



## RETURN BIDS TO:

## RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC

11 Laurier St./ 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

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS SECURITY  
REQUIREMENTS

### 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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Project Management Support Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EP753-182670/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20182670	<b>Date</b> 2018-08-14
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$FK-290-75224	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fk290.EP753-182670	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2018-09-17</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Ghoumrassi, Hakim	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fk290
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 469-4910 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-3600
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**THIS AMENDMENT IS RAISED TO CORRECT A TRANSLATION ERROR IN THE RFP (FRENCH VERSION ONLY) AND TO ANSWER A BIDDER'S QUESTIONS:**

**1/ AT PIÈCE JOINTE 1 DE LA PARTIE 4, GRILLE SOUPLE,**

**DELETE: Attestation professionnelle pertinente in its entirety,**

**REPLACWE WITH:**

**Attestation professionnelle pertinente**

L'attestation professionnelle doit être valide et pertinente à la catégorie visée. Des points seront accordés pour un maximum d'une (1) attestation professionnelle.

La certification doit être pertinente au domaine d'application. Les certifications acceptables incluent mais ne sont pas limitées à celles de la liste suivante. Qu'il soit inscrit ou non, il incombe au fournisseur de démontrer la pertinence des certifications professionnelles par rapport au travail proposé.

- Project Management Professional (PMP)

**2/ AT CRITÈRES TECHNIQUES COTÉS – RÉPONSE ÉCRITE,**

**DELETE :**

3.2 Chef de projet immobilier – principal n° 1 (selon le tableau souple de la pièce jointe 1 de la partie 4) :

**REPLACE WITH :**

3.2 Gestionnaire de projet immobilier – principal n° 1 (selon le tableau souple de la pièce jointe 1 de la partie 4) :

**QUESTIONS/ANSWERS:**

**Q1:** 7 out of the 10 items requested as part of RT2.3 are fact based and demonstrate nothing of value. Indeed the bid would be deemed non-compliant not to include those simple facts. We do not wish to bias the RFP, therefore we suggest the Crown simply remove the points.

**A1:** The Criterion RT2.3 remains unchanged in the RFP.

**Q2:** It's understood that given the nature of the work on Recapitalization projects dealing with heritage, structural elements, building envelopes and mechanical and electrical systems that the Senior Project Managers would rightly be limited to those with Architecture and Engineering degrees and designations. May we suggest that they also have a PMP designation given the complexity of the projects and the focus of this RFP is for the retention of Project Management professionals?

**A2:** Please refer to the "ATTACHMENT 1 TO PART 4 FLEXIBLE GRID" section, paragraph "Relevant Professional Certification" on page 20 of 100. Also refer to "RESOURCE'S CATEGORIES – FLEXIBLE GRID section, paragraph "1. Project Manager for Real Property Flexible Grid" on page 22 of 100.

**Q3:** We have a Senior PM (Architect), who renovated his heritage designated home valued at \$500,000 over the duration of three years. Would the Crown consider lowering the heritage value in section RT3.1 for the Senior PM to \$500,000?

**A3:** No. The RT3.1d) and RT3.2d) criteria remain unchanged in the RFP.

**Q4:** The construction industry is fraught with litigation, and we have seen a significant trend towards project management firms being 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> parties into litigation from Design firms and Constructors. \$1M in Errors and Omissions Liability Insurance appears insufficient given the Program of Work anticipated by PPB. Will the Crown protect the PMSS contractor through indemnification or at a minimum increase the limit of the required E&O insurance to \$10 million per claim and \$10 million aggregate?

**A4:** The Crown **will not limit the liability nor increase the limit** of the Errors and Omissions Liability insurance. \$1,000,000 per loss and in the annual aggregate, inclusive of defence costs, is the minimum required.

**Q5:** Upon review of the LTVP Annual Report 2016-17, we notice that the Recapitalization, Building Component and Connectivity and Security Programs receives significant budget funding. We understand these programs will receive funding for capital projects that may exceed \$50M, with projects potentially exceeding \$100M. Therefore should the Crown increase the experience required in RT3.1 (Senior Project Leader) and RT3.2 (Senior Project Manager) to \$100M?

**A5:**

- RT3.1b) and RT3.2b) criteria remain unchanged. Value of each project to be substantiated has to be over \$50M;
- RT3.3b), RT3.4b), RT3.5b), and RT3.6b) criteria remain unchanged. Value of each project to be substantiated has to be over \$10M.

**Q6:** Can the Crown confirm if there is a minimum rated score required per section for bidder and resource rated requirements i.e. it is not possible to score zero in a section and still be considered a compliant bid?

**A6:** Please refer to section “2. POINT-RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA – WRITTEN”. The pass mark from the paragraph 2.4 (360 points out of 555) applies to the sum of the written technical proposal (Point-Rated Technical Criteria – Written (RTW)).

**Q7:** MT2 and MT3 require that five (5) “Project Managers for Real Property – Senior” and one (1) “Project Manager for Real Property – Intermediate” must be certified professional Engineers or Architects. Given that the Project Leader for Real Property – Senior must provide overall leadership, direction and support to those Project Managers as well as contribute to projects which as defined in section PR 2 can consist of “replacement of windows, mechanical and electrical systems, building exterior, roof, and grounds rehabilitation”; could you please confirm that the Senior Project Leader is also required to be a certified professional Engineer or Architect in good standing in Canada?

**A7:** the Senior Project Leader **IS NOT** required to be a certified professional Engineer or Architect in good standing in Canada.

**OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**