time frame in which the projects must have been completed by to gain maximum points? If so, what is that time frame and is there a time frame beyond which projects will not be considered.
- A13. Projects completed in the last 5 years may obtain additional points. There is no time frame beyond which projects will not be considered

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.