



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Public Works and Government Services Canada  
ATB Place North Tower  
10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave. Jaspe  
5th floor/5e étage  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6  
Bid Fax: (780) 497-3510

**Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer**

**Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes**

Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle du département(OCID)

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

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Public Works and Government Services Canada  
ATB Place North Tower  
10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave Jasper  
5th floor/5e étage  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Architectural Services DISO		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> E0209-171193/A		<b>Date</b> 2016-10-06
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> VARIOUS E0209-171193		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWU-6-39136 (023)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWU-023-10855		
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2016-09-08
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-10-19</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Mountain Daylight Saving Time MDT
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Taylor (RPC), Ian		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwu023
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (780) 566-9487 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (780) 497-3510	
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>		
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>		
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.		

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b> <b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No - Non</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

---

**This solicitation amendment has been raised to respond to questions posed by potential bidders:**

1. Section 2.2 states that *the number of pages ...vary in accordance with the number of zones being proposed*. Please provide clarification on the number of Senior Personnel, Project personnel / significant project examples required per zone. Response: Number of Senior Personnel, project personnel proposed is limited to number requested as if bidder was bidding on one zone. Significant project examples is limited to number requested as if bidder was bidding on one zone.
2. *Individual call-ups will vary, up to a maximum of \$1,000,000.00 (Applicable Taxes included)*. Does the maximum provided cover costs in addition to consultant fees? Response: Maximum limit is inclusive of all consultant fees and disbursements.
3. In **Section 3.2.4 Senior Personnel Expertise and Experience** and **Section 3.2.5 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience**, the RFSO indicates that the Proponent should provide "maximum of two c.v.'s" for the personnel identified in each section. It appears that this number is the same whether or not we are bidding on one zone or all of them. If we are bidding on all of the zones, would it be possible to increase the maximum number of CV's to ensure the senior personnel and project personnel are adequately identified for all the zones? Response: Refer to response to question 1.
4. Who are the project managers from PWGSC that will be leading the standing offer agreements for each zone? Response: PWGSC project managers are not yet assigned to future projects.
5. In section 1.2.1.1 of the TOR it specifies that the Architect provide a multi-disciplinary team.
  - a. In the proposal document under the sections 3.2.3, 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 there is no mention of providing CVs or projects by any of our *Consultant Team*. Should we provide Consultant Team info? And where would you suggest integrating that information? I believe we could provide an organization chart that lists our Consultants, is that sufficient? Response: Delete request for multi-disciplinary team. Consultant response is for Architectural team only.
6. Can you please clarify if we are required to include information of proposed sub-consultants and specialist consultants in the submission? Can the sub-consultants' materials be included in the appendix or does their information need to be included within the page limit? Response: No sub-consultant information is required. All requested references to sub-consultants is deleted.
7. Nowhere in the document does the SO provide for Interior Design. Should we add this somehow in our response? Granted this SO is specifically geared towards Architectural Services. However, one of the mock up projects, Interior Fit-Up, would likely require the services of a Professional Interior Designer. Response: Interior Design services will be required for Interior Fit-Up projects and possibly in support on other assignments. Identify and include senior, junior and other levels of interior design as appropriate in tendered hourly salary rates.

- 
8. Please clarify what timeline is acceptable for referencing past projects. Specifically, the phrasing or extra word difference between GI 2 Introduction clause 2 *"...Firms should be able to demonstrate successful delivery of these services for a broad variety of projects over the last seven (7) years..."* and SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, Section 3.2.3., Clause 1 *"Demonstration that over at least the past seven (7) years, the Proponent has participated in a range of projects..."*. The "over at least" in particular is a bit unclear. Response: Only include projects that were started within past seven (7) years.

**All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.**