



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions
- TPSGC**

11 LaurierSt./ 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

Maintenance & Professional Consulting Services

Division (FK)

11 Laurier St./ 11, rue Laurier

3C2, Place du Portage, Phase III

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet School Project - Lake Winnipeg	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation A2123-170001/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client A2123-170001	Date 2017-10-04
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FK-302-73384	
File No. - N° de dossier fk302.A2123-170001	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-10-17	
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: Kraya, Jeahan	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fk302
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-5351 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

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

This amendment 002 is in two parts. Part 1 is raised to answer questions from the industry, and Part 2 is raised to make modifications to the RFP

Part 1

Q1. Under RT2 (Approach to Implementing the Project), the maximum points column notes 22, however each individual scoring component within RT2 totals 25. Please confirm the scoring total for this rated technical criteria section.

- A1. 1. The scoring for RT2 (Approach to Implementing the Project) totals 25 points.
2. This increases the overall achievable score under the Point Rated Technical Criterion (RT1 to RT 5) from 96 points to 99 points.
3. The new pass mark for technical evaluation is changed from 48 to 50 points.

Q2. Please differentiate between the terms Core and Non-core Contracted Resources noted in item 4.6.2 of Annex 2 on page 63.

A2. Delete 4.6.2 in its entirety and replace with:

4.6.2 *Technical Resources*

The Project Manager shall provide services related to, but not limited to, the following disciplines and shall propose relevant experience levels and names to satisfy the requirements.

- i. Civil Engineering;*
- ii. Architecture;*
- iii. Structural Engineering;*
- iv. Geotechnical Engineering;*
- v. Mechanical Engineering (Such as, Fire Suppression, Fire Protection Plumbing, Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and Integrated Automation);*
- vi. Electrical Engineering;*
- vii. Interior Design; and*
- viii. Cost Estimate Analysis.*

Q3. The Technical Resources in item 4.6.2 of Annex 2 on page 63 notes Cost Estimate Analysis as part of the disciplines required. It is our understanding that the Technical Resources are only involved in the scope of section 4.6 of Annex 2, which encompasses the review of Design-Build proposals and design documents. It is assumed the Cost Estimate Analysis is related to the evaluation of changes to the Design-Build contract during the design and construction phase. Please confirm or provide additional information on the anticipated scope for the Cost Estimate Analysis.

A3. The requirement for Cost Estimate Analysis is related to evaluation of changes of the Design-Build contract during the design and construction phase.

Q4. Item 3.3 of Annex 2 on page 51 notes that the Project Management bidder will be required to review a November 2016 feasibility report and undertake a new inspection. Please confirm that the new inspection is not anticipated to require input by the Technical Resources noted in item 4.6.2 of Annex 2.

A4. The requirement is to undertake a new inspection to confirm previous findings and recommendations and identify any new items that may have developed since the previous inspection. It is the responsibility of the bidders to ensure that they have the requisite expertise as part of their team to undertake a detailed inspection of the various components, such as but not limited to, structural components, mechanical components, electrical systems, etc.

Q5. Item 3.5 of Annex 2 on page 52 notes that Environmental Assessments are required with the preliminary work being part of the Project Management scope. Please clarify what is intended for preliminary work.

A5. The Environmental Review Process is outlined at:

<http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1396026888671/1396027117504>

The work mentioned in the RFP is for the successful bidder to complete, on behalf of INAC, a Project Description Form with the knowledge acquired through their sites visits, discussions with First Nation Communities, INAC personnel, and others relevant sources of information to complete the form in as much detail as possible.

INAC Environmental Officers will review the project information provided in the Project Description Form and make a determination whether Simple Environmental Review Report or a Detailed Environmental Review Report will be required.

Should it be determined that a Detailed Environmental Report will be required, the work will then form part of the Design-Build firm(s)' mandate.

Q6. Section 5.0 of Annex 2 on page 65 notes the schedule by fiscal year and by task/milestone/deliverable. Some timelines do not appear to align. For example, the completion date of item 4.3 'Build Contractor Evaluation and Selection' is 2017/18 Q2 (September 2017). Please clarify the project's tasks/milestones/deliverables noted in this section.

A6. Please find attached an updated table:

Project Tasks/Milestones/Deliverables		Estimated Completion Date per Fiscal Year
4.2	Project Initiation	Jan 2018
4.3	Design Build Contractor Evaluation and Selection	Sept 2018
4.4	Design and Construction Related Services	April 2019
4.7	Designated Substance Report	tbd
4.8	Enhanced Commissioning - Occupancy	Sept 2020
4.9	Completion Reporting – Substantial Completion	Dec 2021
4.10	Warranty Period and Inspection Services	2022

Part 2

1. At "SECTION 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION" subsection 4.1.3 Point Rated Technical Criteria

Delete in its entirety and replace with the following:

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points														
<p>RT1</p>	<p>Experience in managing and implementing projects</p> <p>The Bidder should provide two (2) projects that demonstrate their experience within <u>similar scope and complexity</u>. Projects should have taken place within the last 10 years prior to the RFP closing date.</p> <p>Only projects that are at least 50 percent complete (as of bid closing date) in terms of project duration will be evaluated.</p> <p>Each project will be evaluated as follow:</p> <p><u>1.1 Similar scope means:</u></p> <p>(Maximum 8 Points for each project)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1050 980 1335"> <tr> <td>a. Project was aimed at Aboriginal Communities:</td> <td>max 2 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Project had a component of “capacity building”:</td> <td>max 2 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Project included education facilities:</td> <td>max 2 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. Project involved working with and liaising with First Nations and Federal Government:</td> <td>max 2 pt</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1394 980 1675"> <tr> <td>Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td>2 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td>1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Description not provided or not relevant:</td> <td>0 points</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>1.2 Similar complexity means:</u></p> <p>(Maximum 12 Points for each project)</p>	a. Project was aimed at Aboriginal Communities:	max 2 pt	b. Project had a component of “capacity building”:	max 2 pt	c. Project included education facilities:	max 2 pt	d. Project involved working with and liaising with First Nations and Federal Government:	max 2 pt	Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	2 point	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point	Description not provided or not relevant:	0 points	<p>Where the project was carried out by a consortium or joint venture, the Bidder should clearly identify which member was responsible for management and implementation of the project.</p> <p>Only the experience of the member identified in the proposed methodology as responsible for overall management and implementation will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The experience of other members of the consortium or joint venture will not be considered.</p> <p>If more projects are included in the proposal, only the first two (in order of appearance) will be assessed.</p> <p>“Capacity building” is defined as the</p>	<p>40</p>
a. Project was aimed at Aboriginal Communities:	max 2 pt																
b. Project had a component of “capacity building”:	max 2 pt																
c. Project included education facilities:	max 2 pt																
d. Project involved working with and liaising with First Nations and Federal Government:	max 2 pt																
Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	2 point																
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point																
Description not provided or not relevant:	0 points																

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points						
	<p>a. At least 10 million construction cost. (0.5 point for every 10 million, max 3 point)</p> <p>b. A duration of at least 1 year. (1 point per complete year, max 3 point. Less than 12 months will receive zero points)</p> <p>c. Geographical Coverage (max 3 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • located over 201 km from the nearest service centre (3 points) • located between 50 and 200 km from the nearest service centre (1 point) • located within 50 km from the nearest service centre (0 points) <p><i>A service center is defined as the nearest to a community for which it can gain access to services such as suppliers, materials, federal services and pool of skilled labour.</i></p> <p>d. Locations with limited access year round, ie. With either rail, air or boat access to a service centre for only part of the year and how that factor was managed. (3 point).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1037 982 1312"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1037 849 1129">Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1037 982 1129">3 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1129 849 1222">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1129 982 1222">1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1222 849 1312">Description not provided or not relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1222 982 1312">0 points</td> </tr> </table>	Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 point	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point	Description not provided or not relevant:	0 points	<p>"process of developing and strengthening the skills, instincts, abilities, processes and resources that First Nation communities need to survive, adapt, and thrive in the fast-changing world."</p>	
Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 point								
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point								
Description not provided or not relevant:	0 points								
<p>RT2</p>	<p>Approach to implementing the project</p> <p>A demonstration that the Bidder understands the goals of the project, the functional/technical requirements, the constraints and the issues that will shape the end product, the selection of resources and the way the services are to be delivered should be provided.</p> <p>Information that should be supplied:</p> <p><u>2.1 Understanding of the mandate</u></p> <p>(Maximum 3 Points)</p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate how its description is relevant to the Project.</p>	<p>25</p>						

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points						
	<p>Description of the specific project goals and requirements which highlight those of particular significance to the project and the delivery of services. The description should include, but is not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the client's functional and technical requirements; ii) the client's philosophies and values; iii) the existing conditions; iv) implementation strategies; v) other significant issues (environment, heritage, cultural, socio economic); and vi) challenges and restraints. <p>This criterion will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1035 982 1314"> <tr> <td>Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td>3 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td>1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Description not provided or not relevant:</td> <td>0 points</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Approach to implementing the project</u></p> <p>The Bidder should demonstrate its understanding of the project by describing its approach to implementing the project in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Methodology • Capacity development approach • Communication strategy <p><u>2.2 Proposed Methodology</u> (Maximum 5 Points)</p>	Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 point	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point	Description not provided or not relevant:	0 points		
Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 point								
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point								
Description not provided or not relevant:	0 points								

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points																						
	<p>The Bidder should provide a narrative description of the proposed approach to implement the mandate. The proposed approach should clearly articulate the Bidder's understanding of the mandate and should address the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 541 982 932"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 541 849 617">a. Program/requirement analysis and definition process:</td> <td data-bbox="849 541 982 617">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 617 849 690">b. Quality control of the service in each phase of the project:</td> <td data-bbox="849 617 982 690">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 690 849 825">c. Construction stage services (including inspection, quality control, manuals, deficiency clean up, warranty inspections):</td> <td data-bbox="849 690 982 825">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 825 849 871">d. Cost planning and control process:</td> <td data-bbox="849 825 982 871">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 871 849 932">e. Scheduling methodology and time control process:</td> <td data-bbox="849 871 982 932">max 1 pt</td> </tr> </table> <p>For this element, the proposed approach/strategy will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1083 982 1377"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1083 849 1167">Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1083 982 1167">1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1167 849 1281">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1167 982 1281">0.5 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1281 849 1377">Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1281 982 1377">0 points</td> </tr> </table> <p>2.3 Capacity Development Approach (Maximum 9 Points)</p> <p>The Bidder should demonstrate how it is proposed to reach out to Aboriginal businesses and communities for the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1654 982 1831"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1654 849 1701">a. Maximize Aboriginal employment:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1654 982 1701">max 3 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1701 849 1774">b. Maximize training opportunities and skills career development:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1701 982 1774">max 3 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1774 849 1831">c. Maximize the use of Aboriginal firms where capacity exists and</td> <td data-bbox="849 1774 982 1831">max 3 pt</td> </tr> </table>	a. Program/requirement analysis and definition process:	max 1 pt	b. Quality control of the service in each phase of the project:	max 1 pt	c. Construction stage services (including inspection, quality control, manuals, deficiency clean up, warranty inspections):	max 1 pt	d. Cost planning and control process:	max 1 pt	e. Scheduling methodology and time control process:	max 1 pt	Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:	1 point	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:	0.5 point	Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:	0 points	a. Maximize Aboriginal employment:	max 3 pt	b. Maximize training opportunities and skills career development:	max 3 pt	c. Maximize the use of Aboriginal firms where capacity exists and	max 3 pt		
a. Program/requirement analysis and definition process:	max 1 pt																								
b. Quality control of the service in each phase of the project:	max 1 pt																								
c. Construction stage services (including inspection, quality control, manuals, deficiency clean up, warranty inspections):	max 1 pt																								
d. Cost planning and control process:	max 1 pt																								
e. Scheduling methodology and time control process:	max 1 pt																								
Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:	1 point																								
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:	0.5 point																								
Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:	0 points																								
a. Maximize Aboriginal employment:	max 3 pt																								
b. Maximize training opportunities and skills career development:	max 3 pt																								
c. Maximize the use of Aboriginal firms where capacity exists and	max 3 pt																								

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points																				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="375 352 980 415"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 352 849 415">develop and build Aboriginal business capacity:</td> <td data-bbox="849 352 980 415"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="375 474 971 537">For this element, the proposed approach/strategy will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 621 980 900"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 621 849 716">Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td data-bbox="849 621 980 716">3 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 716 849 810">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 716 980 810">1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 810 849 900">Description not provided or not relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 810 980 900">0 point</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="375 961 727 1024"><u>2.4 Communication Strategy</u> (Maximum 3 Points)</p> <p data-bbox="375 1056 980 1119">The Bidder should demonstrate the following in a draft communication strategy:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1146 980 1413"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1146 849 1276">a. Vertical communication and horizontal communication with stakeholders (Government and communities included):</td> <td data-bbox="849 1146 980 1276">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1276 849 1350">b. Usage of diversity of tools and mechanisms:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1276 980 1350">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1350 849 1413">c. Understanding of local culture and dynamics:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1350 980 1413">max 1 pt</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="375 1472 971 1535">For this element, the proposed approach/strategy will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1562 980 1829"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1562 849 1640">Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1562 980 1640">1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1640 849 1759">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1640 980 1759">0.5 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1759 849 1829">Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1759 980 1829">0 point</td> </tr> </table>	develop and build Aboriginal business capacity:		Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 points	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point	Description not provided or not relevant:	0 point	a. Vertical communication and horizontal communication with stakeholders (Government and communities included):	max 1 pt	b. Usage of diversity of tools and mechanisms:	max 1 pt	c. Understanding of local culture and dynamics:	max 1 pt	Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:	1 point	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:	0.5 point	Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:	0 point		
develop and build Aboriginal business capacity:																							
Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 points																						
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point																						
Description not provided or not relevant:	0 point																						
a. Vertical communication and horizontal communication with stakeholders (Government and communities included):	max 1 pt																						
b. Usage of diversity of tools and mechanisms:	max 1 pt																						
c. Understanding of local culture and dynamics:	max 1 pt																						
Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:	1 point																						
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:	0.5 point																						
Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:	0 point																						

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points																
	<p><u>2.5 Understanding of the project</u></p> <p>(Maximum 5 Points)</p> <p>Bidder should provide a <u>preliminary</u> draft project management plan which should include a description of the following elements:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 653 982 1241"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 653 849 814">a. Management and recruitment of human resources (the recruitment of resources and experts maximizing the use of local labour and resources):</td> <td data-bbox="849 653 982 814">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 814 849 919">b. Management of financial resources (mechanisms to track expenditures, for verification and approval):</td> <td data-bbox="849 814 982 919">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 919 849 1024">c. Integration of Risk Management principles (mechanisms to identify and manage risks):</td> <td data-bbox="849 919 982 1024">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1024 849 1150">d. Quality control and monitoring process (mechanisms to ensure the quality of the deliverables and services provided):</td> <td data-bbox="849 1024 982 1150">max 1 pt</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1150 849 1241">e. Management of relationship with stakeholders (mechanisms to involve stakeholders):</td> <td data-bbox="849 1150 982 1241">max 1 pt</td> </tr> </table> <p>For this element, the proposed approach/strategy will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1392 982 1686"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1392 849 1476">Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1392 982 1476">1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1476 849 1591">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1476 982 1591">0.5 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1591 849 1686">Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:</td> <td data-bbox="849 1591 982 1686">0 points</td> </tr> </table>	a. Management and recruitment of human resources (the recruitment of resources and experts maximizing the use of local labour and resources):	max 1 pt	b. Management of financial resources (mechanisms to track expenditures, for verification and approval):	max 1 pt	c. Integration of Risk Management principles (mechanisms to identify and manage risks):	max 1 pt	d. Quality control and monitoring process (mechanisms to ensure the quality of the deliverables and services provided):	max 1 pt	e. Management of relationship with stakeholders (mechanisms to involve stakeholders):	max 1 pt	Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:	1 point	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:	0.5 point	Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:	0 points		
a. Management and recruitment of human resources (the recruitment of resources and experts maximizing the use of local labour and resources):	max 1 pt																		
b. Management of financial resources (mechanisms to track expenditures, for verification and approval):	max 1 pt																		
c. Integration of Risk Management principles (mechanisms to identify and manage risks):	max 1 pt																		
d. Quality control and monitoring process (mechanisms to ensure the quality of the deliverables and services provided):	max 1 pt																		
e. Management of relationship with stakeholders (mechanisms to involve stakeholders):	max 1 pt																		
Description provided is clear, relevant, complete and feasible:	1 point																		
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant or not feasible:	0.5 point																		
Description not provided, not relevant or not feasible:	0 points																		
RT3	Experience of Project Team	Work Breakdown Structure along with	14																

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points										
	<p>The Bidder will be assessed against the technical human resources provided in this project, and should identify the names and qualifications of people nominated for the major activities in the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and those identified on the organizational chart.</p> <p><u>3.1 Project organizational chart</u> (Maximum 5 points)</p> <p>a. The Bidder should provide a project organization chart:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 758 982 1010"> <tr> <td>Information provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td>3 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Information provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td>1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Information not provided or not relevant:</td> <td>0 points</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. The chart should include the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1157 982 1524"> <tr> <td>The inclusion of personnel (name, position and location) and key stakeholders, including DIAND and First Nations:</td> <td>1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The demonstration of the reporting relationships between personnel, key stakeholders, including DIAND in accordance with the project management plan, and how they will fit into the current structure</td> <td>1 point</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>3.2 Overall level of experience of team members in their respective fields</u> (Maximum 5 points)</p> <p>This criterion will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p>	Information provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 point	Information provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point	Information not provided or not relevant:	0 points	The inclusion of personnel (name, position and location) and key stakeholders, including DIAND and First Nations:	1 point	The demonstration of the reporting relationships between personnel, key stakeholders, including DIAND in accordance with the project management plan, and how they will fit into the current structure	1 point	<p>the organizational chart.</p> <p>The CVs of resources of the project team should be provided.</p> <p>In cases where experience is acquired concurrently, the time period will be considered only once for the purpose of calculating the requirement of 10 years of experience.</p> <p><u>Example for person 1:</u></p> <p>Project 1: started on January 1, 2004 and ended on May 31, 2009 = 65 months</p> <p>Project 2: started on January 1, 2004 and ended on December 31, 2009 = 72 months</p> <p>Project 3: started on January 1, 2010 and ended on December 31, 2013 = 36 months</p> <p>Total period for these 3 projects will count as 108 months and not 173 months because the period Jan. 2004 to</p>	
Information provided is clear, relevant and complete:	3 point												
Information provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	1 point												
Information not provided or not relevant:	0 points												
The inclusion of personnel (name, position and location) and key stakeholders, including DIAND and First Nations:	1 point												
The demonstration of the reporting relationships between personnel, key stakeholders, including DIAND in accordance with the project management plan, and how they will fit into the current structure	1 point												

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion		Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points
	More than half of resources have over 10 years of experience in their field:	5 points	<p>Dec. 2009 has already been counted in Project 2. This employee does not meet the 10 years of experience.</p> <p>*Remote area is defined as: more than 350km from a service center, where a service center is defined as the nearest to a community for which it can gain access to services such as suppliers, materials, federal services and pool of skilled labour.</p>	
Half of resources have over 10 years of experience in their field:	3 points			
Less than half of resources have less than 10 years of experience in their field:	1 point			
Less than half of resources have no experience in their field:	0 point			
	<p>3.3 Extent of Bidder's Experience (Maximum 4 points)</p> <p>a. Projects that the Bidder has worked on worth \$10Million or greater located in a remote area* (1 point per qualifying project, max 2 points).</p> <p>b. Projects that the Bidder has worked on worth \$40 Million or greater (1 point per qualifying project, max 2 points).</p>			
RT4	<p>Risk Management</p> <p>4.1 Risk Management Plan (Maximum 8 Points)</p> <p>The Bidder should describe the proposed processes, methods, and tools for risk management including risk identification (max 2 points), risk assessment (max 2 points), risk monitoring (max 2 points) and risk response (max 2 points).</p> <p>The proposed methods for risk management will be assessed for their appropriateness for a project of this scope and complexity, including the extent to which they demonstrate the Bidder's understanding of the underlying business conditions, project stakeholders and complexities of this project.</p>		<p>For each risk:</p> <p><u>Relevance means</u> that the risk commonly exists in projects of a similar scope and complexity and is an example of a significant risk exposure for this project.</p> <p><u>Adequacy of the risk response means:</u> the</p>	12

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points						
	<p>This criterion will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 443 980 701"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 443 849 527">Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td data-bbox="849 443 980 527">2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 527 849 611">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 527 980 611">0.5 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 611 849 701">Description not provided or not relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 611 980 701">0 point</td> </tr> </table> <p>4.2 Identification of Risks (Maximum 4 Points)</p> <p>In addition, the Bidder should identify and describe four (4) risks associated with this project and provide its assessment of risk level, and proposed response and risk mitigation for each risk. (maximum of 4 points)</p> <p>Each risk identified will be assessed for their relevance to this project (0.5 point per risk identified) and the adequateness of the proposed risk response (0.5 point per risk identified). The risks should be distinct from another and demonstrate an understanding of the range of potential risks to which the project is exposed.</p>	Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	2 points	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	0.5 point	Description not provided or not relevant:	0 point	<p>feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the proposed risk mitigation strategies and the appropriateness of the proposed risk escalation (i.e. level at which the risk will be elevated for approval of the risk response).</p> <p>If the Bidder identifies more than 4 risks, only the risks up to the identified limit of 4 will be evaluated. The first 4 risks listed in the proposal will be considered for evaluation.</p>	
Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	2 points								
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	0.5 point								
Description not provided or not relevant:	0 point								
RT5	<p>Project Schedule</p> <p>The Bidder should provide a proposed schedule for the work complete with activity buffers, approvals, work breakdown structure with description of services, deliverables and milestones following from planning through to warranty period completion (2 points for providing the requested project schedule).</p> <p>This work plan should highlight the mobilization plan and associated implications on schedule (max 2 points), as well as current unknowns, their effect on</p>	<p>Project schedule should be presented in a Gantt chart format using MS Project, and showing the major milestones, deliverables and decision points.</p>	8						

Number	Point Rated Technical Criterion	Bid preparation instructions	Maximum Points						
	<p>the schedule (max 2 points) and the associated plan to address these (max 2 points).</p> <p>This criterion will be evaluated according to the following scale:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 594 982 852"> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 594 849 678">Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:</td> <td data-bbox="849 594 982 678">2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 678 849 762">Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 678 982 762">0.5 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 762 849 852">Description not provided or not relevant:</td> <td data-bbox="849 762 982 852">0 point</td> </tr> </table>	Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	2 points	Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	0.5 point	Description not provided or not relevant:	0 point		
Description provided is clear, relevant and complete:	2 points								
Description provided is partial or not sufficiently clear or relevant:	0.5 point								
Description not provided or not relevant:	0 point								
	Total		99						