



SOLICITATION NUMBER: AACR-17084	NUMÉRO DE L'AVIS D'APPEL D'OFFRES : AACR-17084
PROJECT NUMBER: AACR17084	NUMÉRO DE PROJET : AACR17084
AMENDMENT: No.005	TITLE : ARCHITECTURAL A & E SERVICES - WORLDWIDE

Amendment No.005 is raised to extend the solicitation closing date and to provide and disseminate answers to questions as follows:

1. Delete Request for Supply arrangement A7. Proposal Delivery; and

Replace with the following:

A7. Proposal Delivery

In order for a Proposal to be valid, it must be received no later than 14:00 on **July 12, 2018** (Ottawa, Ontario Time).

Proponents must submit their electronic Proposals in no more than two (2) emails. The first **must** be labelled "**Technical Proposal**", the second **must** be labelled "**Price Proposal**". Note .rar files will not be accepted.

Email file size must not exceed 10MB

Subject Line: AACR17084 - A&E Services

Electronic Proposals must be sent **only** to the following email address:

Email: aacr-contracts@international.gc.ca

Please note: Electronic Proposals must not be copied to any other address or individual. Failure to comply will result in the whole Proposal being declared non-compliant and rejected from further consideration.

Requests for confirmation of receipt of Proposal should be sent to:

Attention: Dale Rudderham

Email: dale.rudderham@international.gc.ca

Telephone: 343-203-1522

Please note: NO Proposals are to be sent directly to the individual above.

2. Questions & Answers (PART2):

Question #6: Section ES2.4 states that senior structural, mechanical and electrical engineers must submit at least five (5) projects each, including three (3) joint venture projects with the Bidder. However, in Quebec, the Architects Act does not allow architects to form a joint venture with an engineering firm. Therefore, we believe that it would be appropriate to allow the submission of at least three (3) projects for which the senior structural, mechanical and electrical engineers were part of the same team as the bidder. As this question determines our ability to bid or not, would it be possible to respond to it as soon as possible?

Answer #6: Yes, agree this would be acceptable as the intent would be met.



Question #7: It is stipulated on the front page of the RFSA that the size of the attachments to the email of Technical Proposal must not exceed 3 MB. We consider that this size of attachments does not allow us to include photos or images. or graphics. Would it be possible to allow us a larger attachment size?

Answer #7: Yes, we will allow larger files. Files 10MB or larger are blocked. Bidders will be responsible to ensure delivery of their bids. Multiple emails will be accepted.

Question #8: In section ES3.1, for each project submitted, a letter of recommendation from the client is requested. On the other hand, several federal clients (eg PWGSC, DFATD, etc.) refuse to provide letters of reference. Therefore, would it be possible to provide only the contact information of the responsible person without being penalized?

Answer #8: Yes

Question #9: We are preparing a proposal as part of the referenced application.

As part of our response to the hypothetical project (ES3.3), it does not seem clear whether construction services should be addressed in the development of our response strategy. Can you specify your intention on this subject? If so, also confirm that it must be part of the effort matrix that we need to produce. As for this matrix of efforts, should we talk about hours or days ???

Answer #9: Construction services are not required for this exercise. We are requesting Design and Tender documents package only. The matrix can be in either hours or days. There is no specific requirement or restriction on this.

Question#10 : Is it possible to obtain a hypothetical project plan (Appendix A) that is more readable (larger scale)?

Answer #10 : Yes. See attachment in NPP

Question#11 : At the description of the Scope, p.8, please confirm how 430 m2 of additional office space on the ground floor is obtained from the figures in the table on page 18. The table gives a total office area of 218 m2 and a total rental of 421.71 m2. What is the figure of 506.05 for the total under construction?

Answer #11 : The 506m2 includes a gross up factor for circulation

Question #12 : Is it possible to obtain one (1) cross-section or two (2)?

Answer#12 : No

Question #13: Regarding SR 3.1 Reference letters. Is the expectation that a reference letter will be provided for every one of the 5 projects? If yes – it may be impossible for us to comply - as the client representatives are no longer available – or because of the time it will take to obtain the reference. We suggest that the requirement be revised to request 3 or 4 or 5 representative references.

Answer #13: Reference letters are not mandatory

Question #14: In section SR2.2a, can the definition of a “Project” be modified for projects up to \$10M CAD instead of \$5M CAD?

Answer #14: We will accept 1 of the 5 projects as up to \$10M



Question #15: In section SR3.1, the document states “elaborate on five recent projects”. Are the five projects elaborated under SR3.1 required to be the same as the five projects under section SR2.2a or can they be different?

Answer #15: Yes, they can be different projects

Question #16: In section SR3.1, “recent projects” do not indicate a minimum/maximum construction value. Please define these values.

Answer #16: The values should be the same as noted in SR2.2

Question #17: The Supplementary Conditions (SC 2) discuss security requirements for the contract. The RFSAP does not list minimum security requirements. Are all staff noted in section SR3.2 required to hold a valid security clearance such as CISD Level II Secret or above?

Answer #17: All staff working on our projects would be subject to having security clearance. Security clearance is NOT a prerequisite.

Question #18: With respect to sections SR2.3 and SR2.4, can you clarify the difference between a Principal Architect and Senior Architect? Can these two roles be completed by the same person? We ask this clarification as the Principal Architect is noted in the Mandatory Requirements but is not noted in the SR3 – Point Rated Criteria.

Answer #18: Yes, they can be the same person thus not an issue under SR3

Question #19: In Section “III” – Price Proposal, for example positions are noted as “Structural Firm – Principal, Senior, Intermediate, Junior, Draftsperson”. Is it the RFSAP’s intention for a senior engineer and senior technologist/designer to both charge out at the same Per Diem rate? In other words, do holders of architectural or engineering licenses have an impact on each per diem category? Do years of experience compensate or replace licensing requirements?

Answer #19: Architects and Engineers are required to hold licences. Experience does not compensate for license.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.