



<b>SOLICITATION NUMBER:</b> AACR-17084	<b>NUMÉRO DE L'AVIS D'APPEL D'OFFRES :</b> AACR-17084
<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b> AACR17084	<b>NUMÉRO DE PROJET :</b> AACR17084
<b>AMENDMENT:</b> No.006	<b>TITLE :</b> ARCHITECTURAL A & E SERVICES - WORLDWIDE

Amendment No.006 is raised to extend the closing date and to provide and disseminate answers to questions:

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 17, 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: [acr-contracts@international.gc.ca](mailto:acr-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](mailto: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 (PART3):**

Question#20. The response to Question #6 implies that of the 5 projects we are featuring, the architect/proponent must have authored the design of all five projects, and worked together with the proposed structural, mechanical and electrical engineers on at least three examples.

Given the restriction on the value and nature of projects that will be favorably considered, and the requirement for work together on three of the featured projects, it will be impossible for us to comply with this requirement of the rfp, notwithstanding a significant portfolio of relevant diplomatic experience for all of the architectural, structural and mechanical and electrical team member firms – and an extensive record of collaboration on other types of assignments.

We request the stipulation be relaxed to simply request evidence of past collaborations as a scored requirement. Please advise as soon as possible to allow us to prepare a proposal on schedule.



**Answer#20 Would agree to relax this requirement slightly such that 3 projects must demonstrate past collaboration with at least 2 of the 3 engineering disciplines.**

Question#21. Regarding STR2.3 Principal Experience

Is it intended that the principal is the senior architect/engineer named at SR3.2, or is it intended that the principal is supplemental to the senior role?

**Answer#21 The principal can occupy both roles.**

Question#22. Regarding SR2.3

The requirement implies that all members of the team that we are promoting must be professionally licensed, including intermediate level staff. As a result, all three members from each discipline (Principal, senior, and intermediate must be licensed.) Normally the requirement for licensure rests with the responsible design lead sealing the contract documents. We request this requirement be clarified and relaxed to allow un-licensed staff to participate in the projects in both senior and intermediate roles.

**Answer#22 We would allow unlicensed staff.**

Question#23. Regarding Mandatory Requirements

Is the intent of the section Mandatory requirements to identify the minimum requirements for the responses we are providing at SR3? Or is it intended that our proposal responds specifically to SR2.2, SR 2.3 and SR2.4 to confirm we have met mandatory requirements?

**Answer#23 Mandatory requirements SR2 are separate from the Point Rated Criteria SR3**

Question#24. Regarding SR1.3 SA Evaluation procedures, item B. The table shows 70% weighting for technical, but the point rated criteria are based on 80 points. It would be clearer if the selection criteria showed 80% technical – but we assume intent is to pro-rate the scoring of 80 points into 70% weighting for selection. Correct?

**Answer#24** SR1.3 Evaluation Procedures are correct. The technical evaluation will be weighted as 70% of the final score. The remaining 30% is the financial score.

Question#25 Are we to submit a total of five projects for the entire team or five projects for each discipline of which three need to be with the architect/ proponent?

**Answer#25 5 projects for the entire team.**

Question #26 The rfp notes that feasibility studies and the like are part of the potential scope of services but the rfp also assumes that projects that we are presenting are built projects with hard construction value. If we submit a feasibility study to demonstrate our ability in this regards - as one if the five projects - will we be penalized?



Answer#26 **Acceptable if the feasibility study can respond to the evaluation criteria and project cost range.**

**All other terms and conditions remain the same.**