



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

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

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

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

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

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

Title - Sujet West Memorial Building	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EH900-173222/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 008
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20173222	Date 2017-09-15
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FE-172-73224	
File No. - N° de dossier fe172.EH900-173222	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-09-28	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Boujenoui(fe172), Nabil	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fe172
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4905 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: West Memorial Building, Ottawa, Ontario	

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

The following changes in the Request for Proposal document is effective immediately. This amendment will form part of the contract documents.

This amendment is being raised to amend the following:

ITEM 001: SI6 Security Requirement

Delete: SI6 Security Requirement in it's entirety

Replace with:

SI6 SECURITY REQUIREMENT

1. At the closing date identified on the front page of the Request for Proposal (the "Bid Close", the following conditions must be met:
 - (a) the Proponent and Sub-Consultants/Specialists must hold a valid organization security clearance as indicated in Supplementary Conditions SC1 and set out in the following table:

Proponent/Sub Consultants/Specialists (Firms)	Facility Security Clearance (FSC Secret) at Bid Close	Document Safeguarding (Secret) at Bid Close
Proponent (Prime Consultant)	X	X
Structural Engineer (with heritage building conservation specialty)	X	
Mechanical Engineer	X	
Electrical Engineer	X	
Security Specialist	X	
IT Specialist	X	

- (b) the Proponent's Key Personnel requiring access to classified or protected information, assets or sensitive work site(s) must meet the security requirement as indicated in Supplementary Conditions SC1 and set out in the following table:

Key Personnel Category (Individuals)	Security Clearance (Secret) at Bid Close
Proponent (Prime Consultant)	X
Structural Engineer (with heritage building conservation specialty)	X
Mechanical Engineer	X
Electrical Engineer	X
Security Specialist	X
IT Specialist	X

- (c) the Proponent's Site or premises requiring safeguard measures must meet the security requirement as indicated in Supplementary Conditions SC1.
- (d) the Proponent must provide the address of the proposed location of the Site or premises requiring safeguard measures as indicated in the Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix B).
2. For additional information on security requirements, proponents should refer to the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate (CISD), Industrial Security Program of Public Works and Government Services Canada (<http://ssi-iss.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/index-eng.html>) website.

END OF ITEM 001

ITEM 002: Submission Requirements and Evaluation

SRE 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 4.2.5 been amended.

With the exception of the above, the presentation of the SRE below is to provide clarity.

Delete: Submissions Requirements and Evaluation in it's entirety

Replace with the following:

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

SRE 1 General Information

SRE 2 Proposal Requirements

SRE 3 Phase One Submission Requirements and Evaluation

SRE 4 Phase Two Submission Requirements and Evaluation

SRE 5 Price of Services

SRE 6 Total Score

SRE 7 Submission Requirements - Checklist

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

SRE 1 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Reference to the Selection Procedure

An 'Overview of the selection procedure' can be found in R1110T General instructions to Proponents (GI3).

1.2 Calculation of Total Score

For this project the Total Score will be established as follows:

Phase One Rating x 30%	=	Phase One Score (Points)
Phase Two Technical Rating x 60%	=	Technical Score (Points)
<u>Phase Two Price Rating x 10%</u>	=	<u>Price Score (Points)</u>
Total Score	=	Max. 100 Points

SRE 2 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Requirement for Proposal Format (for phases one and two)

The following proposal format information should be implemented when preparing the Phase One and Phase Two proposals.

- Phase One - Submit one (1) bound original plus five (5) bound copies of the proposal
- Phase Two - Submit one (1) bound original plus five (5) bound copies of the proposal
- Paper size should be - 216mm x 279mm (8.5" x 11")
- Minimum font size - 11 point Times or equal
- Minimum margins - 12 mm left, right, top, and bottom
- Double-sided submissions are preferred
- One (1) 'page' means one side of a 216mm x 279mm (8.5" x 11") sheet of paper
- 279mm x 432 mm (11" x 17") fold-out sheets for spreadsheets, organization charts etc. will be counted as two pages.
- The order of the proposals should follow the order established in the Request for Proposal SRE section

2.2 Phase One Specific Requirements for Proposal Format

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is twenty-five (25) pages.

The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above;

- Covering letter
- Consultant Team Identification (Appendix A)
- Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix B)
- Integrity Provisions – Required Documentation
- Information related to Security Requirement (Appendix F)

Consequence of non-compliance: any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the proposal and will not be forwarded to the PWGSC Evaluation Board members for evaluation.

2.3 Phase Two Specific Requirements for Proposal Format

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 4.2 is thirty (30) pages.

The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above;

- Covering letter
- Consultant Team Verification
- Front page of the RFP
- Front page of revision(s) to the RFP
- Price Proposal Form (Appendix C)

Consequence of non-compliance: any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the proposal and will not be forwarded to the PWGSC Evaluation Board members for evaluation.

SRE 3 PHASE ONE SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

Intent: The intent of Phase One evaluation activities is to verify that the submissions meet the mandatory screening requirements and to evaluate and rate the proposed teams.

3.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

Failure to meet the mandatory requirements will render the proposal as non-responsive and no further evaluation will be carried out.

3.1.1 Licensing, Certification or Authorization

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

3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification

The consultant team to be identified at Phase One must include the following:

Proponent (prime consultant)

- Architect

Key Sub-consultants / Specialists

- Conservation Architect
- Structural Engineer (with heritage building conservation specialty)
- Mechanical Engineer
- Electrical Engineer
- Security Specialist
- Information Technology Specialist
- Interior Designer

If the proponent proposes to provide multidisciplinary services that might normally be provided by a sub-consultant, this should be indicated here.

Information required - name of firm, key personnel to be assigned to the project. For the prime consultant indicate current license and/or how you intend to meet the provincial or territorial licensing requirements. In the case of a joint venture identify the existing or proposed legal form of the joint venture (refer to R1110T General Instructions to Proponents, G19 Limitation of Submissions).

Proponents will be required to carry over the consultant team identified in Phase One to Phase Two.

An example of an acceptable format (typical) for submission of the team identification information is provided in Appendix A.

3.1.3 Declaration/Certifications Form

Proponents must complete, sign and submit the following:

- Appendix B, Declaration/Certifications Form as required

3.1.4 Integrity Provisions – Required documentation

In accordance with the Ineligibility and Suspension Policy (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html>), the Proponent must provide, as applicable, to be given further consideration in the procurement process, the required documentation as per R1110T (2016-04-04), General instructions 1 (GI1), Integrity Provisions – Proposal, section 3a.

3.1.5 Security Requirement

- 1) Proponents must meet the security requirements as outlined under SI6 and SC1.
- 2) At Bid Close, the following conditions must be met:
 - a. The Proponent and Sub-Consultants/Specialists must meet the following security requirement:

Proponent/Sub Consultants/Specialists (Firms)	Security Clearance (FSC Secret) at Bid Close	Document Safeguarding (Secret) at Bid Close
Proponent (Prime Consultant)	X	X
Structural Engineer (with heritage building conservation specialty)	X	
Mechanical Engineer	X	
Electrical Engineer	X	
Security Specialist	X	
IT Specialist	X	

To help PWGSC with the verification process, Proponent are being asked to complete Appendix F.

- b. The Proponent Key Personnel must meet the following security requirement:

Key Personnel Category (Individuals)	Security Clearance (Secret) at Bid Close
Proponent (Prime Consultant)	X
Structural Engineer (with heritage building conservation specialty)	X
Mechanical Engineer	X
Electrical Engineer	X
Security Specialist	X

IT Specialist	X
---------------	---

To help PWGSC with the verification process, Proponent are being asked to complete Appendix F.

3.2 RATED REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation criteria for the Phase One proposal addresses only the previous achievements and experiences of the proposed Consultant Team. No material is to be prepared or presented on the subject project itself. The Phase One proposal provides the opportunity for Proponents to present their past work in the context of the proposed project. It is at this time that interested firms submit to PWGSC a history of their accomplishments in order to establish the capabilities of their teams and lead designers as well as other key team members.

3.2.1 Achievements of Proponent on Projects

The Proponent shall describe their accomplishments, achievements, knowledge and experience as a prime consultant on three (3), separate projects that are comparable, in terms of scope, scale and complexity of work, to the project described in the Project Brief PD5 Program of Work, PD2 Project Description and PD4 Project Objectives of this RFP.

With respect to the projects described, the Proponent shall provide evidence:

- that at least one (1) of the projects was completed or at least reached Substantial Performance (as defined in GC1.1.4 of R2810D) within the last fifteen (15) years; and
- that, as of Bid Close, the construction of the other two (2) projects described were at least fifty percent (50%) completed within the last fifteen (15) years.

For clarity, projects completed or that reached Substantial Performance more than fifteen (15) years ago shall not meet the foregoing criteria and shall not be evaluated or rated.

A copy of GC 1.1.4 of R2810D can found at the following link:

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R/R2810D/16#substantial-performance>

In the event that the Proponent describes more than three (3) projects, only the first three (3) projects listed, in sequence, will be evaluated and rated (with any other submitted projects not being evaluated or rated by Canada and being deemed not received by Canada).

The foregoing projects description should clearly demonstrate that the Proponent has experience in the following areas:

- a) heritage conservation, including without limitation, rehabilitation, adaptive re-use, additions and material conservation work for masonry, metals and plaster;

- b) abatement of hazardous materials and selective demolition;
- c) seismic upgrade of a heritage building;
- d) external stakeholder involvement;
- e) replacement of base building systems;
- f) working under a construction management project delivery approach;
- g) sustainable design;
- h) life cycle costing; and
- i) value engineering.

In addition, the Proponents should provide the following information for the projects described:

- name of the projects;
- location of the projects;
- at the date of Bid Close, the percent completed or, if completed, the date of completion of the projects;
- if applicable, identify those projects which were carried out in joint venture, partnership or otherwise with a third party or parties and the describe responsibilities of each of the involved entities;
- clearly indicate how the projects are comparable to the project detailed in the project brief;
- brief project description (including, without limitation, description of design philosophy and approach and the manner that the philosophy and approach was appropriate for the projects intent, addressed design challenges and effected resolutions);
- brief description of budget control and management methodology (including without limitation, the contract price, the final (or Substantial Performance) construction cost and, if applicable, an explanation of any variation);
- brief description of project schedule control and management methodology (including without limitation, the initial schedule, any revised schedule(s) and, if applicable, an explanation of any variation);
- names of key personnel responsible for project delivery;
- demonstrates that the Proponent was an active participant (as a professional Architect) in the submitted projects and has the related direct knowledge and experience on all submitted projects; and
- awards received.

The Proponent should possess the knowledge and experience on the above projects. Past project experience from entities other than the Proponent shall not be considered in the evaluation.

3.2.2 Achievements of Key Sub-consultants and Specialists on Projects

The Proponent shall describe the key sub-consultants` and specialists` (as identified in section 3.1.2) accomplishments, achievements, knowledge and experience either as a prime consultant or a sub-consultant on two (2) projects per key sub-consultant and specialist that are comparable in terms of scope, scale and complexity of work, to the project described in the Project Brief PD5 Program of Work, PD2 Project Description, and PD4 Project Objectives of this RFP. If the Proponent is providing the services of any or all of the key sub-consultants or specialists, the Proponent shall provide all the information for such key sub-consultants and specialists in this subsection based on the Proponent being deemed to be such key sub-consultant or specialist, as the case may be. With respect to projects described for each key sub-consultant and specialist, the Proponent shall provide evidence:

- that at least one (1) of the projects was completed or at least reached Substantial Performance (as defined in GC1.1.4 of R2810D) within the last fifteen (15) years; and
- that, as of Bid Close, the construction of the other project described was at least fifty percent (50%) completed within the last fifteen (15) years.

For clarity, a project that was completed or that reached Substantial Performance more than fifteen (15) years ago shall not meet the foregoing criteria and shall not be evaluated or rated.

A copy of GC 1.1.4 of R2810D can found at the following link:

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R/R2810D/16#substantial-performance>

In the event that the Proponent describes more than two (2) projects, only the first two (2) projects listed, in sequence per key sub-consultant or specialist , will be evaluated and rated (with any other submitted projects not being evaluated or rated by Canada and being deemed not received by Canada).

The foregoing projects description should clearly demonstrate that such key sub-consultants and specialists have experience in the following areas:

- a) heritage conservation;
- b) abatement of hazardous material and selective demolition;
- c) seismic upgrade of a heritage building;
- d) replacement of base building systems;
- e) working under a construction management project delivery approach;
- f) sustainable design;
- g) life cycle costing; and
- h) value engineering.

In addition, the Proponent should provide the following information for the projects described:

- name of the projects;
- location of the projects;
- at the date of Bid Close, the percent completed or, if completed, the date of completion of the projects;
- clearly indicate how the projects are comparable to the project detailed in the project brief;
- brief project description (including, without limitation, description of design philosophy and approach and the manner that the philosophy and approach was appropriate for the projects intent, addressed design challenges and effected resolutions);
- brief description of budget control and management methodology (including without limitation, the contract price, the final (or Substantial Performance) construction cost and, if applicable, an explanation of any variation);
- brief description of project schedule control and management methodology (including without limitation, the initial schedule, any revised schedule(s) and, if applicable, an explanation of any variation);
- names of key personnel responsible for project delivery;
- demonstrates that the key sub-consultants and specialists were an active participant (in the requisite professional capacity) in the submitted projects and have the related direct knowledge and experience on all submitted projects; and
- awards received.

The Proponent should demonstrate that the key sub-consultants and specialists possess the knowledge and experience on the above projects. Past project experience from entities other than the key sub-consultants and specialists shall not be considered in the evaluation.

3.2.3 Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects

The Proponent shall describe the expertise, performance, achievements and experience of key personnel to be assigned to this project (regardless of their past association with the Proponent) that demonstrates such key personnel's' (in the requisite professional capacity) ability to effectively work on this project. This is the opportunity to emphasize the strengths of the individuals on the team, to recognize their past responsibilities, commitments and achievements. All key personnel identified should have at least 10 years' experience in their field of expertise. If multiple functions are proposed to be performed by one key personnel, it should be identified here.

The foregoing description of the key personnel should include the following information:

- a) the name of the key personnel and their title;
- b) the current employer of the key personnel;

- c) all related professional accreditation, including the jurisdiction of accreditation, status of accreditation and the year originally accredited;
- d) a description of expertise and experience (with number of years) relevant to this project;
- e) a description of the roles, responsibilities and degree of involvement of the key personnel on past projects that will corroborate the person's experience and expertise; and
- f) special accomplishments / achievements / awards.

3.3 EVALUATION AND RATING

Past experience of the Proponent and the consultant team will be evaluated at the Phase One submission stage and the scores for this evaluation will be carried over to the Phase Two submission.

Phase One proposals which are responsive will be reviewed, evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Board in accordance with the following:

Criterion	Weight Factor	Rating	Weighted Rating
3.2.1 Achievements of Proponent on Projects	4.0	0 - 10	0 - 40
3.2.2 Achievements of Key Sub-consultants / Specialists on projects	4.0	0 - 10	0 - 40
3.2.3 Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
Phase One Rating	10.0		0 - 100

The Phase One rating which is assigned to each responsive Proposal in accordance with the procedure outlined in the General Instructions to Proponents is the total weighted rating assigned to the Phase One proposal in accordance with the above table. The Phase One rating is recorded for subsequent inclusion as a percentage of the total score to be established following the evaluation and rating of Phase Two proposals.

Generic Evaluation Table

PWGSC Evaluation Board members will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Proponent's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) using the generic evaluation table below:

	INADEQUATE	WEAK	ADEQUATE	FULLY SATISFACTORY	STRONG
0 point	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements.	Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understanding in some areas of the requirements.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements.
	Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be corrected	No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses
	Proponent do not possess qualifications and experience	Proponent lacks qualifications and experience	Proponent has an acceptable level of qualifications and experience	Proponent is qualified and experienced	Proponent is highly qualified and experienced
	Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements	Team does not cover all components or overall experience is weak	Team covers most components and will likely meet requirements	Team covers all components - some members have worked successfully together	Strong team - has worked successfully together on comparable projects
	Sample projects not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Leads in sample projects directly related to this requirement

	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, should ensure adequate results	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results
--	---	--	---	--	---

SRE 4 PHASE TWO SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

Intent: The intent of Phase Two evaluation activity is to verify that the submissions meet the mandatory screening requirements, to evaluate and rate the proposals and to recommend contract award to the Proponent with the highest total score.

4.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

Only those submissions from Proponents that have met the following requirements will be evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Board:

- having submitted a responsive Phase One proposal; and
- having carried over the consultant’s team identified in Phase One to Phase Two.

4.2 RATED REQUIREMENTS

Intent: The evaluation criteria for the Phase Two proposal addresses the Consultant Team’s “understanding of the project” i.e. technical, schedule and estimate requirements, “scope of services” “management of services” and “design philosophy/approach” based on the requirements described in the Project Brief. Past achievements and experience of the Proponent and Key Sub-Consultants are evaluated in Phase One and will not be re-evaluated in Phase Two. The Phase Two Proposal gives the Proponents the opportunity to describe what they intend to offer PWGSC in terms of their understanding of the project, scope of services and management of the project.

The following requirements will be evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Board. The price proposal of each Proponent may or may not be opened.

4.2.1 Understanding of the Project:

The Proponent should demonstrate a clear understanding of the project objectives, the functional/technical requirements, the constraints and the issues that may affect the design, delivery and implementation of the project. This demonstration should include an understanding of:

- a) the project's functional and technical requirements including the interrelation of complementary and / or co-dependent project components;

- b) the project objectives as they relate to heritage conservation, sustainable development and site sensitivities;
- c) the project significant issues, challenges and constraints;
- d) the project implementation strategy, as contained in the project brief PD 2 Project Description, section 2.6 Implementation Strategy;
- e) the project schedule and cost and provide a high-level risk management strategy for both schedule and cost;
- f) the project integration strategy, including a description of the proposed integration of the PWGSC separately contracted consultant team(s) and the construction management team(s);
- g) the involvement and management approach of the project stakeholders; and
- h) the application of life cycle costing and value engineering to this project.

4.2.2 Design Philosophy / Approach / Methodology

The Proponent should describe the aspects of the project that are likely to be the major challenge(s) and the manner in which the Proponent's proposed design philosophy, approach and methodology will effectively address such challenge(s). This is the opportunity for the Proponent to state the overall design philosophy of the team as well as their approach to resolving design issues and in particular to focus on the unique aspects of the current project.

This description should include:

- a) the Proponent's architectural vision specific to this project;
- b) the Proponent's design philosophy, approach and methodology;
- c) a narrative of the likely major challenge(s) and the manner in which the Proponent's team will address such challenge(s); and
- d) a description of a heritage conservation approach which includes an understanding of the significance of the West Memorial Building heritage value.

4.2.3 Scope of Services:

The Proponent should demonstrate an understanding of the full scope of service for this project. This demonstration should include:

- a) a description of the Proponent's understanding of the full scope of services and deliverables required for this project;
- b) a description of the Proponent's approach to quality assurance and control;
- c) a proposed project schedule indicating major milestones (including without limitation, tender and construction milestones) using a construction management approach;

- d) a proposed risk management strategy (including without limitation, risk techniques applied to project budget and schedule);
- e) a proposed project cost control methodology, including without limitation, an explanation of how cost control will be applied to maintain the project budget;
- f) a description of a program for the Resident Site Services during Construction; and
- g) a description of the Proponent's capability to perform the services and meet project challenges.

4.2.4 Management of Services:

The Proponent should describe how they propose to manage the services described in the Project Brief, as an efficient and effective manager.

This description should include:

- a) the Proponent's internal processes and methodologies to ensure that all project services are delivered on time, on budget, on scope and at the highest level of quality;
- b) the manner that the Proponent proposes to perform the services and meet the project constraints;
- c) the manner that the services will be managed to ensure continuing and consistent control, as well as production and communication efficiency;
- d) the manner that the team will be organized and how the team will fit in the existing structure of the Proponent;
- e) a description of how the team will be managed;
- f) a description of the full project team including the names of the consultant's, sub-consultants and specialists' personnel and their role on the project;
- g) an organization chart, with position titles and names (consultant team), what back-up will be committed and reporting relationships.
- h) if applicable, joint venture and partnership business plans, team structures and responsibilities;
- i) the profiles of the key positions (specific assignments and responsibilities) including principal resident site representative;
- j) an outline of an action plan of the project services with implementation strategies and sequence of main activities;
- k) a work plan for the project that provides a detailed breakdown of work tasks and deliverables, including without limitation, all required reviews and approvals and clear assignment of responsibilities for activities and deliverables to project team personnel with an estimation of levels of effort;
- l) the Proponent's proposed communication strategies, including lines of communication and reporting structure within the Proponent team and with PWGSC and Construction Manager; and
- m) the Proponent's proposed project response times, including a demonstration as to how the Proponent will meet the required response times outlined in PA 1.12.

4.3 EVALUATION AND RATING

4.3.1 Technical Rating

Phase Two proposals that are responsive (i.e. which meet all the mandatory requirements set out in the RFP) will be reviewed, evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Board. In the first instance, price envelopes will remain sealed and only the technical components of the Phase Two proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the following to establish Technical Ratings:

Criterion	Weight Factor	Rating	Weighted Rating
4.2.1 Understanding of the Project	2.5	0 - 10	0 - 25
4.2.2 Design Philosophy/Approach/Methodology	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
4.2.3 Scope of Services	2.5	0 - 10	0 - 25
4.2.4 Management of Services	3.5	0 - 10	0 - 35
Phase Two Technical Rating	10.0		0 - 100

Generic Evaluation Table

PWGSC Evaluation Board members will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Proponent's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) using the generic evaluation table found in the above section 3.3 Evaluation and Rating.

4.3.2 Combined Technical Rating

The Phase One Rating and Phase Two Technical Rating will be combined to establish a Combined Technical Score:

Combined Rating	Possible Range	% of Total Score	Score (Points)
Phase One Rating	0 - 100	30	0 - 30
Phase Two Technical Rating	0 - 100	60	0 - 60
Combined Technical Score		90	0 - 90

To be considered further, Proponents **must** achieve a minimum Combined Technical Score of fifty-four (54) points out of the ninety (90) points available as specified above.

No further consideration will be given to Proponents not achieving the pass mark of fifty-four (54) points.

END OF ITEM 002