



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

Title - Sujet Consulting Services for HHERA	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EZ897-161534/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EZ897-161534	Date 2016-03-30
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$VAN-576-7740	
File No. - N° de dossier VAN-5-38343 (576)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-04-14	
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: Sobhee, Sachin	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur van576
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (604) 775-7022 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (604) 775-7526
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 created to respond to bidder questions and to make changes to the RFP.

The question period is now closed and no further questions will be accepted.

Questions and Answers

Q1) Section F.1.2.3 states that the descriptions for each sample project should include in bullet #1 (personnel and roles) the identity of at least one Senior or Expert Risk Assessor/toxicologist and “summarize their role on the project including a detailed description of services provided in relation to the Statement of Work”. Under bullet #6 (risk assessment details) the bidder needs to “describe in detail the scope of work performed...”. To avoid repetition between these two requirements, we would like to know if it is acceptable to include the information that is requested under bullet #1 (i.e., summary of role and detailed description of services) in the text addressing bullet #6. Please confirm (yes or no) whether this is acceptable and if there is any further instruction from PWGSC on this matter?

A1) The first bullet, Personnel and Roles, must state the name of the individual and their role. E.g. Jane Doe, Senior Risk Assessor/Toxicologist OR Jane Doe, Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist OR Jane Doe, Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist). Under bullet 6, Risk Assessment Details, the scope of work completed by the same individual must be described. Under bullet 6, “the bidder”, refers to the Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist.

Q2) Similarly, Section F.1.3.3 states that the descriptions for each sample project should include in bullet #1 (personnel and roles) the identity of at least one Senior Project Manager and “summarize their role on the project including a detailed description of services provided in relation to the Statement of Work”. Under bullet #6 (project management details) the bidder needs to “describe in detail the scope of work performed...”. To avoid repetition between these two requirements, we would like to know if it is acceptable to include the information that is requested under bullet #1 (i.e., summary of role and detailed description of services) in the text addressing bullet #6. Please confirm (yes or no) whether this is acceptable and if there is any further instruction from PWGSC on this matter?

A2) The first bullet, Personnel and Roles, must state the name of the individual and their role. E.g. Jane Doe, Senior Project Manager. Under bullet 6, Project Management Details, the scope of work completed by the same individual must be described. Under bullet 6, “the bidder”, refers to the Senior Project Manager.

Q3) Can a project be used as an example for the Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist project experience and for the Senior Project Manager project experience if written separately to highlight the requirements?

A3) Yes, you may use the same project for a Senior Project Manager and a Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist. You are not permitted to use the same project for more than one Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist. You are not permitted to use the same project for both project managers.

Q4) Can PWGSC provide a point scoring formula for this proposal?

A4) No other details will be provided for scoring.

Q5) Can a team member be part of more than one separate submissions if he/she operates as an independent consultant (from a business perspective, i.e. they are not considered employees of one company)?

A5) 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) For example, we have access to a consultant who has agreed to join us on the set-aside proposal and will join us on the non-set-aside proposal provided it is ok to do so (as he currently is committed to another firm for the non-set-aside).

We are concerned that this will disqualify the team member.

A6) The team member will not be disqualified if they are used twice. However, there's an expectation that the person will be available when requested.

Q7) Regarding: Section F.1.2.2 asks: Describe six (6) HHERA projects completed by up to four different senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologists (maximum of 2 projects per person) within the last ten (10) years.

Question: In order to satisfy the requirement of F.1.2.4, is it acceptable to use experience gained and projects that were completed by the individual senior/expert risk assessors/toxicologists during previous employment?

A7) Yes, you may use experience gained while working for a previous employer if the experience is relevant.

Q8a) On page 47 (F.1.1.1. (d) (ii), the use of the term "Expert" in concert with the designation of "CSAP-Risk" is somewhat confusing. The professional designation CSAP-Risk conferred by the CSAP Society is in itself indicative of expert knowledge on the subject matter of BC CSR HHERA. PWGSC's use of the term "expert" with "CSAP-Risk" creates confusion/conflict on the matter of "years experience" described as 10 yrs career experience for a CSAP-Risk specialist (item F 1.1.1 (d) (ii)), versus the generic statement made in the last paragraph Pg 47 ("Experts will receive full marks provided they have a minimum of 20 years experience").

Is PWGSC's use of the adjective "Expert" in conjunction with "CSAP-Risk" an unintended redundancy and not intended to be considered in the context of the generic statement quoted above for item F 1.1.1 (d)(i)?

A8a) The use of "Expert" for CSAP (Risk Assessment Specialists) allows bidders to charge the Expert rate, while only requiring 10 year's experience. This is an exception to the rule that "Experts will receive full marks provided they have a minimum of 20 years experience".

Q8b) Can you confirm that the "Expert" CSAP-Risk Specialist is satisfied with a minimum 10yrs career experience in HHERA.

A8b) Correct, an Expert CSAP (Risk Assessment Specialist) qualifies with a minimum of 10 year's experience.

Q9) Section F.1.2.2: Is the intent of this section to describe a representative RA project and the risk assessment components completed, or focus on the details on what the single senior (lead) risk assessor/toxicologist contributed to the project?

A9) The intent is to focus on the details of what the single senior/expert risk assessor/toxicologist being proposed contributed for a particular risk assessment project.

Q10) Section F.1.2.3: How does Bullet #1 (summary of their role... including detailed description of services) differ from Bullet #6 (describe scope of work)? There is likely to be considerable overlap.

A10) *A subsequent amendment to the RFP clarifies the difference.* The first bullet, Personnel and Roles, must state the name of the individual and their role. E.g. Jane Doe, Senior Risk Assessor/Toxicologist OR Jane Doe, Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist OR Jane Doe, Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist). Under bullet 6, Risk Assessment Details, the scope of work completed by the same individual must be described. Under bullet 6, "the bidder", refers to the Senior/Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist.

Q11) Section F.1.2.3: Large RA projects are often completed collaboratively by a team rather than by an individual. In bullet #1, if we identify a lead risk assessor but also identify other personnel in the corporate table that were involved in the project being presented, might we be considered by the evaluation team to exceed the limitations of the RFP (e.g., can't list more than two projects per individual, can't list more than four experts/seniors RAs, etc)?

A11) The intent is to focus on the details of what the single senior/expert risk assessor/toxicologist being proposed contributed for a particular risk assessment project. There is no requirement to discuss the other team members contributions.

Q12) Given the lengthy duration of some risk assessments, there is often multiple companies and discrete project teams who may have worked on a wide area site within a 10-year period, and in fact the only connectivity is the wide area boundaries of the site. For specific content of our question: the individual proposed in the Expert Category was the lead Risk Assessor for a period of 5 years (2006-2010) while employed at company A, and the individual proposed in the Senior Risk Assessor / Toxicologist Role worked on the file for the next 5 years (2011-2016) while employed at company B; the work was completed under different contracts let to different companies; company A and company B had no 'partner' relationship for project delivery; entirely separate deliverables were submitted to PWGSC; and further, there was no collaboration whatsoever between the project teams referenced above. We assume these are considered separate 'projects' in accordance with the definition in Section F.1.2.2. Please confirm.

A12) Independent risk assessments completed for different areas of the same site would be considered separate projects.

Changes to the RFP

At section 7.1.1.1 Task Authorization Process,

Delete:

As more than one contract has been awarded for this requirement, a request to perform a task will be sent to the first ranked contractor. If that contractor confirms in writing that it is unable to perform the task

as a result of previous commitments under a TA, the request to perform a task will then be forwarded to the contractor ranked second. This process will continue until the task can be performed by another contractor. If no contractor can perform the task, Canada reserves the right to acquire the required Work by other means. A contractor may advise the Project Authority and the Contracting Authority in writing that it is unable to carry out additional tasks as a result of previous commitments under a TA and no request to perform a task will be sent to that contractor until that contractor has given notice in writing to the Project Authority and the Contracting Authority that it is available to perform additional tasks.

Insert:

As more than one contract will be awarded for this requirement, Canada will use the following approach to select/assign an appropriate contractor.

Unless a best fit exception is approved by the Contracting Authority, a Contractor will be selected based on which Contractor is farthest away from their predetermined maximum percentage distribution, therefore ensuring that work is evenly distributed as identified to the Contractor's in the RFP/resulting contract. In the case where insufficient funds remain in a Contractor's contract to complete a proposed TA, the Contractor next farthest away from their percentage distribution, and with enough funds remaining, will be selected for the work.

The best fit exception is described as follows:

A Contractor may be considered based on their history in conducting previous phases of a client's project/program. For example, if a Contractor has completed initial phases of a specific client's project, then this Contractor may be considered for a subsequent phase. Rationale for this best fit exception would be based on the Contractor's significant previous experience with the site, thereby reducing planning time and costs for subsequent project packages and ensuring consistency with the work.

At Annex F, section F.1.2.3, bullet 1,

Delete: Summarize their role on the project including a detailed description of services provided in relation to the Statement of Work.

Insert: State the name of the individual and their role. e.g. Jane Doe, Senior Risk Assessor/Toxicologist OR Jane Doe, Expert Risk Assessor/Toxicologist OR Jane Doe, Expert Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (Risk Assessment Specialist)

At Annex F, section F.1.3.3, bullet 1,

Delete: Summarize their role on the project including a detailed description of services provided in relation to the Statement of Work.

Insert: State the name of the individual and their role. e.g. Jane Doe, Senior Project Manager.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.