



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving
PWGSC
33 City Centre Drive
Suite 480C
Mississauga
Ontario
L5B 2N5
Bid Fax: (905) 615-2095

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

Regional Individual Standing Offer (RISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle régionale (OCIR)

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

This Document contains a Security Requirement.

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
Ontario Region
33 City Centre Drive
Suite 480
Mississauga
Ontario
L5B 2N5

Title - Sujet Environmental Services - RISO		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ447-180276/A		Date 2017-09-13
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EQ447-180276		Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
File No. - N° de dossier TOR-7-40033 (018)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$TOR-018-7346		
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2017-08-24
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-10-10		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pan, Long		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur tor018
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (905) 615-2076 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -	
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée		
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:		
Security - Sécurité 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

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
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)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

THE SOLICITATION AMENDMENT No. 03 IS RAISED TO MODIFY THE BID SOLICITATION AND ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM THE INDUSTRY.

Modification # 001

Reference:

RFSO; Question 08

Modification #01:

The third paragraph in RFSO Part 1 General Information, Section 1.2, will be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Details of the Statement of Work for the Streams are contained in Annex "A". Offerors may submit an Offer for any or all Streams, however a separate AND complete offer is required for each Stream. Offers for parts of Streams are not acceptable. However, it is possible for Offerors to Joint Venture. All proposed resources must be in-house. Further, resources employed by a joint-venture are considered in-house; sub-contractors are not considered in-house.

Modification # 02

Reference:

RFSO – Steam 5 – Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria – R5

Modification #02:

The first paragraph of R4 in Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria in Stream 5 is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Capacity Management

Along with the proposed resources identified in the org chart in M3, the Offeror should list all project resources with the capability, capacity and expertise to provide the full range of required services and deliverables listed in the Required Services (RS). These resources will form the core project team. For the relevant experience refer to Annex A statement of work – Stream 5.

Modification # 03

Reference:

RFSO – Attachment 1 to Part 4 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Modification #03:

Under Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, the following formatting and title numbers are hereby revised.

Please note: All Contents remain unchanged under this section.

For Stream 1:

1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria is replaced with:

1.0 Mandatory Technical Criteria

2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria is replaced with:

2.0 Point Rated Technical Criteria

For Stream 2:

1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria is replaced with:

1.0 Mandatory Technical Criteria

For M2, under Mandatory Technical Criteria, the project category numbers (4, 5, 6 and 7) are replaced with 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria is replaced with:

2.0 Point Rated Technical Criteria

For R1, under Corporate Experience, the criteria number in the Scoring Scheme column is replaced with:

i, ii and iii

For R2, under Corporate Experience, the criteria number in the Scoring Scheme column is replaced with:

i, ii, iii, iv, v and vi

For R3, under Corporate Experience, for c, d and e, the criteria number in the Scoring Scheme column is replaced with:

i, ii, and iii

In Sample Table, the item numbers (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13) are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

For Stream 3:

1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria is replaced with:

1.0 Mandatory Technical Criteria

For M3 under Mandatory Technical Criteria, the project category numbers (8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria is replaced with:

2.0 Point Rated Technical Criteria

4. Corporate Experience is replaced with:

1. Corporate Experience

The category number under the 1. Corporate Experience is replaced with:

a. Project Information

b. Client Information

c. Project Value

d. Project Scope and Description

e. Project Management

The category number under R2: Project Value (CAD) is replaced with:

- a) Phase I ESA Project
- b) Phase II ESA Project
- c) Human Health Risk Assessment / Ecological Risk Assessment
- d) Design and Management of Site Remediation Project
- e) Contaminated Sediment Assessment Project

The category number under R4 is replaced with:

R4: Capacity Management

- c) Junior Professional
- d) Senior Technologist
- e) Technologist

The category number under 2.2 of Resource Experience is replaced with:

- a. Project Information
- b. Client Information
- c. Project Scope and Description

Under R8, the category numbers (v, vi, vii and viii) are replaced with I, ii, iii and iv, respectively.

In Sample Table, the item numbers (14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19) are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively. Also, the criterion numbers of xii to xxii are replaced with 1 to 11, respectively.

For Stream 4:

- 1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria is replaced with:
- 1.0 Mandatory Technical Criteria

Under M2, the project category numbers of 14, 15, 16 and 17 are replaced with 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

- 1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria is replaced with:
- 2.0 Point Rated Technical Criteria

- 7. Corporate Experience is replaced with:
- 1. Corporate Experience

Under R1, the criterion numbers of v, vi, vii and viii are replaced with i, ii, iii and iv, respectively.

Under R2, the criterion numbers of vii, viii, ix, x, xi and xii are replaced with i, ii, iii, iv, v and vi, respectively.

Under R3, a. the criterion numbers of iv, v and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R3, c. the criterion numbers of iv, v and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R3, d. the criterion numbers of iv, v and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

3. Resource Experience is replaced with:

2.0 Resource Experience

Under Resource Experience, 2.1, the criterion numbers of d, e and f are replaced with a, b and c, respectively.

a. Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role is replaced with:

2.3 Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role

Under R7, the criterion numbers of ix, x, xi and xii are replaced with i, ii, iii and iv, respectively.

In Sample Table, the item numbers (20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25) are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

For Stream 5:

1.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria is replaced with:

1.0 Mandatory Technical Criteria

Under M3, the category numbers of 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, respectively.

Under M4, the item numbers of 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, respectively.

2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria is replaced with:

2.0 Point Rated Technical Criteria

9. Corporate Experience is replaced with:

1. Corporate Experience

The category number under the 1. Corporate Experience is replaced with:

- a. Project Information
- b. Client Information
- c. Project Value
- d. Project Scope and Description
- e. Project Management

Under R1, the criterion numbers of ix, x, xi and xii are replaced with i, ii, iii and iv, respectively.

The category number under R2: Project Value (CAD) is replaced with:

- a) Phase I ESA Project
- b) Phase II ESA Project
- c) Human Health Risk Assessment / Ecological Risk Assessment
- d) Design and Management of Site Remediation Project
- e) Contaminated Sediment Assessment Project
- f) Public Consultation

Under R2, Phase I ESA Project, the criterion numbers of iv, v, and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R2, Phase II ESA Project, the criterion numbers of iv, v, and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R2, Human Health Risk Assessment/Ecological Risk Assessment Project, the criterion numbers of iv, v, and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R2, Design and Management of Site Remediation Project, the criterion numbers of iv, v, and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R2, Contaminated Sediment Assessment Project, the criterion numbers of iv, v, and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R3, the criterion numbers of xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvii, xviii and xix are replaced with i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi and vii, respectively.

The category number under R4 is replaced with:

R4: Capacity Management

- a) Senior Professional
- b) Intermediate Professional
- c) Junior Professional
- d) Senior Technologist
- e) Technologist

Under R4, Senior Professional, the criterion numbers of vii, viii and ix are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R4, Intermediate Professional, the criterion numbers of iv, v, and vi are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R4, Junior Professional, the criterion numbers of vii, viii, and ix are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R4, Senior Technologist, the criterion numbers of vii, viii, and ix are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

4. Resource Experience is replaced with:
2.0 Resource Experience

The category number under 2.1 of Resource Experience is replaced with:

- a. Accreditation organization, date accreditation obtained and current status.
- b. All post-secondary education institutions, dates attended and credentials obtained. List highest level of certificates, diplomas and degrees in the fields relevant to the proposed role
- c. Work history with employer's names, dates employed, job title and responsibilities.

The category number under 2.2 of Resource Experience is replaced with:

- a. Project Information
- b. Client Information
- c. Project Scope and Description

Under 2.3 Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role:

- i. Senior Environmental Engineer – Remediation Design: is replaced with
- h. Senior Environmental Engineer – Remediation Design

Under R5, the criterion numbers of iii, iv, and v are replaced with i, ii and iii, respectively.

Under R6, the criterion numbers of iii and iv are replaced with i and ii, respectively.

The category number under R7 is replaced with:

- a) Senior RISO Contact
- b) Senior Project Manager
- c) Senior Consultant – Environmental Site Assessment
- d) Senior Hydrogeologist
- e) Senior Risk Assessor – Human Health Toxicologist
- f) Senior Risk Assessor - Terrestrial or Wildlife
- g) Senior Sediment Assessment Specialist
- h) Senior Environmental Engineer - Remediation Design

Under R8, the criterion numbers of xiii, xiv, xv and xvi are replaced with i, ii, iii and iv, respectively.

In Sample Table, the item numbers (26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31) are replaced with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively. Also, the criterion numbers of xxiv to xxxiv are replaced with 1 to 11, respectively.

All category numbers in the Point-Rated breakdown table are hereby deleted:

Criterion	Maximum Points Available	Minimum Pass Score
Corporate Experience		
Resource Experience		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question # 05

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #05:

Given the level of complexity of this proposal and the compilation of the printed documents, we would like to ask for an extension on the closing to Friday, October 13th as the holiday on October 9th will set us back several days.

Answer #05:

Canada does not contemplate any extension at this point.

Question # 06

Reference:

RFSO - Stream 1 – Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria – R3

Question #06:

In the Rated Requirements for Stream 1 R3, the RFP states that they would like Resumes for each person listed in the Capacity Management requirements. Stream 2-5 do not request resumes. Does PSPC want resumes for the additional resources for only stream 1? And if so, are they to be 2 page resumes with the same requirements laid out for the key personnel in M3?

Answer #06:

Resumes for additional resources for Stream 1 are not required.

Question # 07

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams– Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria for Project Experience under Resource Experience Section

Question #07:

Is there a page or word limit for the Resource Experience Project Descriptions in the Rated Requirements for each stream?

Answer #07:

For all streams, Offeror should limit their response for each project to a maximum of 1500 words.

Question # 08

Reference:

RFSO - Stream 3

Question #08:

Near the top of Page 4 (Section 1.2) the RFSO document states: "it is possible for Offerors to Joint Venture. The same subcontractor may be included in more than one offer. If a subcontractor is proposed as one of the team members, company security clearances must be met."

In ATTACHMENT 1 TO PART 4, Stream 3: Contaminated Sites Consulting Services, 2.2 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, 2. Resource Experience, 2.1 (grey shaded box on page 93 of the PDF document), it

states: "All resources must be in-house. Further, resources employed by a joint-venture are considered in-house; sub-contractors are not considered in-house."

Can you please clarify for Stream 3, whether the use of sub-contractors (not in a joint-venture) can be considered as part of the in-house resources (as implied by Page 4, Section 1.2); or do sub-contractors need to be within a joint-venture to be considered as in-house resources?

Answer #08:

Please refer to Modification 01. Joint Venture and Subcontract refer to Corporate Entities. All proposed resources must be in-house. Further, resources employed by a joint-venture are considered in-house; sub-contractors of Prime Contract or Joint Venture are not considered in-house. This clarification applies to all streams.

Question # 09

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria – M4

Question #09:

For Stream 3, in the Mandatory Technical Criteria M4, we are required to provide evidence that the Senior Risk Assessor (human health) is a QPRA under O.Reg. 153/04 by submitting Sections 8 and 10 of a submitted Risk Assessment Pre-Submission Form. If the Risk Assessor is no longer with the same firm that submitted the Pre-Submission Form, would a letter or email from the MOECC confirming that the Senior Risk Assessor is in fact a QPRA be sufficient?

Answer #09:

Yes.

Question # 10

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #10:

In all streams, can the projects submitted in the category of Corporate Experience be the same as project submitted in the category of Resource Experience?

Answer #10:

Yes but different projects for both categories are also acceptable.

Question # 11

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #11:

In all streams, can the projects submitted for one resource (e.g., the RISO Contact) be the same projects as those submitted for another resource (e.g., the Senior Consultant)?

Answer #11:

Yes.

Question # 12**Reference:**

RFSO – Streams 3 and 5 – Mandatory Technical Criteria M3 and Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria R2

Question #12:

For Corporate Mandatory Technical Evaluation M3 and R2e) projects, please confirm that past federal projects that encompass some or all of FCSAP steps 3 to 6 (notably steps 3 and/or 5) are acceptable for evaluation as a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment project.

Answer #12:

Phase II ESA requirements are included in Annex A, Statement of Work of RFSO.

Question # 13**Reference:**

RFSO – All Streams

Question #13:

It is not clear how the projects that were put forward under Section 4, Corporate Experience will be scored. The RFP requires a detailed description of the Project Scope and Description for each proposed project, and also states that the maximum length of each project description is 1500 words. Yet, the scoring points in R1 and R2 appear to be solely based on client type (max 15 points per project) and value (max 10 points per project). There does not appear to be any points provided for the Project Scope and Description. Please clarify how each project will be scored, including clarity regarding the point scoring of the project scope and description.

Answer #13:

For all streams, for projects submitted under Corporate Experience, there is no point scoring of the project scope and description. However, for all streams, part of Mandatory Requirement submission, the offeror are required to submit projects under each specified category and clearly describe the project scope and its similarity to the scope and tasks of required services related to the specified category described in Annex A, Statement of Work. The projects submitted under Mandatory Requirements are further evaluated in the point rated evaluation criteria.

Question # 14

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #14:

Is there an overall page limit to the proposal submission?

Answer #14:

There is no overall page limit to the proposal submission.