



**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
**Bid Receiving Public Works and Government**  
**Services Canada/Réception des soumissions**  
**Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux**  
**Canada**  
**800 Burrard Street, Room 219**  
**800, rue Burrard, pièce 219**  
**Vancouver, BC V6Z 0B9**  
**Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526**

## 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 -  
Pacific Region  
219 - 800 Burrard Street  
800, rue Burrard, pièce 219  
Vancouver, BC V6Z 0B9

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Consulting Services for HHERA	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EZ897-161534/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EZ897-161534	<b>Date</b> 2016-03-11
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$VAN-576-7740	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> VAN-5-38343 (576)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-03-31</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Pacific Standard Time PST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Sobhee, Sachin	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> van576
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (604) 775-7022 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (604) 775-7526
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

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

This amendment is created to respond to bidder questions and to post the transcript of the bidder's conference.

### **Questions and Answers**

Q1) Section F.1.1 (the maximum number of names for each specialization): What would the procedure be to add employees to the project following commencement? Also, will less points be awarded if the maximum individuals for a respective specialization are not listed? For example, for the Senior Project Manager specialization the maximum permitted is two, would we receive less points for only providing the credentials of one individual?

A1) Employees may be added on a task by task basis. The PWGSC project manager will review the individual's CV to determine whether or not their experience is relevant to the position and that they've met the minimum number of years of experience required for the proposed category.  
Yes, you would receive less points if only one individual was proposed when the maximum was two.

Q2) Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (CSAP)- In Section A.10 its states that this individual typically will have limited involvement as PWGSC does not seek a provincial regulatory instrument- According to CSAP individuals who are Standards Specialists are still permitted to senior review risk assessments conducted at the screening level. Thus, does the proposal require an Expert CSAP Risk Assessment Specialist to fulfill this specialization, or would an Expert CSAP Standards Specialist suffice?

A2) An expert CSAP Standards Specialist would not suffice.

Q3) Section F.1.1.1 (d) Years of Experience- Would you kindly please provide further explanation or equation as to how the example was calculated?

· If the individual proposed for the specialization has relevant experience equaling the minimum number of years of experience as outlined above, a score of 10% will be given for their experience. Each subsequent year of relevant experience (rounded down to the nearest year) will receive a linearly proportional increase to their score up to a maximum of a 100%. For example, an individual being proposed as a senior with 12 years' experience would receive a score of 28%.

A3) For the example of a senior with 12 years experience, the equation is as follows

$$10 + (90/10 * 2) = 28\%$$

If the senior being proposed had 16 years experience, the equation would be

$$10 + (90/10 * 6) = 64\%$$

If the senior being proposed had 20 years experience, the equation would be

$$10 + (90/10 * 10) = 100\%$$

Scores cannot exceed 100%

Q4) Appendix F, Section F.1.1 (a) indicates that individuals may only be listed under one specialization. Section A.10 states that the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional typically has limited involvement since PWGSC does not seek provincial regulatory instruments.

· Given the limited involvement expected for the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional, would PWGSC consider allowing this individual to be also named in another role, e.g. Senior or Expert Risk Assessor? It is felt this would benefit PWGSC as CSAP members are typically highly experienced risk assessors.

A4) The individual proposed as the Expert CSAP cannot be named as a senior or expert risk assessor. Personnel can only be named once in the corporate capability table.

Q5) The RFP states that a bidder must include a Contaminated Sites Approved Professional on its team. To ensure we meet the technical requirements, our team will need to include an external CSAP. However, that same individual will be included on another team as well, albeit not as a CSAP, but as an expert or senior risk assessor.

My question: Are we allowed to include an independent consultant as a CSAP when that same person would fill one of the non-CSAP related roles on another team? In other words, is there a risk that teams could get disqualified for having the same person on their respective teams but for different technical roles?

There are a limited number of Approved Professionals in the Province, which could result in a rather small number of qualifying bids (if the option to tag-on CS Approved Professionals isn't available).

A5) A CSAP is not necessarily required. Spaces in the corporate capability table that are left blank will not be scored but there's no requirement to fill every space.

Yes, you may hire an independent consultant as a CSAP when that same person is named on another bidder's proposal. However, there's an expectation that the person will be available when requested.

Q6) Can the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional be a member of more than one submission team?

A6) Yes, you may hire an independent consultant as a CSAP when that same person is named on another bidder's proposal. However, there's an expectation that the person will be available when requested.

Q7) Is the expert contaminated sites approved professional included in the "senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologists" identified for project descriptions? (Section F.1.2.2 states to include projects that list up to four different senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologists)

A7) The intent is to allow bidders to use projects completed by the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist). Therefore, the four eligible staff under F.1.2.1 are the two Senior Risk Assessors/Toxicologists, the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist), and the Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist.

Q8) For the Project description (F.1.2.3. #2), does 'years worked on project' refer to the number of years worked (i.e 4 years) or the date?

A8) The "years worked on the project" refers to the number of years spent working on the risk assessment. This information is not evaluated but must be included in the description.

Q9) Does a Masters in Resource Management (MRM) qualify as a Masters Degree under F.1.1.1, section (c)?

A9) Yes, a MRM would qualify as a Master's Degree.

Q10) Do junior and administrative staff require accreditation to gain full points in the corporate capability table?

A10) Yes, junior staff are scored the same as intermediate, senior, and expert personnel for accreditation.

Q11) Section F.1.1.1 Evaluation part (c) it states,

"Education: Education is weighted at 20% of an individual's score in the corporate capability table. Scoring will be based on the highest level of education completed. Full points (100%) will be awarded to an individual with a Doctor of Philosophy or Master's Degree, 50% of the maximum score will be awarded to an individual with a Bachelor's Degree, and 25% of the maximum score will be awarded to an individual with a certificate or diploma. Education levels are defined as follows:  
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) or Masters (MAsc, MEng, MSc) Bachelor (BAsc, BEng, BSc, BA) Certificate or Diploma or equivalent."

Does this apply to all positions and levels, for example is junior staff or GIS staff required to have a PHD to get full marks?

A11) Yes, junior staff are scored the same as intermediate, senior, and expert personnel for education.

Q12) Does a Masters of Environmental Studies count as a MSc for accreditation purposes (Part 1: Corporate Capability)

A12) Yes, a Masters of Environmental Studies would receive full points.

Q13) Does a Qualified Professional Risk Assessor (QPRA) from the Province of Ontario count for accreditation purposes (Part 1: Corporate Capability)

A13) No, a Qualified Professional Risk Assessor (QPRA) from the Province of Ontario would not count as per F.1.1.1 (b), "the relevant jurisdictions are BC and the Yukon, except for those accreditations that are not issued regionally".

Q14) On page 48 of 55, Annex F, the text indicates that up to 6 Human health and ecological risk assessment projects completed by up to 4 different senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologist (maximum of 2 projects/person) within the last 10 years, can be presented. Please confirm that a maximum of two of these project descriptions can come from the Expert Contaminated Sites approved professional.

A14) Yes, the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist) may submit two project descriptions as part of the six project summaries required.

Q15) Please clarify the intent of the following statement in Section F.1.2.2. – "describe six Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment projects completed by up to four different senior /expert risk assessors/toxicologists (maximum 2 per person) within the last ten years. The senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologists put forward must be named in the corporate capability table provided in F.1.1.2."

The phrase "up to four different senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologists" appears inconsistent with the number of individuals named as expert risk assessors and senior risk assessors in the corporate capability table (i.e. 3 individuals total – 1 expert risk assessor and 2 senior risk assessors). Is the intention that bidders could also provide a project summary for the Expert CSAP Risk Assessment Specialist (i.e. does the "expert" risk assessor/toxicologist include both the Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist and the Expert CSAP)? If so and a project summary can be submitted for the Expert CSAP, then will maximum points be achieved if the project demonstrates a strong response to

information listed in F1.2.3 but has been prepared according to the Expert CSAP's role (which would typically involve use of BC guidelines only for issuance of a MOE regulatory instrument)?

Further, if a project summary can be submitted for the Expert CSAP, then do we need to provide a project summary for all of the expert/senior risk assessors? For instance, can you provide two summaries for the Expert CSAP and two summaries each for each of the senior risk assessors? Or is the intention to provide a summary for each individual named as either a senior risk assessor or an expert risk assessor?

A15) The intent is to allow bidders to use projects completed by the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist). Therefore, the four eligible staff under F.1.2.1 are the two Senior Risk Assessors/Toxicologists, the Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist), and the Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist.

Project summaries that include the use of CCME or Canadian federal guidelines will receive more points than those that have used provincial standards.

You do not have to provide a summary for each of the four eligible personnel. However, as per F.1.2.3, there is a "maximum of 2 projects per person".

Q16) Do a Graduate Diploma in Toxicology, Masters of Environmental Toxicology (M.E.T.) or Masters of Resource and Environmental Management (M.REM.), gain full (100%) points for Education?

A16) Yes, a Master's Degree in Environmental Toxicology and a Master's in Resource & Environmental Management will receive full points. As per F.1.1.1 (c), "Full points (100%) will awarded to an individual with a Doctor of Philosophy or Master's Degree...".

Q17) Many organizations recognize an equivalent number of years working experience for the completion of a Masters degree or PhD. Section F 1.1.1. suggests that this will not be considered for the evaluation of years of experience. Please confirm.

A17) Correct, experience is evaluated separately from education. There is no equivalent number of years of experience that can replace the education requirements.

Q18) Will the education and accreditation information be scored the same for the CADD/GIS and junior administrative support positions as for other positions in the corporate capability table?

A18) Yes, junior staff are scored the same as intermediate, senior, and expert personnel for education and accreditation.

Q19) Under the "project" definitions in Sections F.1.3.2 and F.1.2.2 (Project Experience Descriptions), please clarify the meaning of the bullet "for which a specific contract was let". Does a specific contract mean work completed under a single TA? Or can the project work account for risk assessment activities which have spanned across multiple contracts/TAs? The paragraphs above these bullets suggest that PWGSC recognizes that risk assessment work will carry across multiple years and hence across multiple TAs. Please confirm.

A19) Correct, PWGSC recognizes that risk assessments may span multiple years and multiple contracts.

Q20) For the project experience descriptions (i.e. F.1.2.3 and F.1.3.3.), will risk assessment descriptions that pertain to work completed for First Nations clients in BC be capable of achieving maximum points

given that they should fulfill the relevant location and regulatory environment requirements of the evaluation criteria?

A20) If the proposed project used CCME or Canadian Federal Guidelines, then the project is eligible for the maximum points for that specific criteria.

Q21) Page 50, Section F.1.3.3 states "Describe up to two (2) different human health and ecological risk assessment projects managed by the project managers, with one page for each of the two projects being submitted. Maximum number of pages for each project example project: one (1) page inclusive". Table F.1.4 (Technical Submissions Summary on page 51) shows Senior Project Manager experience as "1 page/2 projects" for total max page length of 2 pages. For each of the two project managers, are you are looking for: (a) one project example (not two) and (b) for each of the two project descriptions, are they one page long (one side of a sheet of paper)?

A21) Yes, one project for each of the Project Managers.  
Yes, the project descriptions should be one page in length. One page refers to one single sided 8.5" X 11" piece of paper.

Q22) In regards to the Project Descriptions for both for the Risk Assessors/Toxicologists and the Project Managers, what if the reference for a project or a department is no longer with that company? If there is no alternative reference available (i.e., project may be completed), what would PWGSC's recommendation be to provide the appropriate client reference?

A22) The reference must be reachable by phone should PWGSC choose to contact them. If there is no reference phone number provided or if the reference cannot be reached at the phone number provided, the project summary will score a zero.

Q23) The inclusion of an Expert CSAP RA tends to suggest that the you are looking for an individual who is intimately familiar with the BC MOE process. If we choose to present project summaries for the CSAP, can full points be obtained if the project focusses on fulfillment of BC MOE requirements for the purpose of a Certificate of Compliance or should the summaries still maintain a federal regulatory focus to obtain the maximum number of points? (There are very few projects which can achieve both).

A23) The project summaries for the Expert CSAP Risk Assessment Specialist are likely to score better with a federal regulatory focus.

Q24) Section F.1.1.1 outlines the scoring evaluation for the Corporate Capability table. Items F.1.1.1 (b) Accreditation and (c) Education outline the requirements for obtaining full points under these headings for the various Categories of Work Specializations (Section A.10). Are the F.1.1.1 (b) Accreditation and (c) Education requirements applicable for all Categories of Work Specializations including Senior CADD/GIS/Data Manager, Junior Scientist, Junior CADD/GIS, and Junior Administrative Support?

A24) Yes, junior staff are scored the same as intermediate, senior, and expert personnel for education and accreditation.

Q25) Is there an allowance for yearly Labour Rate increases (Section B.1, Section F.2) over the term of this Task Authorization Contact?

A25) No allowance has been made for annual labour rate increases.

Q26) With respect to Part 6 (6.1 Security Requirements) and Part 7 (7.3 Security Requirements), do bidders need reliability status for each individual listed in the corporate capability table upon submission of bid? Or is the intention that bidders will require this to be in place for individuals proposed for specific contracts (i.e. specific Task Authorizations) where access to protected information will be necessary?

A26) Reliability status for each individual is not required at the time of bid submission. This will be required for specific Task Authorizations where access to protected information will be necessary.

Q27) I would like you to please address at the bidders meeting how/if the bid process evaluates the effectiveness of the bidder to meet the purpose and objectives of the Federal Set Aside program in general (i.e., not just the HHERA technical needs of PWGSC). This question is based on my read of the RFP that there seems to be no obvious point awarding to take into account the value added by the bidder to the betterment/capacity building of First Nations entities, for example. The award process appears to be entirely based on technical merits of the team rather than giving points to whether the process of performance of the work actually helps build capacity in the concerned First Nation, etc.

A27) Under the Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business (PSAB), it is mandatory that contracts that serve a primarily Aboriginal population are set aside for competition among qualified Aboriginal businesses. In the case of this procurement, PWGSC has voluntarily set-aside a portion of the requirement in order to further support the participation of Aboriginal business. The PSAB does not require the inclusion of criteria within set-aside requirements that are any different from those of the Non-aboriginal requirements.

By setting aside the requirement in accordance with the PSAB, PWGSC is providing its clients with the opportunity of choosing a set-aside in order to meet their PSAB performance objectives and providing Aboriginal businesses with a greater access to government procurement opportunities. The PSAB initiative aims to increase federal contracting opportunities and to gain access to the overall federal procurement process for Aboriginal businesses. The PSAB is a policy led by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) and the following AANDC web site provides more information about the purpose and objectives of the PSAB and set-aside program, <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1354798736570/1354798836012>. Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) is required to conduct procurement in accordance with the policy and in the case of this procurement, PWGSC has conformed to all the requirements of the policy. Should you have any concerns or recommendations regarding the policy itself, you may wish to communicate with the group within AANDC that is responsible for the PSAB. They can be reached at:

Contact for AANDC on PSAB:

Dolores Coelho  
Sr. Program Officer, Aboriginal Economic and Business Opportunities Branch/Business Development Directorate  
Aboriginal Affairs & Northern Development Canada / Government of Canada  
[dolores.coelho@canada.ca](mailto:dolores.coelho@canada.ca) / Tel: 819-918-0580 / Fax :819-956-9837 / Toll Free: 1-800-400-7677

Q28) Are individuals or companies permitted to join more than one Joint Venture for this solicitation (i.e., can they be a member of two or more Joint Ventures)?

A28) Yes, this is permitted.



## **Transcription of Bidders Conference**

### **BIDDERS CONFERENCE February 24, 2016, 10 a.m. Pacific Time**

Sachin Sobhee: Okay, we'll get started. It's about 10:00 now by my watch. So this is a Bidders Conference for quotation EZ897-161534/A and EZ897-161534/B, so A Tender is the open tender and then B Tender is the Aboriginal [inaudible] tender. We can talk about both of them today. My name is Sachin Sobhee. I'm the contracting officer for this file and the prescribed labour and the technical authority, so any technical questions relating to the Statement of Work and Evaluation Criteria, I will be answering anything factual related and the other clauses I'll be answering. Just before we get started, a few housekeeping items. There are a couple of washroom keys over here. The washrooms are just straight down the hall to the right. If there's a fire alarm, if there's an intermittent alarm we stay in the room until we hear further on the speaker system. If there's a full alarm, and it's not intermittent, it's a full blown alarm, we evacuate immediately and there are two stairwells just outside by the elevators regardless and that's about it. We'll get right into it.

I want to keep points 3 and 4 really brief. You've got the overview requirement and Evaluation Criteria and the overview of the contracting aspect for number 4. I'll basically scroll through the entire document and bring out some highlights as to what you should be looking for when you're bidding, but I want to keep as much time as possible at the end for the questions. We have received a bunch of questions already by e-mail and we're going to go through all of those and answer all of those today and if you have any new questions you can definitely ask them here after that.

This is being recorded, so we're recording the video and the audio, so the audio is being recorded on a phone here in the front, so if you guys in the front row can just try to keep it down a little bit. It's being picked up on the microphones here. If you have questions at the end, there is a microphone that will be passed around so that the sound comes out on the speaker system and then it can get picked up by the microphones here. The entire video conference will be transcribed afterwards and it'll be available on the Internet as an amendment to the initial quotation. So we'll get started right away. Brad, I'll turn it over to you to talk about the requirements.

Brad: Yeah, so sure. Just skipping right ahead to the Statement of Work, I should mention that if anybody has questions at any point, maybe just wait until I have completed, sort of my piece, and then jump in, or if you have questions on anything before the Statement of Work, feel free to put your hand up at this point and we'll speak to it now. If there's nothing further, I will jump to page 20 of 55 and [inaudible] Statement of Work. So I'm going to go through this quite quickly because, of course, potentially there's not any new information at this point. It's simply highlighting from the key pieces of the Statement of Work and later in the Evaluation Criteria.

Under Scope of Services. The intent of these contracts is to provide services for the following, and it entails Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment type tasks which does include design and completing ecological and human health quantitative risk assessment, preparing and conducting sampling and analysis, preparing site-specific recommendations for risk management objectives, designing and completing risk management work, writing or reviewing guidance documents, rules or guidelines which may require researching new or changing the district standards, communicating ecological and/or human health risks to members of the public, First Nations or other stakeholders as required, conducting supplementary investigations, and finally, producing reports and adhering to federal reporting requirements. So that was just a general overview of what these contracts shall entail.



Just skipping ahead again to page 31 of 55, the Categories of Work, which show up later in the Corporate Capability Table, are highlighted here, so be sure to have a full understanding of what our expectations are for each of those roles. They are highlighted in that Section.

Again, moving forward. I'm going to skip Basis of Payment. If there are any questions on Basis of Payment or Statement of Work, feel free to put them out there now. We can also cover them later. It's not a problem.

I'll just move ahead to Annex F. This is really the key, I think, Section of this document in terms of what we're looking for and what we're evaluating for each of your bids. So under the Corporate Capability Section, which shows up later, so on page 44 at the moment, it shows up later on page 47 as a Table and that Table, just really quickly, is what we're looking for with your technical bid. It doesn't have to be that exact size Table but it needs to be a reasonable facsimile or representation of that Table. It basically allows us to quickly assess the individuals put forward, preference those with the resumes attached and do a hopefully, fairly quick review and evaluation of the information. So just jumping back to page 44, individuals may only be listed under one specialization, so basically, they can't be listed in the Corporate Capability Table more than once. I believe we have 25 individuals that can appear in the Corporate Capability Table. Not all of the spaces have to be filled. I think that was one of the questions that comes later, but certainly, you know, the more spaces you have filled, the better you're going to do, most likely.

With respect to years of experience, accreditation and education, those are all weighted, well it says how they're weighted in here, but essentially those are the types of key information that we're evaluating for each person. Under accreditation, I believe it was 10 percent. Under education we're weighting that at 20 percent and experience we're weighting at 70 percent. So I'm not going to read too much more about each of those, the [inaudible] information that's in there. The one thing I'll say about resumes is that we are asking for them and they do need to be provided for each individual in the Corporate Capability Table, but we're not necessarily evaluating the resumes themselves. We are just ensuring that the information presented there matches categories that the person [inaudible] is at.

So skipping ahead, any questions on the Corporate Capability Section? Okay, keep going. So under the individual assessment, which is Part 2, page 47, Depth of Experience. We're looking at the Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist and we're looking at the Project Managers. So again, we're looking at four individuals. That does include the Expert CADD, which, again, is a question we'll highlight later and potentially only three individuals actually need to be put forward because those three individuals each have two project salaries attached to their names. So again, under the Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist Project Experience Summary Table, we're looking for a total of six. Project Summary, again completed by up to four different Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist, maximum of two per person within the last 10 years. The bidder may only submit projects for the Risk Assessor/Toxicologist with the lead Risk Assessor for the Risk Assessment. A project may only be submitted once and a project submitted more than once under different names will only be scored once. So that's important. The other thing that's important under Submissions, I'm on page 48 for those following along, is that the page count, where it says two pages all inclusive for the Project Summary, one page essentially of paper, if it's written on front and back counts as two pages of text, so I'll probably clarify that with the Q & As later, but just so everyone's clear, two pages does mean potentially one piece of paper, 8½ x 11, with text on both sides or two single-sided pages. I'm sure that question will come up at some point.

Just jumping ahead to the Submissions Section again, F.1.2.3, that sort of outlines what we're looking for in these project descriptions, so I think I'm not going to cover anything there specifically. There are questions later that touch on some of those criteria, so I'll leave that for now.

Under the Technical Evaluation, we've got a table there under F.1.2.5, page 49 of 55, which highlights how we're scoring the summaries. Again, there's six projects that will be scored for a total of 60 points for the Senior Expert Risk Assessor.

Moving ahead to the Project Manager. We are looking for two, two in Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Projects managed by two different Senior Project Managers within the last 10 years. Again, the bidder can only submit projects for the Senior Project Manager with the Lead Project Manager or the Risk Assessor. Here we're looking for a maximum number of pages for each project, one page all inclusive, so again this would be one single-sided page of paper and the type of criteria that we're evaluating are highlighted under F.1.3.3. And again, under the Technical Evaluation, it has that same Summary Table with a generic evaluation. Each of the two projects are scored out of 10, for a maximum total of 20 points. I realize I'm going through this quite quickly but we do want to save time for Q & As, so again, jump in if you have any comments specifically on the Risk Assessor or Project Manager Summary that we've requested. If not, I'll keep going.

Participant: I just have one quick question.

A. Yeah.

Q. I'm assuming we can't reuse the same project between the Lead Risk Assessor and the Project Manager and you can't [inaudible].

A. It can be the same project, yeah, in that case it can be. So if it's the Project Manager that happened to work on the same project as the Risk Assessor's Project Summary, that's okay. It cannot be the same project within the Lead Risk Assessor Summary or Project Manager. Obviously, if there's two different Project Managers being put forward, they can't have the same project. Yeah?

Q. Question for you.

Sorry, for everyone else, if you have a question, just raise your hand so we can get the microphone to you so that it picks up on the audio here on the phone.

Q. I don't see anywhere that it indicates that there's points awarded to projects that describe that use multiple people in the Capability Section or....

A. Yeah, we're evaluating the individual, so we're evaluating the Senior Lead Risk Assessor and the Senior or Lead Project Manager for the project. In these summaries we're not necessarily evaluating the team, so that is a key point here.

Okay, so I'll keep going. Under the overall Technical Evaluation Section, F.1.5, page 52, it highlights how the Technical Evaluation is broken down. We are requiring a minimum tasking score of 70 points for the bid to be considered technically responsive. Following that, it shows the breakdown of the technical score. Corporate Capability is rated at 20 percent, the Senior/Expert Risk Assessors are weighted at 60 percent of the technical score, and the Senior Project Managers are weighted at 20 percent of the technical score.

I won't say much on Financial Evaluation, but I will move to the Basis of Selection which is F.3, page 53 of 55. Just some key highlights there, again minimum weighted score of 70 points for the total technical score is required to pass. You must have a price within 125 percent of the average of all technically passing bid prices, so that's key. The price versus technical ratio is 20:80, so 20 percent price, 80 percent technical and there's some examples there that follow that give a little more information on that, but that's really all I wanted to say about this document, the tender itself. We do have, again, questions and answers that have been prepared, well, questions that have been submitted and answers that have been prepared to those questions that we'd like to run through, just because I think they're relevant for everyone. They will get posted as such, as said earlier. They have to be translated so they will probably be posted to Buy and Sell in about a week from now and then any questions taken today will also form part of that amendment. So I'm going to run through them quite quickly. Sure, yeah, I'll go over the contracting aspect first, then we'll go through the [inaudible].

So, we can go to page 1, Marcel. So I'm just going to go through basically page by page [inaudible] and highlight [inaudible] bid basically. The very first thing, a lot of people forget to sign the bid, so make sure your front page is signed when you send in your bid. That's at the bottom of the first page here. Skipping ahead, I notice, first of all, some people don't have a copy. Do you want a copy if you want to make notes or whatever, I have some extra copies here if anyone needs it. Okay. Skipping ahead to page 4, at the bottom, the Former Public Servant clause, so that has to be filled out and submitted if there is anyone working in any of these projects that are former public servants basically.

Page 6, the Applicable Laws clause. It states here the laws in force will be the ones in BC, but you can change that to any province that you want. Going ahead to page 7, the Bid Preparation Instructions. We request that you submit three hard copies of your Technical Bid to allow [inaudible] Evaluation Bid, so three hard copies of the Technical, two copies of the Financial and two copies of the Certifications.

Skipping ahead to the next page, page 9. Page 9 outlines the certifications required. So the only certifications that are required with your bid to submit your bid is the declaration of convicted offences of basically the directors of the company, so that's required. If you don't self-declare that and it is found out afterwards that there was a conviction that should have been declared, you would be found non-compliant at that point, basically. And there's also, for the Aboriginal Certification is also mandatory at the time of bidding, so if that certification is not in there then you'll be found non-compliant for the Aboriginal Benefactor Requirement. At 5.2, it starts listing the certifications that are required precedents to contract the board so these are not necessarily required with your bid but they will be required at some point if you are to get a contract. So that's the list of the directors of the company at 5.2.1. 5.2.2 is the Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity. Now there's a whole other one here, the [inaudible] education and experience.

Skipping ahead to page 12, there will be up to five contracts awarded as a result of this quotation. You can see here the dollar value that we'll be deciding, [inaudible] five or less. The total budget is \$20 million for this. If there is one compliant Aboriginal Bid, they would get a contract for \$400,000 and the last place bidder in the open tender would get \$400,000 less.

The Minimum Work Guarantee, it's not specified here. It only makes reference to it, I think, in one [inaudible]. It probably should be mentioned is that it is 5 percent, so the minimum guarantee is 5 percent of whatever front page contract value. As to the Security Requirement at page 14, so there is a security requirement associated with this quotation so the bidding company must have a department, a designated organizational security department before getting a contract and then individual employees must be cleared to the relevant liability status level if they are actually to work on a project that requires such a clearance, basically. So not everyone, not all the employees being put forward have to be security cleared at the time of bidding but the company has to be.

I'll mention Annex D briefly. If you go to page 40, the Insurance Requirements are specified here and you have to provide, basically prove that you're able to get these, to be insured to that level when you submit your bid. That's about all I have to say, actually, regarding the contracting aspect of this. So we'll go through now the questions submitted by e-mail, we will answer a few questions first and then we'll open up and have a discussion to any new questions that [inaudible]. So again, if your question is not read but you have submitted it, let us know and we will certainly address it, prior to the [inaudible] being issued or if you have any new questions, obviously, they will be answered today as well. We do have a number of questions so I'll do my best to summarize some of the information and try to go through as quickly as I can. There are some duplicate questions so I can skip some, no offence to anyone.

Q. The first question was, please clarify the intent of the following statement in Section F.1.2.2: Describe six human health and ecological risk assessment projects [inaudible], four different Senior/Expert Risk Assessors/Toxicologists within the last 10 years. The Senior/Expert put forward must be named in the Corporate Capability Table provided. The phrase up to four, so this is a good question, the phrase up to four different Senior/Expert Risk Assessors appears inconsistent with the number of individuals seen as Expert Risk Assessors and Senior Risk Assessors in the Corporate Capability Table, i.e., three individuals

total, one Expert Risk Assessor and two Senior Risk Assessors. Is the intention that bidders could also provide a project summary for the Expert CADD Risk Assessment Specialist, i.e., does the Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist include both the Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist and the Expert CADD?

A. So the short answer to that is yes, you can include the Expert CADD.

Q. Moving forward. Further, if a project summary can be submitted for the Expert CADD, then do we need to provide a project summary for all the Experts/Senior Risk Assessors?

A. So I'm not totally clear on what the intent of that was, but again, just to recap, we are looking for up to four individual project summaries. It can include the two Senior Risk Assessors and the two Expert Risk Assessors. If by chance you select three out of four and each of them have two project summary reports, that's also acceptable. So I think that probably answers that question, but if not, you can always clarify that question later once you see the response posted online.

Q. Second question, does a Graduate Diploma in Toxicology, Master's of Environmental Toxicology or Master's of Resource and Environmental Management gain a full point for education?

A. So the answer to the second two is yes. The Master's of Environmental Toxicology and the Master's of Resource and Environmental Management do qualify and would gain points. I'm not totally clear on what the Graduate Diploma in Toxicology is, so we are going to ask for clarification on that. If there is question or doubt about the educational diploma that one of your staff has, you can always ask the question to determine whether or not, in our eyes, it's equivalent and we will provide a response to you. So if you have any doubt or question about whether or not it meets our requirements it's best to ask the question because we can always let you know what it is [inaudible].

Q3. With respect to Part 6, Security Requirements, and Part 7, Security Requirements, do bidders need reliability status for each individual listed in the Corporate Capability Table upon submission of bid? The second part of the question is: Or is the intention that bidders will require this to be in place for individuals proposed for a specific contract, i.e., specific [inaudible] or access to protected information will be necessary. I'll let Sachin answer that one around security.

A. Yes, so like I said before, if the company has its clearance at the time of getting a contract, and the individuals listed must be cleared before they work on a project that requires a security clearance basis. So, no it's not required that that's in place at the time of bidding. Short answer.

Q4. Many organizations recognize an equivalent number of years of working experience for the completion of a Master's Degree or Ph.D. Section F.1.1.1.1 suggests that this will not be considered for the evaluation years of experience. Please confirm.

A. So the quick answer to that is that experience is evaluated separately from education and that there is no equivalent number of years of experience that will replace the education requirement.

Q5. Will the education accreditation information be scored the same for the CADD/GIF and Junior Administrative Support positions as for other positions in the Corporate Capability Table?

A. The answer is yes, they will be scored the same.

Q6. Under the project definitions in Section F.1.3.2 and F.1.2.2, Project Experience Descriptions, please clarify the meaning of bullet for which a specific contract was let. Does a specific contract mean work completed under a single TA or can the project work account for risk assessment activities which is found across multiple contracts/TAs? The paragraph above these bullets suggests that the PWGSC recognizes that risk assessment work will carry across multiple years and hence, across multiple TAs.

A. Again, the short answer to that is yes, PWGSC does recognize that risk assessment will span multiple years and multiple contracts. That's perfectly acceptable.

Q7. For the project experience descriptions, will risk assessment descriptions that pertain to work completed for First Nations clients in BC, be capable of achieving maximum points given that they should fulfill the relevant location and regulatory environment requirements of the Evaluation Criteria?

A. The answer to that one is fairly simple as well. If the proposed project uses [inaudible] or Canadian Federal Guidelines, then the project is eligible for the maximum points for that criteria.

Q. We have another question here. Are we allowed to include an independent consultant as a CSAP when that same person would fill one of the non- CSAP -related roles on another team? In other words, is there a risk that teams could get disqualified for having the same person on their respective teams but for different technical roles?

A. The answer is that a CSAP is not necessarily required. Again, as I mentioned earlier, not all of the spaces must be filled. Obviously, you will likely do better if all of the spaces are filled but essentially you may hire an independent consultant as the CSAP when that same person is named on another bidder's proposal, however the expectation is that that person will be available when requested by Public Works.

Q. Moving on, another question. Section F.1.1, the maximum number of names for each specialization, what would the procedure be to add employees to projects following commencement? Also, will that point be awarded if the maximum individuals for respective specialization are not listed, for example, for the Senior Project Manager specialization, the maximum permitted is two. Would we receive less points for only providing credentials of one individual?

A. The answer is that employees may be added on a task-by-task basis. The Public Works Project Manager will review the individuals he deems to determine whether or not their experience is relevant to the position being proposed and that they've met the minimum number of years experience required for the proposed categories. The second answer to that second question was would you receive less points if only one individual was proposed when the maximum was two and the answer is yes, you would receive less points.

Q. Another question. Expert contaminated sites approved professionals, so CSAP in Section 8.10, states that this individual typically will have limited involvement and PWGSC does not see a provincial regulatory inference. According to CSAP individuals, I think there's an error in the question, basically the gist of it is are they still permitted to Senior Review Risk Assessment conducted at the screening level, thus does the proposal require an expert CSAP Risk Assessment Specialist to fulfill this specialization or would an expert CSAP Standards Specialist suffice?

A. The answer to that is no. We are looking for a Risk Assessment Specialist, not a Standards Specialist.

Q3. From the same component, in Section F.1.1.1, years of experience, would you kindly provide further explanation or the equation as to how the example was calculated.

A. So this calculation would be the one around, I think we would like a Senior. I'll open the page so everyone can follow along. So it's on page 46, and it's about mid-way down the page. The example that we've provided is if the Senior has 12 years experience they would receive a score of 28 percent. Essentially, I've provided some additional examples which will get posted online, but if there is any confusion around the scoring after this is posted, I would just encourage you to then clarify your question again, but hopefully when we post additional examples it will become quite clear with the formulas that we've provided.



Q4. From this same bidder, Appendix F, Section F.1.1 indicates that individuals may only be listed under one specialization.

A. Again, we've sort of covered this one. The individual proposed as the Expert CSAP cannot be named as a Senior or Expert Risk Assessor. I covered that earlier by saying that they can only be in the Table once. I think I answered that question at this point.

Moving on to more questions.

Q. Can the expert CSAP be a member of more than one submission team?

A. I've answered that one as well.

Q. Is the Expert becoming a site [inaudible] professional in the Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist, identify for project descriptions, Section F.1.2.2 states to include project that list up to four individuals.

A. I've answered that question now as well.

Q. For the project description, does years worked on a project refer to the number of years worked or the date?

A. I wasn't totally clear on that question, but I can answer what I think the question was, which is, the years worked on the project refer to the number of years spent working on the risk assessment project. The information presented in that particular Section is not evaluated but must still be included as part of the description, so hopefully that answers that question about years worked on the project.

Q. Does a Master's in Resource Management qualify as a Master's Degree?

A. The answer to that is yes.

Q. Do junior and admin staff require accreditation to gain full points in the Corporate Capability Table?

A. We've answered that question.

Q. Section F.1.1.1 Evaluation Part C states that education is weighted at 20 percent. Scoring will be based on the highest level of education completed. I won't keep reading what it all says there, but the question is, does this apply to all positions and levels?

A. Again, the answer is yes.

Q. Does a Master's of Environmental Studies count for accreditation purposes?

A. The answer is yes.

Q. Next question. Does a qualified Professional Risk Assessor from the Province of Ontario count for accreditation purposes?

A. The answer there is no. A qualified Professional Risk Assessor from the Province of Ontario would not count as per F.1.1.1(b), the relevant jurisdictions are BC and the Yukon except for those accreditations that are not issued regionally.

Q. Next question. On page 20 of 55, the [inaudible] indicates that up to six [inaudible] Risk Assessments completed by four different Senior/Expert Risk Assessors within the last 10 years [inaudible]. Please confirm that a maximum of two of these project descriptions can come from the expert CSAP.

A. The answer to that is yes.

Q. I would like you to please address at the Bidders Meeting how and if the bid process evaluates the effectiveness of the bidder to meet the purpose and objectives of the Federal [inaudible] program in general. Did you want to answer that one?

A. Yeah, so this question is really getting at the actual human strategy, for Aboriginal business policy itself, so the PSAB is not a Public Works policy. It is an AANDC policy, Aboriginal [inaudible] in [inaudible] Canada policy and we just follow that policy, so we have followed the policy. We conform to it to the best of our understanding of the policy. We have met all of our obligations in accordance with that policy, so if this bidder has any issues with the actual policy itself, I encourage you to actually contact ANEC directly because the policy does not state that we have to add any additional Evaluation Criteria in the [inaudible] quotation as then we have in the open quotation.

So that was it for the questions that were submitted to-date. Again, if we missed your question you can certainly ask it again or just resubmit it by e-mail or if there are any questions at this point, feel free to raise your hand if you have any questions and Christine will bring the mic over to you.

Q. In Annex B on page 33, it says the hourly rate for each person in a specific category must be the same, so can you confirm that the category refers to all the positions listed on the previous page, 31 and 32, are simply the Expert, Senior, Intermediate or Junior categories.

A. I believe that statement, and I'm not at the same point as you were just reading from, but it basically means that for the Junior categories proposed, all of the Junior personnel get the same rate. All of the Intermediate personnel proposed will be at the same rate and same for Senior/Experts. It just means that the rate established for those four levels will be the same within those levels.

Q. For private restrictions for projects completed outside of BC scored at a lower value?

A. Yes. The short answer is yes. If they're completed in other provinces or other countries for that matter, they will be scored [inaudible].

Q. Is there a matrix for that?

A. We haven't provided the details around the scoring, but you can generally, I think, infer, I'll switch to the page, hopefully it's summarized here. On page 50, for the Senior Project Manager and again for the Risk Assessor, page 49, at the top of the page it gives A, B, C, D, for Risk Assessor and then F, G, H, I, J on page 50, for the Project Managers and those five criteria specifically are the ones that are going to be scored. So it's from that you can hopefully infer sort of what the general scoring for each of those might be and then again, with the generic evaluations there in that matrix rating to follow. Just along that same line, Project Description for the Project Manager and the Risk Assessor is not listed in either of those listings that I just read out, so again, those are not being scored specifically but they are still required to evaluate the summaries.

Any other questions? There's still lots of time to submit questions before closing. I think it was two weeks. It closes on March 16, so the A Tender, and the B Tender March 17, so there's still plenty of time.

Q. Can you clarify the best way to send questions. Is it by the fax machine [inaudible] tried it. I hear other people [inaudible] e-mail addresses are.

A. Yeah, by e-mail.

Q. [inaudible] e-mail address or....

A. Yeah, it's in there. I hope so, it should be.



Q. Written in handwriting. [inaudible]

A. [inaudible] it's in there.

Q. To clarify we're okay to send e-mail.

A. Yeah, absolutely, that's the best way. If you find the page before I do let me know the page number. On page 15.

Q. Page 15, thanks. So we're okay to do that.

A. Oh yeah, absolutely. You just can't submit your bid by e-mail. So the bid has to be in hard copy or [inaudible] for that matter. [inaudible]

Q. Just wanted to confirm the last day for questions.

A. Must be March 2 on page 6.

Okay, if there are no other questions then we'll wrap it up. Took much less time than I thought. It's only 42 minutes, but we'll adjourn the meeting and as I said e-mail questions if you have any more and make sure that your proposal gets here by 2 p.m. on the closing date. So that's really a hard and fast [inaudible]. If it gets here at 2:01 it's considered non-compliant so make sure it does get here on time. Thank you very much.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.**