



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 2017-10-02
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EQ447-180276	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
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 2017-10-16	
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. 06 IS RAISED TO EXTEND THE BIDDING PERIOD AND ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM THE INDUSTRY.

1. **The bid closing date is extended to 14:00, October 16, 2017.**
2. **NOTE TO ALL OFFERORS:** All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority no later than ten (10) calendar days before the Request for Standing Offers (RFSO) closing date. The deadline for submitting any enquiry is 14:00, October 6, 2017. Enquiries received after that time will not be answered.

Modification # 06

<u>Reference:</u>		
RFSO – Header		
<u>Modification #06:</u>		
The Header of the RFSO document from Page 56 and onwards is revised to the following:		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ447-180276/A	Amd. No. - N° de la modif.	Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur TOR018
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client	File No. - N° du dossier	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Modification # 07

<u>Reference:</u>		
Question and Answer # 60		
<u>Modification #07:</u>		
The answer to Question # 60 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:		
Please refer to Section 6.1 in Part 6. Designated organization screening (DOS) is required for your organization to access contract opportunities at the protected level. As indicated in 7.2.2 1) of Part 7, the Offeror must hold a valid organization security clearance by the time of issuance of call-up against standing offer. However, the Offerors are recommended to demonstrate compliance with this requirement in their proposal.		
Before issuance of the Call-up against Standing Offer, as indicated in 7.2.2 of Part 7, The Contractor/Offeror personnel requiring access to sensitive work site(s) must EACH hold a valid RELIABILITY STATUS, granted or approved by CISD/PWGSC.		

Modification # 08

Reference:

Stream 1 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – Resource Experience – Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role – Grey Section

Modification #08:

In Resource Experience, under Resource Responsibilities in the Proposed Role, the following 3 additional key elements are added under Senior Environmental Assessment Specialist resource category:

- Communication with regulators,
- Communication with stakeholders, and
- Development of management plans

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question # 65

Reference:

Stream 3 – Annex A

Question #65:

The services of CADD/GIS technologists are typically required to meet the reporting requirements described in Annex A. The resource category descriptions for technologist and senior technologist do not refer to CADD/GIS roles. Is it possible for the resource category descriptions to be revised to include CADD/GIS services? Under what resource category are offerors expected to list these resources?

Answer #65:

These resources should be listed under the Senior Technologist and Technologist resource categories – See Annex A, Appendix 3.

Question # 66

Reference:

Stream 3 – Point-Rated Technical Criteria- R4-Capacity Management

Question #66:

How are offerors to demonstrate capability, capacity and expertise of the proposed project resources? Is it sufficient to only identify the number of resources in the various positions to satisfy the scoring scheme, or does additional information need to be provided, such as a summary list of identified individuals, including name, position, years of experience, education background, etc.? If additional information is to be provided, what level of detail is required to demonstrate “capability, capacity and

expertise to provide the full range of required services and deliverables listed in the Required Services”?

Answer #66:

The Offeror should provide names of resources, years of relevant experience, credential and education to demonstrate the capability, capacity and expertise to provide the full range of required services and deliverables listed in the Required Services (see answer to question 56 b.).

Question #67

Reference:

Stream 3 - Point-Rated Technical Criteria- Capacity Management and Resource Experience

Question #67:

Resource Experience, indicates that “The offeror should include resumes for all resources...” Can you please clarify that resumes are only required for the key positions in mandatory requirement M4 (so 8 resumes total) or are resumes to be provided for all resources listed under requirement R4-Capacity Management?

Answer #67:

For all streams, resumes are only required for resources proposed for key positions under Mandatory Technical Criteria. Resumes for additional resources identified under Point Rated Criteria-> Corporate Experience-> Capacity Management are not required. (see answer to Question 57)

Questions #68

Reference:

For Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – Corporate Experience - R2

Question #68:

Mandatory requirement M3 requires two project descriptions each for Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) and Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). The scoring scheme under Corporate Experience, R2 Project Value, R2c describes scores based on project value for “Human Health Risk Assessment / Ecological Risk Assessment” suggesting that they are considered together. Please clarify if this project value score is evaluated based on the individual or combined value of HHRA and ERA projects

Answer #68:

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. (See answer to Question 48)

Question #69

Reference:

RFSO

Question #69:

We respectfully request a three-week extension to the submission deadline.

Answer #69:

Canada has extending the end date of the submission to 14:00, October 16, 2017.

Question #70

Reference:

RFSO

Question #70:

The tender call and subsequent addenda note that Joint Ventures are acceptable. Do you require a copy of the formal joint venture agreement with the tender submission?

Answer #70:

1. Offerors who submit an offer as a joint venture must indicate clearly that it is a joint venture and provide the following information:
 - a. the name of each member of the joint venture;
 - b. the Procurement Business Number of each member of the joint venture;
 - c. the name of the representative of the joint venture, i.e. the member chosen by the other members to act on their behalf, if applicable;
 - d. the name of the joint venture, if applicable.
2. If the information is not clearly provided in the offer, the Offeror must provide the information on request from the Standing Offer Authority.
3. The offer and any resulting standing offer must be signed by all the members of the joint venture unless one member has been appointed to act on behalf of all members of the joint venture. The Standing Offer Authority may, at any time, require each member of the joint venture to confirm that the representative has been appointed with full authority to act as its representative for the purposes of the RFSO and any resulting standing offer. If a standing offer is issued to a joint venture, all members of the joint venture will be jointly and severally or solidarily liable for the performance of any contract resulting from a call-up against the standing offer.

Question #71

Reference:

Stream 1 – Mandatory Technical Criteria - M3

Question #71:

Can a single source be named for more than one position? For example, can the RISO contact also be the Senior project manager?

Answer #71:

No

Question #72

<u>Reference:</u> Joint Venture
<u>Question #72:</u> If bidding as a joint venture is it sufficient to provide confirmation of the proposed joint venture as part of the bid with commitment to implement on award?
<u>Answer #72:</u> No. Please see answer to Question 70.

Question #73

<u>Reference:</u> RFSO – Header
<u>Question #73:</u> Is solicitation number and other references that appear in the header of the document beginning on page 56 a typo?
<u>Answer #73:</u> Yes. It was a typo and please refer to Modification # 06.

Question #74

<u>Reference:</u> Stream 3 – Mandatory Technical Criteria – M4
<u>Question #74:</u> We have a sediment specialist who in November of 2017 will have 10 years of continuous, relevant practical project experience plus two years completing a PhD in sediment related studies. Will this satisfy the M4 criteria of 10 years of experience in the related field?
<u>Answer #74:</u> Years spent at schools to obtain a degree doesn't count as part of years of experience in the related field.

Question #75

<u>Reference:</u> Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R7 and R8
<u>Question #75:</u> Here is my question to address the apparent discrepancy between Amendment 004 (Answer #46) and the original Terms of Reference.

Is it a mandatory requirement that the submitted R8 representative project for a given Resource be one of the two representative projects submitted for that resource in R7 or can the R8 project be different than the submitted R7 projects for that Resource?

Answer #75:

The projects submitted under R8 (8 projects) should be selected from projects submitted under R7 (16 projects). For each resource category only 1 project will be evaluated for a total of 8 projects.

Question #76

Reference:

Stream 5

Question #76:

Can you please confirm this to be the case (i.e. an Ontario licensed firm can partner with an aboriginal based firm with extensive federal and first nations experience that is not based in Ontario and thus not licensed by either PEO or APGO)?

Answer #76:

Please refer to Stream 5. Note to Offerors: The Offeror must certify in its bid that it is an Aboriginal business or an eligible joint venture as defined within the Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business.

Question #77

Reference:

Stream 1 -

Question #77:

In stream 1, where the RFP refers to Strategic Environmental Assessments, is that referring specifically to Strategic Environmental Assessments pursuant to the Cabinet Directive on the Environmental Assessment of Policy, Plan and Program Proposals?

Answer #77:

Yes.

Question #78

Reference:

Stream 1 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – Resource Experience - R5 and R6

Question #78:

In stream 1, for the evaluation of Senior Environmental Assessment Specialist, it is understood from point-rated criterion R5 that one CEAA 2012 Environmental Assessment project and one Strategic Environmental Assessment project must be described for that resource. Point-rated criterion R6 states that one of those two projects must be identified to demonstrate Resource Responsibilities. The RFP states for R6 the maximum points per person (60) will be awarded for the identification and clear demonstration of 10 or more elements as indicated in section 2.2 of the table. For Senior Environmental Assessment Specialist, there are only 10 elements, and at least two of those elements

(i.e., CEAA 2012 EA and Strategic EA) are not typically completed as one project. Will PSPC consider using both projects for evaluation of the Senior Environmental Assessment Specialist?

Answer #78:

Please see Modification # 08.

Question #79

Reference:

Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria - R7 and R8

Question #79:

For R7 and R8 project evaluations, are projects for Canadian Federal Government Organizations scored higher than for non-federal clients?

Answer #79:

No.

Question #80

Reference:

Stream 3

Question #80:

Will PWGSC accepted a Resource's accreditation from another jurisdiction where the Resource is in the process of receiving accreditation in Ontario, and that in consideration of them having full accreditation in another jurisdiction the application is considered administrative only by the Ontario licensing body? PWGSC has accepted this allowance in previous Stream 3 RISO competitions. Such a request is also consistent with the Agreement on Internal Trade.

Answer #80:

Canada will only accept accreditations specified in the RFSO.

Question #81

Reference:

Stream 3 – Point Rated Technical Criteria – R6

Question #81:

Stream 3, R6 says “accreditations considered acceptable include...” and a list is provided. We read this to mean that there are other relevant accreditations which could be considered acceptable. Our Senior Risk Assessor is a qualified professional (QP) in Ontario for Risk Assessment and is an Ontario Professional Agrologist (P.Ag.). Please confirm that this is considered acceptable accreditation for R6.

Answer #81:

Only the accreditations provided in the list are considered acceptable. P.Ag. is not considered an acceptable accreditation for R6.

Question #82

Reference:

RFSO - Stream 3

Question #82:

Regarding the requirement for Environmental Impairment Liability (EIL) Insurance (reference section 7.8.2), we believe this should be Contractors Pollution Liability (CPL) Insurance which covers pollution caused by or exacerbated by the Contractor.

There is also a reference in this section to Contractors Professional Liability Insurance but that is also a standalone policy separate and distinct from EIL or CPL and is sometimes referred to as errors and omissions insurance which addresses professional liability such as in a design, study or evaluation. Can PWGSC please clarify what its actual insurance requirements are?

Answer #82:

Canada included the Type 4: "Contractors Professional Liability" in this Environmental Impairment Liability Insurance. Please refer to the SACC Manual clause G2040C in the following link:

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/G/G2040C/2>

Question #83

Reference:

Stream 5 – Appendix 5 to Annex A

Question #83:

Can Public Works provide an idea of the distribution of work expected for the Aboriginal Set-Aside, either by treaty, by tribal council or other geographic reference?

Answer #83:

For the distribution of work, 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. The distribution of work will not be based on treaty, tribal council or other geographic reference.

Question #84

Reference:

Stream 3 - Mandatory Technical Criteria - M4

Question #84:

"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 (PSF) that **has been accepted** by the MOECC. The version of the requested PSF was issued in 2016/2017. Considering that the MOECC's Risk Assessment review timeline is typically months/years, compliance with this requirement is challenging. As an alternative, would PWGSC consider acceptance of the previous (2011) version of the PSF which was in use from 2011 to 2016? If so, Sections 7 and 9 of the 2011 PSF provide the

equivalent information requested in the current solicitation (i.e., Risk Assessment Team (including sub-consultants) and Business Contact Information (Qualified Person conducting the Risk Assessment).”

Answer #84:

See the Response to Question #09 from Amendment #3 (a letter or email from the MOECC confirming that the Senior Risk Assessor is in fact a QPRA will be sufficient to meet this Mandatory Criteria).

Question #85

Reference:

RFSO

Question #85:

We are planning to form a joint venture with another firm for the purpose of responding to the above-referenced standing offer. The other firm is in the process of obtaining Designated Organization Screening (DOS). In order to provide adequate time for the DOS to come through, we request that a minimum three-week extension be provided for submission of proposals in response to this solicitation.

Answer #85:

Please refer to Modification #07.

Question #86

Reference:

RFSO

Question #86:

Would PWGSC consider making DOS clearance a requirement before issuance of a Call-up against the Standing Offer requiring access to sensitive work site?

Answer #86:

Please refer to Modification # 07.

Question #87

Reference:

Stream 3

Question #87:

With respect to the requirements provided in the Request for Standing Offer, for Stream 3 it states that the Senior Risk Assessor – Human Health Toxicologist must submit two projects from the following project categories:

- Human Health Risk Assessment **as per FCSAP Framework**; and
- Human Health Risk Assessment as per other jurisdictions

(No. R7, Point Rated Criteria e) under Project Experience)

As Federal Human Health Risk Assessments are generally conducted to meet federal risk assessment protocols developed by Health Canada, can you please clarify the meaning of a “Human Health Risk Assessment as per FCSAP Framework”?

Answer #87:

The April 2016 “Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan Decision-Making Framework” references guidance from the FCSAP program, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME), Health Canada (HC) and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) for conducting Risk Assessments (both Ecological and Human Health). All of the appropriate guidance (as per the FCSAP Framework) should be referenced as part of completing Federal Human Health Risk Assessments.

Question #88

Reference:

All Streams – Point Rated Technical Criteria – Resource Experience – Project Experience

Question #88:

Reference Stream 3, R7. Do the 16 projects provided have to be within a certain time period to show the resource capability? It is understood that the projects from M3 have to be within the last 10 years, however, since this is not stated for the projects in R7, we understand there is no time limit. Please confirm.

Answer #88:

For all streams, all projects submitted under Project Experience should be completed within the last 10 years.

Question #89

Reference:

Stream 1 – Point Rated Technical Criteria

Question #89:

In stream 1, for the evaluation of Senior Environmental Assessment Specialist, point-rated criterion R5 requires that one CEAA 2012 Environmental Assessment project must be described for that resource. Will PSPC accept as a similar project an assessment of the environmental effects of a project on federal land pursuant to sections 66 and 67 of CEAA 2012, or to be awarded full points is it required that the similar project is an environmental assessment of a designated project as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Act?

Answer #89:

We will accept Environmental Assessments completed under Section 66 and 67 of CEAA 2012.

Question #90

Reference:

RFSO

Question #90:

Based on the definition of the joint-venture and the answers to Questions 60 & 61 contained in Addendum number 5 can PWGSC confirm that we can form a joint venture bid with a firm who does not presently have a Designated Organization Screening (DOS) provided that:

- The joint Venture clearly indicates that our firm has been appointed to act on behalf of all members of the joint venture
- Our firm currently has a DOS
- The firm we are joint venturing with commits to obtain a DOS and have it in place upon Contract award

Answer #90:

Please refer to Modification #07. All parties involved in the Joint-Venture must obtain the DOS before issuance of Call-up against Standing Offer.

Question #91

Reference:

RFSO

Question #91:

Are there educational requirements or accreditations or affiliations that would determine whether a staff member can be characterized as a professional vs a technologist?

Answer #91:

Please refer to Annex A, Statement of Work for the description of roles and responsibilities for different resource categories.

Question #92

Reference:

RFSO

Question #92:

Can you confirm the address that we should deliver the proposal to? Is it 4900 Yonge St or 33 city centre drive?

Answer #92:

Please return bids to : Bid Receiving, PWGSC, 33 City Centre Drive, Suite 480C, Mississauga, Ontario, L5B 2N5

Question #93

Reference:

RFSO

Question #93:

With regards to the RFP listed above, should the quality/quantity be for potable water or does a wastewater project work as well?

Answer #93:

Please refer to Annex A, Statement of Work for the description of requirements.