



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 2017-09-19
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EQ447-180276	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
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	
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	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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. 04 IS RAISED TO MODIFY THE BID SOLICITATION AND ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM THE INDUSTRY.

Modification # 04

Reference:

RFSO – Part 7 Standing Offer and Resulting Contract Clauses

Modification #04:

1. The section 7.3.1 General Conditions in Part 7 – Standing Offer and Resulting Contract Clauses is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with:

2005 (2017-06-21) General Conditions - Standing Offers - Goods or Services, apply to and form part of the Standing Offer.

2. The sub-section c) of section 7.11 Priority of Documents in Part 7 – Standing Offer and Resulting Contract Clauses is hereby deleted and replaced with:

c) the general conditions 2005 (2017-06-21), General Conditions - Standing Offers - Goods or Services

Modification # 05

Reference:

RFSO – Steam 5 – Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria – Grey Areas under “Corporate Experience” and “Resource Experience”

Modification #05:

In grey section under “Corporate Experience”, under Project Scope and Description, the first sentence is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Clearly describe the project scope and its similarity to the scope and tasks of required services related to the specified category described in Appendix 5 to Annex A, Statement of Work.

In grey section, “Resource Experience”, under Project Scope and Description, the first sentence is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Clearly describe the project scope and its similarity to the scope and tasks of required services related to the specified category described in Appendix 5 to Annex A, Statement of Work.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question # 15

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #15:

Is there an overall limit on the size of the submission?

Answer #15:

Please see answer to Questions 14, Amendment#3.

Question # 16

Reference:

RFSO - All Streams

Question #16:

Is there a required font type and size to be used?

Answer #06:

There is no required font type or size to be used.

Question # 17

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #17:

Do all documents have to be submitted on 8.5" x 11" paper?

Answer #17:

We recommend the bidder to use the paper size described in the RFSO, however, for the convenience of the submission, the different size of paper will be accepted.

Question # 18

Reference:

RFSO - Stream 3

Question #18:

Other than the table to list project resource experience to satisfy rated requirement R8, are there any specific technical formats to be followed?

Answer #18:

There are no other specific technical formats.

Question # 19

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #19:

Are there any restrictions on project example format other than the 1500 word limit (i.e. no restriction on number or size of pages)?

Answer #19:

No.

Question # 20

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3

Question #20:

How will the \$15M be allocated to the five winning bidders (i.e. evenly or on a sliding scale for firms ranked 1 thru 5)?

Answer #20:

Please refer to Section 7.8 Call up Procedures in Part 7 A: Standing Offer and Attachment 1 to Part 7 – Call- Up Allocation and Rating Process.

Question # 21

Reference:

RFSO – Mandatory Technical Criteria – M1 to M6 - Stream 3

Question #21:

Please advise on the format required to meet mandatory requirements M1-M6 (i.e. page limit, format, structure etc.)

Answer #21:

No specific format is required.

Question # 22

Reference:

RFSO – Streams 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria - M2

Question #22:

Can we provide a written summary of our corporate experience? If yes is there a restriction on size (i.e. page limit) or specified format to provide this information? Are we to list all projects completed in the past 10 years (i.e. federal and non-federal) in each of the 4 categories requested?

Answer #22:

Yes. There is no restrictions on size or format. Bidder are requested to demonstrate compliance with the requirement listed in the Mandatory criteria. It is at your sole discretion to provide the sufficient info.

Question # 23

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Mandatory Technical Criteria – M2 and M3

Question #23:

We are assuming that we need to cross reference the 12 projects example provided while documenting our corporate experience to satisfy this mandatory requirement. Is this correct?

Answer #23:

Please refer to requirements included in M2 and M3.

Question # 24

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria - M4 and Point Rated Criteria -R4

Question #24:

Is there any distinction between the 8 mandatory senior resources requested here (one per key position) vs the 16 senior professionals requested in rated requirement R4 (i.e. can 2 page resumes using same format be submitted for both)? Are these resources resumes to be presented separately from the overall project team identified in R4?

Answer #24:

Please Refer to requirements included in M4 and R4. Resumes for additional resources under R4 submission are not required.

Question # 25

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Mandatory Technical Criteria – M5

Question #25:

M5a: Can the organization chart be presented on 11"x17" paper? This would be helpful to present the 62 total resources requested in rated requirement R4 plus cross-reference their roles and responsibilities

Answer #25:

Yes. The proposed size of paper is acceptable.

Question # 26

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria – M5

Question #26:

M5b: Are we free to present this information in a format of our choosing? Is there a restriction or limit (i.e. x pages, or y total words) to be adhered to?

Answer #26:

There is no restrictions on size or format.

Question # 27

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria – M6

Question #27:

M6: Are we free to present our project management methodology in a format we chose? Is there a restriction or limit on either the number of pages or total words that can be used?

Answer #27:

There is no restrictions on size or format.

Question # 28

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Point-Rated Criteria – R2

Question #28:

Why are more points awarded for spending more money for Phase I & II ESAs? If the intent is to demonstrate ability to do Phase I & II ESAs on multi property portfolios than please indicate same, otherwise would it not be better to identify ability to do Phase I and II ESA in a timely, cost effective manner?

Answer #28:

Complex projects with higher values receive more points.

Question # 29

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R3

Question #29:

Please advise the rationale for selection of sediment assessment as one of the 3 projects highlighted for detailed project management review? Can an alternate project (i.e. Phase I or II ESA) be used instead – particularly since they will account for 1/3 of the example projects provided OR the same amount as HHERAs)?

Answer #29:

Sediment Assessment projects are one of the major project categories in the Stream 3.

Question # 30

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R4

Question #30:

Are there any restrictions on the 16 senior professionals? Can we have 3 or more for a given category (i.e. risk assessor) OR is intent to provide a backup for each of the 8 mandatory resources specific in M4?

Answer #30:

The offeror is requested to 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. There is no specific required number of resources for each category.

Question # 31

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R4

Question #31:

Why are resumes required for all of the staff requested when the Capacity management and resource experience appear to be weighed based on the 8 mandatory senior resources (RISO to Senior Remedial Engineer)? If the resumes for intermediate professionals, junior professions, senior technologists and technologists are not included in the rated requirement scoring would it not be suitable to provide a short table outlining these staff and cross-reference their roles in the 12 example projects provided or use our Org Chart to demonstrate the capacity of resources requested and meet this requirement?

Answer #31:

Please refer to R4. Resumes for additional resources are not required.

Question # 32

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R7

Question #32:

Is the project experience for the 8 senior resources listed to be rated based on project examples identified or the resumes provided or both? Will the information provided in our proposal responding to mandatory requirement M4 be considered?

Answer #32:

All information included in the proposal will be considered during the evaluation. Information provided should be clearly referenced in the proposal.

Question # 33

Reference:

RFSo – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R8

Question #33:

R8: Please confirm that the 480 points available references a maximum of 60 points for each of the 8 mandatory senior resources (RISO to Remedial engineer) and the roles they play in example projects.

Answer #33:

A maximum of 60 points is available for each project submitted for each resource category.

Question # 34

Reference:

RFSo – All Streams

Question #34:

Can the deadline for this submittal be extended (October 10th is the Tuesday after Thanksgiving)?

Answer #34:

Canada does not contemplate any extension at this point.

Question # 35

Reference:

RFSo – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R7

Question #35:

It is our understanding that the roles RISO Contact, Senior Project Manager and Senior Consultant – Environmental Site Assessment must submit two projects from two different categories listed for their role, however, the Senior Hydrogeologist, Senior Risk Assessor – Human Health, Senior Risk Assessor Terrestrial or Wildlife, Senior Sediment Assessment, and Senior Environmental Engineer - Remediation Design can provide two projects from the same category provided for each individual role. Is that correct or must all personnel submit projects from two different categories?

Answer #35:

Yes, it is correct.

Question # 36

Reference:

RFSo – All Streams

Question #36:

In all streams - For the Resource Project Experience examples for the RISO Contact only, is it permitted to use a supply arrangement such as a standing offer as a project in order to highlight the RISO's experience in this role?

Answer #36:

Identifying positions on standing Offers or supply arrangements in and of itself will not be considered as an example of a project.

Question # 37

Reference:

RFSO – Streams 2 and 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria

Question #37:

In regards to Stream 2 Section R4 and Stream 3, Section R3 of the Technical Evaluation Criteria Capacity Management it states "The Offeror is to identify the number of resources, in the following positions, in order to demonstrate the capacity of the firm to deliver the required services:....", are submissions required to include CV's for all resources identified in this section?

Answer #37:

CVs for additional resources are not required.

Question # 38

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria – M4, Point Rated Technical Criteria R7 and R8

Question #38:

Section M3. The RFP requests that the Offeror must provide a resume for each proposed individual resource. It further states that the resume must include: a) Resource Role, b) Name of proposed Resource, c) All post-secondary educational institutions, dates attended and credentials obtained, and d) Work history with employer's names, dates employed, job title and responsibility. We note that there is no request to include example projects showing relevant experience for the individual over time, which is typically what is provided for federal government submissions. Please confirm that it is not required for the bidders resume's to include example projects showing relevant experience in the proposed role for the individual over time.

Answer #38:

Proper reference should be Section M4 under Stream 3. See Sections R7 and R8 under "Resource Experience" for requirements.

Question # 39

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R8

Question #39:

Please elaborate on the level of detail required to describe the individual's job title and responsibilities, and whether example project details are required to support the stated responsibilities.

Answer #39:

See “Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role” under “Resource Experience section” for level of details required. Yes, project details are required to support the stated responsibilities.

Question # 40

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams

Question #40:

Should the CVs be included as an appendix or be placed in the body of the submission.

Answer #40:

CVs included as an appendix, or placed in the body of the submission, are acceptable as long as they are properly referenced to the rest of the submission.

Question # 41

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Mandatory Technical Criteria – M3 and Point Rated Technical Criteria- Corporate Experience

Question #41:

Corporate Experience: Are each of the 12 submitted projects to describe the Project Management elements listed in the gray shaded area under 4. Corporate Experience, or are the Project Management elements only to be included in those projects that are to be further assessed in R3?

Answer #41:

As per M3, the offeror must provide information on Project Management for all 12 projects. Also, the Offeror should demonstrate the applicable elements of project managements (as specified under Corporate Experience section, grey section) for all 12 projects.

Question # 42

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Mandatory Technical Criteria – M3 and Point Rated Technical Criteria - R3

Question #42:

Is the Offeror to resubmit three of the M3 Corporate Experience projects (as described in the gray shaded area under 4. Corporate Experience) in a different form to highlight the 12 Project Management elements described in R3 or are they to simply name the three M3 projects that are to be used in the R3 evaluation?

Answer #42:

The submitted 12 projects under M3 will be further evaluated in the point rated evaluation criteria under Corporate Experience section. Re-submission of the same projects is not required. Clear references to submitted projects under M3 for evaluation under R3 is required.

Question # 43

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – R4

Question #43:

Can PWGSC identify if any further information is required to address this submission requirement beyond the numbers of resources in each resource category? For instance, are resumes required for each identified resource (in addition to the key positions in M4). What format would PWGSC like to see?

Answer #43:

Resume for the additional staff (in addition to the key positions in M4) are not required. There is no specified requirement for format.

Question # 44

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – R4

Question #44:

Can PWGSC provide their definition of “professional” versus “technologist” for the purposes of the R4 evaluation?

Answer #44:

Please refer to Annex A, Statement of Work for more details about definition of “professional” versus “technologist”.

Question # 45

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – Resource Experience (R5 to R8)

Question #45:

Resource Experience (p 93 of pdf) - In section 2.1, it appears that this is specific to the 8 key positions, or are resumes required for all resources on the project team? Can PWGSC clarify that all requirements in the Resource Experience section pertain only to the 8 key positions identified in M4.

Answer #45:

Resumes are required only for key positions specified in M4. Only 8 key positions are evaluated under Resource Experience section (R5 to R8).

Question # 46

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – R1 to R8

Question #46:

R8. Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role. Can PWGSC clarify what is being asked in this section? It appears that PWGSC is requesting 8 project descriptions in addition to those provided under Corporate Experience (R1-R4). Are you requesting an additional project description that each of the key position candidates was involved in performing in their respective area of expertise? How are the projects requested in R8 different than the projects requested in R7? Can the R8 projects be the same as the R7 projects? Can the R8 projects be the same as the Corporate Experience projects (R1-R4)?

Answer #46:

The projects submitted under R1 to R3 are evaluated for Corporate Experience. The projects submitted under R7 and R8 are evaluate for the Resource Experience. Under Resource Experience section, the Offeror should submit 16 projects (2 projects for each key position). All 16 projects will be evaluated under R7. From submitted 16 projects, the Offerors are requested to identify eight (8) projects for evaluation. For each resource category only 1 project will be evaluated for a total of 8 projects under R8. These projects can be the same as the Corporate Experience projects but need to include requirements under Resource Experience as well.

Question # 47

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – Corporate Experience

Question #47:

For Stream 3, Corporate Projects, do ERAs include both terrestrial and aquatic ERAs as outlined in the statement of work?

Answer #47:

Yes.

Question # 48

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – R2

Question #48:

In Stream 3, R2, the RFP describes a requirement for the Project Value of Human Health Risk Assessment / Ecological Risk Assessment in one combined row (labelled row f). Could PWGSC clarify if the project value requirement is for these items combined? Could PWGSC clarify if project descriptions are required for these two items separately or together?

Answer #48:

If a project included both HHRA and ERA components, the total cost of the project for both items should be provided. If the project included only HHRA or ERA, the cost for the completed item should be only included. Project description should be for all risk assessment works completed under the project.

Question # 49

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams - Point Rated Technical Criteria - Corporate Experience

Question #49:

During the evaluation of Corporate Experience, will PSPC favour projects that have a geographic proximity to Ontario?

Answer #49:

No.

Question # 50

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams - Point Rated Technical Criteria - Corporate Experience (R1 to R3)

Question #50:

Does PSPC require project team information for the Corporate Experience projects? Will preference be given during evaluation for corporate experience projects that have been performed by the proposed team members for this RISO?

Answer #50:

No, Corporate Experience and Resource Experience are evaluated separately.

Question # 51

Reference:

RFSO – All Streams - Point Rated Technical Criteria – R1

Question #51:

Can PSPC provide a list of Crown Corporations that will be awarded full points?

Answer #51:

Please refer to the link below for the list of Federal Crown Corporations:

<https://tbs-sct.gc.ca/gov-gouv/rc-cr/links-liens-eng.asp>

Question # 52

Reference:

RFSO – Stream 3 - Point Rated Technical Criteria – R2

Question #52:

In complex projects, when site investigation is done in multiple phases, can the whole process of investigation be considered as a phase II?

Answer #52:

No. The total cost should include the cost of the commissioned work/contract for the specified category portion of the project. For example, if a project was completed for Phase I and II ESAs, and the project is submitted for the Phase II ESA category, only the cost for the Phase II ESA portion of the work will be considered as the Project Value. A Phase II ESA completed in multiple phases under multiple contracts is not considered as a single Phase II ESA project for the purpose of the evaluation under R2.