



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions
- TPSGC**
11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**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
Consultant Services Division/Division des services
d'experts-conseils
11 Laurier St./11 Rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Phase III
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet LAND BORDER CROSSING PROJECT	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 47419-166834/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 1000326834	Date 2016-02-08
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FE-175-68804	
File No. - N° de dossier fe175.47419-166834	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-02-23	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Lohnes, Melissa	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fe175
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6097 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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

THIS AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING:**QUESTION 010:**

RE: SRE 3.1.1. - Mandatory Requirement for Licensing, Certification or Authorization - is it mandatory that we have all of the provincial architectural registrations in place at time of RFP response?

ANSWER 010:

Delete SRE 3.1.1 and replace with the following:

3.1.1 Licensing, Certification or Authorization

The Proponent shall be an architect(s) licensed, or eligible to be licensed, certified or otherwise authorized to provide the necessary professional services to the full extent that may be required by provincial or territorial law in the various provinces identified in the Project Brief.

QUESTION 011:

RE: Appendix C - Table on page 2, Time Based Fees (R1230D (2015-02-25), GC 5 - Terms of Payment):
Please provide a brief scope of work expected for the Environmental Specialist listed on this table.

ANSWER 011:

RS1 identifies areas where the input of an Environmental Specialist may be required. Reminder: Table A is a notional level of effort and is not based directly on any detailed scope of work.

QUESTION 012:

RE: Appendix C - Table on page 2, Time Based Fees (R1230D (2015-02-25), GC 5 - Terms of Payment):
According to your response to question #4 in Addendum #2 - we believe that the reference to "Financial Advisory Specialist(s)" shown here (as well as indicated in SRE 3.1.2. (b)) should be changed to "Cost Consultant". Please confirm.

ANSWER 012:

Refer to Amendment 003, Answer 006.

QUESTION 013:

Your answer to Question 004 contained in Amendment 002 states that a second solicitation will be issued in late spring for financial advisors. However, your current solicitation requires a Financial Advisory Specialist(s). How do these two mandates differ?

ANSWER 013:

The Financial Advisory Specialist and the Cost Consultant, covered by this RFP may or may not be the same individual and may or may not possess the same skill sets. For example, the Financial Advisor role is to provide support to the CBSA Project management office on issues relating to internal corporate finance, project costing, projections, including information required for central agencies all in the context of a P3 arrangement. The Cost Consultant is to provide specific costing information, gleaned from the review of the sites, to inform the Schematic Design Estimate Guide (SDEG) report.

The second solicitation will engage a financial firm familiar with P3's to complete the Business Case, Value for Money, and other required deliverables needed by Central agencies for formal Project approval.

QUESTION 014:

Will the Financial Advisory Specialist retained in the current solicitation be prohibited from obtaining the solicitation mentioned in Question 004 of Amendment 002?

ANSWER 014:

In accordance with R1210D GC1.6 (5) "Conflict of Interest and Values and Ethics Codes for the Public Service", the Consultant shall not be eligible to compete as a consultant or sub-consultant for a project which may result from the provision of the Services if the Consultant is involved in the development of a Project Brief or Terms of Reference, a Request for Proposal or similar documents for such project.

QUESTION 015:

Regarding Former Public Servant – Certification in Appendix B: Does this apply only to the Proponent and its directors OR does it also apply to personnel of sub consultants or individuals under contract to the Proponent?

ANSWER 015:

Appendix B Certifications applies only to the Proponent as defined in R1410T GI2 "Definitions".

QUESTION 016:

Regarding Appendix D – A great emphasis is placed on capital cost estimating, yet Appendix C does not seek hourly rates for a cost consultant and Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2 does not ask for a cost consultant to be identified. Project Brief 8.2 lists both “Costing and pricing” and Costing Analysis (Quantity Surveyors) as areas of expertise. Did you intend to have Cost Consultant as a key sub consultant / specialist?

ANSWER 016:

Refer to Amendment 003-Answer 006. In addition, the Cost Consultant need not be a Key Consultant.

QUESTION 017:

Amendment 002 – Answer 004 – We are informed that the Financial Advisor is to be engaged separately by PPP Canada. Appendix C asks for hourly rates for Financial Advisory Specialist(s) – should this item be removed? Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2 asks for a Financial Advisor to be identified – should this item be removed? Project Brief 8.2 lists “Financial Services” as an area of expertise – should this be removed? Project Brief 8.2 also lists “Financial Services including business case and value for money support” as an area of expertise – should this be removed?

ANSWER 017:

Refer to Answer 013 above. All of these items are applicable to this RFP.

QUESTION 018:

Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2 lists a “Facility Maintenance Specialist”. Appendix C asks for rates for “Facility Maintenance Specialist”. Project Brief 8.1 and 8.2 requires “Facility Management (FM)” experience. Maintenance experience is not the same as management experience. Should the term “maintenance” should be changed to “management”.

ANSWER 018:

Delete the following:

Appendix C, Table A:	Facility Maintenance Specialist – Senior
Appendix C, Table A:	Facility Maintenance Specialist – Intermediate
SRE 3.1.2 (b)	Facility Maintenance Specialist

Insert the following:

Appendix C, Table A:	Facility Management Specialist – Senior
Appendix C, Table A:	Facility Management Specialist – Intermediate
SRE 3.1.2 (b)	Facility Management Specialist

QUESTION 019:

Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2 lists a "Security Specialist". Project Brief 8.1 requires experience with "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)", "Physical Security", "Security Systems", "Electronic Security Engineering", and "Hardware consulting including security hardware". Usually there are separate specialists for Physical Security and Systems Security as the skill sets are quite different. Would you consider separating them out in Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2?

ANSWER 019:

The intent was for the Security Specialist(s) to be able to understand the unique needs of a high security establishment and to liaise with internal stakeholders. For example, specific design criteria (CPTED) or electronic systems may be provided by other components of the team such as architects and Information Technology specialists. Should there be more than one Specialist required to support Submissions and Evaluation 3.1.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, then proponents may propose separate specialists and link them back to "Hourly rates-Table A".

QUESTION 020:

Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2 lists a "Heritage Architect". Appendix C asks for rates for a "Lead Conservation Architect". Project Brief 8.1 mentions "Architecture including Heritage". Project Brief 8.2 makes no mention of heritage conservation. After examining the background material provided it seems that only a few POEs involve heritage buildings. While heritage conservation skills will be needed, in our opinion, they are not "key" sub consultants. Might you consider, for simplicity, removing them from the Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.2 list?

ANSWER 020:

The Heritage architect will remain a Key Sub-consultant.

QUESTION 021:

How is CBSA/PWGSC organizing themselves with respect to staffing hierarchy for each phase of this assignment? Will CBSA/PWGSC be dividing staff up regionally or will all key CBSA/PWGSC staff assigned to this project be operating out of the NCR? Please provide an organizational Chart illustrating how CBSA/PWGSC are structured for this assignment in order that we can structure our team in a responsive manner.

ANSWER 021:

Prior to formal Project Approval, no definitive organizational structure has been approved. The intent however, is for all CBSA/PMO staff and PWGSC Contracting Authority staff to be located within the NCR.

QUESTION 022:

What is the template "Project Agreement" document to be and what "Schedules" is the "Advocate Architect" responsible for?

ANSWER 022:

The Project Agreement template has not yet been developed but the Advocate Architect team may be asked to contribute to any schedule as appropriate.

QUESTION 023:

Will PWGSC be engaging a third party independent scheduler or is the Advocate Architect responsible for scheduling for all phases of the assignment?

ANSWER 023:

The Advocate Architect will be providing scheduling support to the CBSA/PMO.

QUESTION 024:

From what we can tell, RS2 includes Functional Programming while RS1 identifies Concept Design. Typically Functional Programming is completed before getting into Concept Design.

ANSWER 024:

Refer to Project Brief RS1 "Site Data Collection and Schematic Level Design & Costing", which includes "Develop a Functional Program".

QUESTION 025:

Is there any flexibility in the proposal format?

ANSWER 025:

The proposal is required to be submitted in accordance with SRE 2 "Proposal Requirements" as well as R1410T G116 "Submission of Proposal".