

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Room 100,
167 Lombard Ave.
Winnipeg
Manitoba
R3B 0T6
Bid Fax: (204) 983-0338

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation 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 -
Western Region
Room 100
167 Lombard Ave.
Winnipeg
Manitoba
R3B 0T6

Title - Sujet Investment Analysis Report, CHARS	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EW003-152413/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client CHARS-AANDC	Date 2015-07-23
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$WPG-016-9506	
File No. - N° de dossier WPG-5-38008 (016)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2015-08-04	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Central Daylight Saving Time CDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Hall, Marlene	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur wpg016
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (204) 984-6423 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (204) 983-7796
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EW003-152413/A

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

CHARS-AANDC

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

File No. - N° du dossier

WPG-5-38008

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

wpg016

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

INTENTIONAL BLANK PAGE

This **amendment #002** is raised to modify Solicitation # EW003-152413/A and respond to Supplier questions as follows:

Part A: Questions and Answers

- Q1:** Can the Crown confirm whether there is an incumbent provider(s) of some or all of the services described in the RFP and whether they have expressed an interest in bidding to provide all or part of the services detailed in the Statement of work?
- A1:** *No providers have been retained or solicited for any services identified in the RFP.*
- Q2:** Annex B supplies a timeline of 46 weeks. Can the Crown confirm that:
- a) Given that this is tied to milestone dates, this timeline would be sequential not overlapping:
 - b) There would be a commitment of at least one Whole Time Equivalent of consultant time for the duration of the contract?
- A2:** *Annex B identifies five (5) milestones with a total of 22 weeks from date of Contract Award.*
- a) *The timelines presented are assumed sequential.*
 - b) *It is up to the Bidder (Joint Venture) to determine the time and commitment of each of its individual resources allocated to the project.*
- Q3:** Can the Crown confirm the maximum budget for the project?
- A3:** *No budget is available as this is a study with financial analysis to support decisions.*
- Q4:** The RFP identifies the requirement for an economist. Can the Crown confirm that bidders could propose additional resources within this category to supplement the expertise described (appreciating that they may not be subject to any kind of evaluation)?
- A4:** *Bidders are encouraged to propose additional resources to supplement the expertise described.*
- Q5:** We would intend to create a Joint Venture if selected but because of the expense of doing this would not intend to do this for bidding. We would intend to establish a Memorandum of Understanding between bidding entities, for the purposes of providing a response, which would deliver to the criteria in 4.1.1.1. Can the Crown confirm this is acceptable?
- A5:** *Joint Ventures may be submitted in accordance with the terms and conditions of the solicitation. Refer to Standard Instructions 2003, Article 17, Joint Venture. Bidders (Joint Ventures) must meet all the mandatory and technical requirements of the solicitation.*

Part B: Modification

Annex F, Evaluation Criteria Section 2.2, Point Rated Criteria

Bidders must clearly demonstrate in their bid how they meet the following Point-Rated Criteria:

- Delete:** Delete R1, R2, R3, R4 and R5 in its entirety (page 41 to 45 of 45)
- Insert:** Replace with the following

ITEM	POINT RATED CRITERIA	MAX. POINTS
R1	Comparable Projects	30
	<p>a. Through the description of up to three (3) recently completed (in the past seven years from RFP closing date) Facility Management projects and/or studies worked on by Bidder's Firm/Joint Venture. The comparable project typology should include, at a minimum:</p> <p>i. One example of the delivery of Facilities Management services to support ongoing operations by the Bidder;</p> <p>ii. One example of the preparation of an investment analysis study of Facilities Management options to support long term delivery of facilities management decisions making by a client; and</p> <p>b. The Bidder must provide evidence that they have comparable experience to effectively provide services outlined in the SOW. Proposal must include project description and intent narrative, including demonstration of:</p> <p>iii. How the project supports the Bidder in demonstrating that they are qualified to prepare an effective and accurate <i>Investment Analysis Report to select a Facilities Management Strategy for the Canadian High Arctic Research Station</i> in Cambridge Bay, Nunavut.</p> <p>iv. Comparable constraints and challenges complete with approach to address constraints and challenges and resulting supporting resolutions to the project Constraints and Challenges. Assessment will consider innovation, development of appropriate and cost effective solutions that support providing demonstrate-able value to the project.</p> <p>v. Outline of Quality Management approach to ensure project is effective, comprehensive, considers the inter-related components within study and support decision making.</p> <p>vi. Lessons learned and challenges in the application of Facilities Management services against the projected Facilities Management model in predicting the Facilities Management requirements.</p> <p>(as an example comparable Facilities Management projects could be located in the Arctic climate (above 55 degrees latitude) or for campuses of buildings that support multiple occupancies.)</p> <p>Bidders will be evaluated on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparable project typology (maximum 6 pts) • How the comparable project supports this project (maximum 3 points for each relevant project to a maximum of 9 pts) • Comparable constraints and challenges (maximum 6 pts) • Quality management approach (maximum of 3 pts) • Applicability of Lessons Learned to this project (maximum 6 pts) 	30 (based upon grid table 1)

R2	Core Project Team	40
	<p>a. Demonstration of working as an interdisciplinary team environment should include a minimum of three (3) comparable Facilities Management Investment Analysis Report studies. The Core Project Team of the following specialists should be demonstrated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consultant Team Leader: Facilities Management Professional; Facilities Management Modeling Specialist; Facilities Management Benchmarking Specialist; Facilities Management Investment Analyst; Facilities Management Risk Analyst. <p>b. The assessment will consider, at a minimum, the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of the Core Project Team members complete with explanation of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Roles within the project team of comparable studies. Proposed role within this project. Demonstration of experience working together as a part of the same interdisciplinary project team. Identification of how each comparable study is considered applicable to this study. Include for each comparable study consideration for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Complexity of the Facilities Management model developed and how it is comparable to that of this project. Success in determining appropriate variables and modeling techniques for the facilities Management model in support the determination of reliable, long term, Facilities Management requirements/projections. Approach to customizing Benchmarking exercise to the project to ensure relevant, comparable data is used in the study. Applicability of Benchmarking exercise to identify and assess comparable facilities that was conducted in previous projects compared to that of this project. Identification of challenges and constraints as the Project Team Lead/Facilities Management Lead complete with resolution to address identified challenges and constraints. Identification of project specific Facility management Risks and Mitigation strategies proposed within the study that could be relevant to this study. <p>(as an example comparable Facilities Management projects could be located in the Arctic climate (above 55 degrees latitude) or for campuses of buildings that support multiple occupancies.)</p> <p>Bidders will be evaluated on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of Core Team experience and appropriateness of comparable study by Core Team (maximum of 25 pts) Challenges and Constraints complete with resolutions (maximum 5 pts) Risks and Mitigations strategies from comparable study by Core Team (max 5 pts) Arctic climate or campuses that support multiple occupancy types (max 5 pts) 	<p>40 (based upon grid tables 2 & 4)</p>

R3	Supporting Project Team	25
	1. Economist: Provide previous experiences (projects) that demonstrate experience in the quantification and evaluation of investment alternatives to support decision making, including development in support of analyzing alternatives of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advantages and disadvantages with supporting justification • Potential growth and/or economic impact over time and • Assessment of feasibility. 	5 (based upon grid table 2)
	2. Isolated Buildings Facilities Management Specialist: Should provide a minimum of two (2) years previous experience in providing Facilities Management services within isolated (immovable) buildings, in locations that can be accessed by road or water no more than six months of the year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Identify the facility/facilities location, size and primary function; and (ii) Identify three (3) complications the team member experienced in the delivery of Facilities Management services to isolated locations and the methods used to mitigate complication(s) in the future. 	5 (based upon grid table 2)
	3. Laboratory Buildings Facilities Management Specialist: Should provide a minimum of three (3) years previous experience in providing Facilities Management services within Laboratory buildings that include, at a minimum, containment level 2 based upon Health Canada standards and guidelines. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Identify the facility/facilities location, size, primary function and identified containment level; and (ii) Identify three (3) complications the team member experienced in delivery of Facilities Management services in the laboratory buildings and the methods used to mitigate complication(s) in the future. 	5 (based upon grid table 2)
	4. Campus Facilities Management Specialist: Should provide a minimum of three (3) years previous experience in providing Facilities Management services within buildings that include a minimum of four (4) different Occupancy Classifications based upon the National Building Code of Canada. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Identify the campus building's Building Occupancies based upon the National Building Codes of Canada; and (ii) Identify three (3) complications in delivering Facilities Managements services within the campus buildings and the methods used to mitigate complication(s) in the future. 	5 (based upon grid table 2)

	<p>5. Building Life Cycle Analyst:</p> <p>Demonstrate past experience, through 3 projects conducted over the last 10 years, in developing life cycle analysis to project the cost of facilities management ownership including the following for each facility/campus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Identify facility/facilities location, size, and function; (ii) Identify the projected life cycle of the analysis; (iii) Identify the scope of considerations within the analysis and how they are comparable to this project scope; and (iv) Comparison of the life cycle analysis to the first three years of implementation of facilities management for the said example. 	<p>5 (based upon grid table 2)</p>
R4	Team Asset Qualifications	5
	<p>Points will be given for a project team that includes members who are in good standing with the following qualifications will be evaluated as follows (provide proof):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Analyst: Canadian Risk Management (CRM) designation with experience in Facilities Management analysis. (1/2 point) 2. Economist: Post Graduate degree in Economics from a recognized university in North America. (1/2 point) 3. Investment Analyst: Graduate degree in business, business administration or commerce with a speciality in: (1 point) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Investment Analysis or Risk Analysis; (b) Facilities Management. 4. Professional Engineer able to practise in the Nunavut Territory and able to demonstrate experience in Laboratory buildings with a speciality in Mechanical Engineering. (1/2 point) 5. Profession Engineer able to practise in the Nunavut Territory and able to demonstrate experience in Arctic buildings (above 55 degrees latitude) with a speciality in: (1 1/2 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Building Envelop Engineer; or (b) Mechanical Engineering; or (c) Electrical Engineering. 6. Professional Architect able to practise in the Nunavut Territory and able to demonstrate experience in the role of the "project architect", "lead architect", "project manager" or "architect of record: in: (1 point) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Laboratory buildings; or (b) Arctic building (above 55 degrees latitude) classified under Part 3 of the National Building Code of Canada. 	<p>5 (no grid)</p>

R5	Inuit Opportunities Considerations (No minimum pass mark)	30
	<p>1. The existence of head offices, administration offices or other facilities in the Nunavut Settlement Area</p> <p>Points will be assigned based on the following:</p> <p>a) Existence of head office(s) (2 pts)</p> <p>b) Administration office(s) (2 pts)</p> <p>c) Other facilities (2 pts)</p>	6 (no grid)
	<p>2. The employment of Inuit labour, engagement of Inuit professional services, or use of suppliers that are Inuit or Inuit firms in carrying out the contract.</p> <p>Points will be assigned based on the following: (max 24 pts)</p> <p>a) Details on the work to be carried out for each position proposed to be filled by an Inuit person.</p> <p>b) Strategies for recruitment of Inuit persons.</p> <p>c) Use of suppliers and identification of services to be provided by Inuit firms.</p>	24 (based upon grid table 3)

EVALUATION RATING GRID GUIDELINES

Grid Table 1 (multiple of 3s)

<u>INADEQUATE</u>	<u>WEAK</u>	<u>ACCEPTABLE</u>	<u>VERY GOOD</u>
<u>0 point</u>	<u>1 (2 or 3) points</u>	<u>2 (4 or 6) points</u>	<u>3 (6 or 9) points</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not submit information which could be evaluated • Absolutely inadequate • Weaknesses can't be corrected • Proponent lacks qualification and experience • Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements • Sample projects not related to this projects needs • Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just fails to meet the desirable minimum • Weaknesses can be corrected • Proponent just below minimum qualifications and experience • Team not quite capable of fulfilling requirements as presented • Sample projects only marginally related to this projects needs • Just below acceptable capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the desirable minimum • No significant weaknesses • Proponent is qualified and experienced • Team covers all components and will likely meet requirements • Sample projects generally related to this projects needs • Average capability should be adequate for effective results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than satisfies desirable minimum • No apparent weaknesses • Proponent is highly qualified and experienced • Strong team – some members have previously worked together • Sample projects directly related to this projects needs • Superior capability, should ensure effective results

Grid Table 2

<u>INADEQUATE</u>	<u>POOR</u>	<u>WEAK</u>	<u>ACCEPTABLE</u>	<u>VERY GOOD</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>
<u>0 point</u>	<u>1.0 points</u>	<u>2 points</u>	<u>3 points</u>	<u>4.5 points</u>	<u>5 points</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not submit information which could be evaluated • Absolutely inadequate • Weaknesses can't be corrected • Proponent lacks qualification and experience • Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements • Sample projects not related to this projects needs • Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Below the desirable minimum • Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected • Proponent generally lacks qualifications and experience • Team is weak – either missing components or overall experience is weak • Sample pr objects not related to this projects needs • Little capability to meet performance requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just fails to meet the desirable minimum • Weaknesses can be corrected • Proponent just below minimum qualifications and experience • Team not quite capable of fulfilling requirements as presented • Sample projects only marginally related to this projects needs • Just below acceptable capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the desirable minimum • No significant weaknesses • Proponent is qualified and experienced • Team covers all components and will likely meet requirements • Sample projects generally related to this projects needs • Average capability should be adequate for effective results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than satisfies desirable minimum • No apparent weaknesses • Proponent is highly qualified and experienced • Strong team – some members have previously worked together • Sample projects directly related to this projects needs • Superior capability, should ensure effective results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptionally strong proposal • No apparent weaknesses • Proponent is exceptionally qualified and experience • Exceptional team – has worked well together before on comparable work • Sample projects directly related to this projects needs • Exceptional capability, should ensure extremely effective results

Grid Table 3

<u>INADEQUATE</u>	<u>POOR</u>	<u>WEAK</u>	<u>ACCEPTABLE</u>	<u>GOOD</u>	<u>VERY GOOD</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>
<u>0 point</u>	<u>6 points</u>	<u>10 points</u>	<u>12 points</u>	<u>16 points</u>	<u>22 points</u>	<u>24 points</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not submit information which could be evaluated Absolutely inadequate Weaknesses can't be corrected Proponent lacks qualification and experience Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements Sample projects not related to this projects needs Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly or substantially below the desirable minimum Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected Proponent generally lacks qualifications and experience Team is weak – either missing components or overall experience is weak Sample pr objects not related to this projects needs Little capability to meet performance requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just fails to meet the desirable minimum Weaknesses can be corrected Proponent just below minimum qualifications and experience Team not quite capable of fulfilling requirements as presented Sample projects only marginally related to this projects needs Just below acceptable capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the desirable minimum No significant weaknesses Proponent is qualified and experienced Team covers all components and will likely meet requirements Sample projects generally related to this projects needs Average capability should be adequate for effective results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly exceeds the desirable minimum No significant weaknesses Proponent is well qualified and experienced Team covers all components and more than likely will meet requirements Sample projects are related to this projects needs Above average capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than satisfies desirable minimum No apparent weaknesses Proponent is highly qualified and experienced Strong team – some members have previously worked together Sample projects directly related to this projects needs Superior capability, should ensure effective results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceptionally strong proposal No apparent weaknesses Proponent is exceptionally qualified and experience Exceptional team – has worked well together before on comparable work Sample projects directly related to this projects needs Exceptional capability, should ensure extremely effective results

Grid Table 4

<u>INADEQUATE</u>	<u>POOR</u>	<u>WEAK</u>	<u>JUST ACCEPTABLE</u>	<u>ACCEPTABLE</u>	<u>GOOD</u>	<u>VERY GOOD</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>
<u>0 point</u>	<u>7.5 points</u>	<u>10 points</u>	<u>12.5 points</u>	<u>17.5 points</u>	<u>20 points</u>	<u>22.5 points</u>	<u>25 points</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Did not submit information which could be evaluated</u> • <u>Absolutely inadequate</u> • <u>Weaknesses can't be corrected</u> • <u>Proponent lacks qualification and experience</u> • <u>Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements</u> • <u>Sample projects not related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Slightly or substantially below the desirable minimum</u> • <u>Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected</u> • <u>Proponent generally lacks qualifications and experience</u> • <u>Team is weak – either missing components or overall experience is weak</u> • <u>Sample projects not related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Little capability to meet performance requirements</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Just fails to meet the desirable minimum</u> • <u>Weaknesses can be corrected</u> • <u>Proponent just below minimum qualifications and experience</u> • <u>Team not quite capable of fulfilling requirements as presented</u> • <u>Sample projects only marginally related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Just below acceptable capability</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Just meets the desirable minimum</u> • <u>Weaknesses can easily be corrected</u> • <u>Proponent has minimum qualifications and experience</u> • <u>Team capable of just fulfilling requirements</u> • <u>Sample projects somewhat related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Minimum acceptable capability, should meet minimum performance</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Meets the desirable minimum</u> • <u>No significant weaknesses</u> • <u>Proponent is qualified and experienced</u> • <u>Team covers all components and will likely meet requirements</u> • <u>Sample projects generally related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Average capability should be adequate for effective results</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Slightly exceeds the desirable minimum</u> • <u>No significant weaknesses</u> • <u>Proponent is well qualified and experienced</u> • <u>Team covers all components and will likely meet requirements</u> • <u>Sample projects generally related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Average capability should be adequate for effective results</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>More than satisfies desirable minimum</u> • <u>No apparent weaknesses</u> • <u>Proponent is highly qualified and experienced</u> • <u>Strong team – some members have previously worked together</u> • <u>Sample projects directly related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Superior capability, should ensure effective results</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Exceptionally strong proposal</u> • <u>No apparent weaknesses</u> • <u>Proponent is exceptionally qualified and experienced</u> • <u>Exceptional team – has worked well together before on comparable work</u> • <u>Sample projects directly related to this projects needs</u> • <u>Exceptional capability, should ensure extremely effective results</u>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME