



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

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

**11 Laurier/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 PROCUREMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT**

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

**Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Parliamentary Precinct Division/Acquisitions de la Cité
parlementaire
222 Queen Street / 222, rue Queen
Ottawa
Ontario
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet PPB A&E - Integrated Campus	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP750-182231/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EP750-182231	Date 2018-08-28
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PPS-021-26904	
File No. - N° de dossier 021pps.EP750-182231	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-09-20	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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: Bennett, Adrian	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 021pps
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 990-3849 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: PWGSC / TPSGC Operations - Parliament Hill Opérations - Terrain Colline Parlementaire Wellington St, Ottawa K1A0A6	

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

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

This Amendment will be presented in three parts as follows:

- 1. Questions and Responses**
- 2. Revisions to the Request For Proposal**
- 3. Bidder's Conference Attendees List**

PART ONE: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question 1:

As per the following RFP references [SRE 3.1.6, SRE 3.1.7, SRE 3.1.8, SRE 3.2.1, SRE 2.2.2, and SRE 3.2.3], could PSPC confirm that "Proponent" in this context is defined as the Prime Consultant (Architect/Urban Planner) and does not include Key Subconsultant/Specialist Firms?

Response 1:

Confirmed. See definition of Proponent in General Instructions R1410T.

Question 2:

Please confirm that the Sub-Consultant/Specialist experience will only qualify in the response to Section 3.1.8 [out of the SRE sections referenced in Question 1].

Response 2:

Sub-Consultant/Specialist experience will also be evaluated in SRE 3.2.3. See revision in part 2.

Question 3:

Is the successful bidder precluded from bidding on future opportunities that will arise and be procured separately from this Project?

And,

Our understanding is that the Proponent who is successful on this RFP would be involved in many enabling works for future projects on buildings within the Parliamentary Precinct. However, please confirm that ONLY Stream 3 services where the proponent and our specialists are in the role of Advocate Architect and Engineer would we be disqualified from competing on these related future projects.

And,

In the Advanced Procurement Notice, under the heading "Prevention of Future Conflict of Interest", it states that "Canada may reject proposals from the Consultant and Stream 3 Sub-Consultants and Specialists of this contract for future projects utilizing the services of the Stream 3 Advocate Architect."

For clarity, does this mean that Stream 1 and 2 sub-consultants and Specialists may still participate fully in future procurement processes for other projects for Canada? Would being part of the winning Proponent's team place any restrictions on bids from Stream 1 and 2 Sub-Consultants and Specialists?

Response 3:

To protect the integrity of future procurement processes, Canada may reject future proposals from the Proponent and Stream 2 Key Sub Consultants and Specialists of this contract based on the nature and extent of services provided under Stream 2 Task Authorizations. In certain

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

instances the services requested could give, or could appear to give, an unfair advantage or create a situation of putting the consultant into a conflict of interest.

Canada may also reject future proposals from the Proponent and Stream 3 Key Sub Consultants and Specialists if a Task Authorization has been issued under Stream 3 Advocate Architect which requires their services for the same project. In Canada's opinion, given the specialized role of the Advocate Architect, the services constitute a Conflict of Interest as per relevant clauses referenced below.

For all streams, it is anticipated that any subsequent Request For Proposals will include the SACC Manual clause General Instructions, Conflict of Interest-Unfair Advantage, either R1410T GI25 or R1110T GI 25.

Question 4:

With respect to Section RT4 Team Composition, Organization Structure and Capacity, could PSPC provide more structure and detail on what information is expected and how it will be evaluated given the limited number of pages relative to the numerous professional services required?

Response 4:

The information sought and scoring method is well described in the RFP. It is noted that the page count specified is a recommended value for proposal planning purposes and Proponents are free to increase/reduce the number of pages, as long as the overall submission maximum page count is respected (refer to SRE 2.2).

Question 5:

It is noted that proponents are allowed 80 pages (excluding the requirements as noted in 2.2) however, after reviewing the submission requirements, I can only find 77 pages to allocate. Please clarify the total page count.

And,

At SRE 3: 3.6 RATED TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (RT) – MANAGEMENT OF SERVICES

It is recommended we submit the information using a maximum of five (5) pages. Should all information in subsection 3.6.1, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3 to be included in 5 pages?

And,

The RFP notes page counts for various components. Do we have the latitude to adjust the page counts for each section of the proposal as we see fit?

And,

Maximum page count

In SRE 2 Proposal Requirements, subsection 2.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format, the maximum page count is set at 80. There does not appear to be a maximum page count for the RT4 and RT5 sections:

SECTION	MAX NUMBER OF PAGES
RP1	6
RP2	6

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

RP3	6	
RP4	6	
RP5	6	
RT1	26	
RT2	5	
RT3	5	
RT4	?	= 9
RT5	?	
RT6	5	
TOTAL	71	

- A. According to the table, there are still 9 pages to be allocated. Is there a desired minimum distribution for the 2 sections that do not have a maximum page count? The total recommended page count for RT4, RT5 and RT6 is 5 pages.

Considering the scope of the mandate, the number of pages remaining for RT5 is somewhat limited. Would it be possible to increase the number of pages in order to provide in-depth coverage of this section?

Response 5:

The page counts for individual sections in the RFP are recommendations intended to guide Proponents in the preparation of their submission, and are not hard values. It is at the proponents' discretion to reduce/increase individual page counts as long as the overall number of pages submitted for Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 to 3.6 does not exceed 80 as per Section 2.2 of the RFP.

Question 6:

Will Section Header / Divider pages count towards to 80 page limit?

Response 6:

Section Headers/ Dividers will not count towards the limit as long as no content is included beyond the section's title and/or number, including any other text and graphics. See revision in part two.

Question 7:

May we obtain a copy of the slideshow presented at the Bidders Conference?

Response 7:

PWGSC is not sharing the slideshow as the information presented does not form a part of the Request For Proposal.

Question 8:**At SRE 5: ABORIGINAL PARTICIPATION PLAN**

Is each sub-consultants/specialist firm required to complete and submit an APP form? Or do we submit one APP form for the team?

Do minor sub-consultants (i.e. Building Code Consultant) need to complete the APP form?

Response 8:

It is expected that one comprehensive Aboriginal Participation Plan will be submitted for the full consultant team including the Proponent and sub-consultants/specialists.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

Question 9:

RE: Terms Conditions and Clauses, Page 11 of 20. We presume the intent that the terms and conditions are the current iteration and not the iteration of the documents listed. Correct?

Response 9:

Correct. See revision in part two.

Question 10:

Is it possible that Options 1 and 2 of Stream 1 would occur concurrent with the 2 year term of Stream 1?

Response 10:

Options 1 and 2 require the Master Plan to be substantially completed in order to prepare an Implementation and Costing Plan and the Synopsis Document, therefore, no.

Question 11:

Is there any advantage to Canada to complete the work of Stream 1 earlier than the 2 year allowance noted in the RFP?

Response 11:

The two year timeframe is a realistic timeframe given the scope of work. If the successful proponent is able to complete the work and produce a quality deliverable in advance of the two year timeframe, Canada has no issue.

Question 12:

RE: SC14 item d. It is possible that team members may elect - on occasion – for business development or other reasons - to charge a lower rate for similar work for clients other than Canada. We presume it is not Canada's intent to require that we charge the lowest rate that we have ever charged a client. Please clarify the intent.

Response 12:

Canada does not intend to have the Proponent sign a "most favoured customer" certification so long as prices and rates are supported through a competitive process. Canada may ask for the certification if Canada enters into negotiations with the Proponent, which would occur, for example, if Canada receives only one compliant proposal.

Question 13:

RE: Appendix B. In the case of Joint Venture proponent we presume that each of the joint venture members each submit the documentation. Correct?

Response 13:

In the case of Joint Venture, the Joint Venture may submit one Appendix B, with item B2 on page 3 selected, indicating that 'The Proponent is a Joint Venture and each member of the Joint Venture must provide the Contracting Authority with a completed Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Certification. (Refer to the Joint Venture section of the General Instructions)'

Question 14:

RE: SRE 3.1.1. We presume this is not intended to apply to the entirety of the consulting teams engages – but rather for consulting team members who would normally be required to submit for permits from the City of Ottawa. Please clarify the requirement.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

Response 14:

As stated in SRE3.1.1, the requirements of SRE 3.1.1 apply to the Proponent and all member's of the Proponent's Consultant Team.

Question 15:

RE: SRE 3 - 3.1.8. We understand the intent of '4 building type office space accommodation' it to have experience with building projects for work environments rather than experience with heavy civil or engineering infrastructure. Will facilities such as training, academic or operations buildings and the like serving institutional clients with relatively small portions of office space be considered?

Response 15:

See revision in part two for change in reference project definition.

Question 16:

RT1 suggests that only a single individual is named and represented by a CV to represent the capabilities of the team to attend to each discipline. Whereas in reality the work associated with any particular discipline could be shared between 2 or 3 Principal level team members and a variety of senior staff responsible for the day to day work of the project. If we introduce information regarding these other team members as part of the CV for the lead individual will it be considered in the scoring?

Response 16:

Only information pertaining to the Key Discipline Individual will be considered in the evaluation. If multiple CVs are given for one Key Discipline Individual, only the first one will be evaluated.

Question 17:

Please elaborate on the role and scope of the Security Specialist

And,

Security Specialist

In the Project Brief section, subsection RFP 4.1.2 Stream 1 Consultant Services (p.13 of 201 or 132/320 in the PDF), it states that the team must have, at a minimum, professional competencies in "security (for buildings and campus environments)."

A. Please clarify which type of security issues must be addressed (traffic accidents, terrorism, fires, public gatherings, building integrity, information security, etc.)?

B. What are your expectations regarding the profile of the security specialist?

Response 17:

The requirement is for a physical security specialist- please refer to pages 51 and 56 in the Project Brief for scope and deliverables that are required from this professional related to Stream 1. For Streams 2 and 3, refer to RS2.3.14 (page 161 of the Project Brief) and Annex D (page 200).

Question 18:

Please clarify the scope of the Indigenous Engagement

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

Response 18:

Scope and role for Stream 1 are outlined on pg. 42 under P.A. 3.3 and pg. 46. For Stream 2 and 3, this will be determined at the time of individual Task Authorizations. For Streams 2 and 3, refer to RS2.3.29 (page 169 of the Project Brief) and Annex D (page 200).

Question 19:

Please clarify role/scope of Industrial Engineering

Response 19:

The scope of services required of the Industrial/Material Handling Specialist will be defined in Task Authorizations under Streams 2 and 3. Refer to RS 2.3.29 (page 169 of the Project Brief) and Annex D (page 200).

Question 20:

The project briefs identify additional consultant services not listed in Section RT1 (key discipline individuals). Can PWGSC please clarify where/if we ought to provide either firm or individual CVs/experience for the outstanding consultants (such as Public Consultation, Accessibility, Indigenous Engagement, Costing etc...)?

Response 20:

Proponents are only expected to provide CVs of Key Discipline Individuals as identified in section 3.4 of the SRE. However, there is an opportunity for Proponents to provide information on the broader consultant team in their response to RT4 Team Composition, Organization Structure and Capacity (refer to SRE 3.6.1).

Question 21:

Can PWGSC consider allowing overlap and / or duplication of Key Discipline leads, such that a single individual can hold a maximum of two positions?

Response 21:

Each position requires a different individual, if an individual is proposed in multiple positions, only the first position will be evaluated.

Question 22:

Is a CV for Lead Civil Engineer Required? It is not listed on P. 21/43, but is listed in Appendix A.

Response 22:

No CV is required for the Lead Civil Engineer.

Question 23:

In Sections 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, (p. 6-9 of 41), you list the Mandatory Experience Requirements, with Pass / Fail associated with each point – does this mean that if only one item does not meet the requirement, that the entire project is a fail, and will get 0 marks?

Response 23:

Confirmed.

Question 24:

Given that it is the labour day long weekend immediately before the deadline, essentially shortening the 1-week extension that you granted (because printing will have to be completed

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

on the Friday, since Monday is a Stat holiday), would PWGSC consider granting an additional extension?

And,

Could PWGSC please consider a three week extension considering the Labour Day weekend, vacations and the time needed to assemble a team for a project of this magnitude?

Response 24:

Solicitation closing date was extended in amendment #2.

Question 25:

If we feel that our strengths are best suited for only 2 out of the 3 streams of work are we permitted to submit a proposal in response to just 2 streams of work? Or is it mandatory to undertake all 3 streams?

Response 25:

It is mandatory to undertake all 3 streams.

Question 26:

Prime Consultant

In the French version of SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation (p.3 of 45 or 83/346 in the PDF), it states that the prime consultant should be an "Architecte et urbaniste." However, in the English version (p.3 of 41 or 81/320 in the PDF), it repeatedly states "architect/urban planner."

- A. Must the prime consultant, who manages the entire mandate across the 3 streams, be both an architect and urban planner, combining the two professions?
- B. Can he be either an architect or an urban planner?

Response 26 A&B :

The Proponent must be an Architect and Urban Planner. See revision in part 2.

Question 27:

The term "proponent"

At several points in the tender documents, the concept of "proponent" is confusing since it is used both to refer to the firm responding to the request for proposals and, at other times, to refer to the primary manager who will be in charge of all 3 streams.

In SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, it repeatedly states that the proposal must present a project that reflects the "proponent's" experience:

- It is mentioned in the 3 subsections concerning the reference project, for all 3 streams:
Section 3.1.6 Stream 1, Section 3.1.7 Stream 2 and Section 3.1.8 Stream 3
"The proposal must demonstrate the **Proponent's** experience..."
- It is mentioned in the 3 subsections concerning the "proponent's" achievements, for all 3 streams:
Section 3.2.1 RP1 Stream 1, Section 3.2.2 RP2 Stream 2 and Section 3.2.3 RP3 Stream 3
"Describe the **Proponent's** accomplishments, achievements and experience on comparable projects..."
- Could you please specify, for each of these sections, whether it is referring to the firm's experience or that of the prime consultant?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

Response 27 :

See Responses 1 and 2. For Section 3.1.6 Stream 1, Section 3.1.7 Stream 2, Section 3.1.8 Stream 3, Section 3.2.1 Stream 1, Section 3.2.2 Stream 2 and Section 3.2.3 Stream 3, the Proponent is referring to the firm, not the individuals.

Question 28:

List of professionals required

Several times in the tender documents, the list of required professionals varies from 13 to 24. In addition, the terms associated with these professionals vary throughout the documents, adding to the confusion:

- Appendix A, Team Identification Format (p.1 to 4 or 21 to 24/320 in the PDF) :
 - 1 prime consultant and 10 specialists
 - SRE 3, Submission Requirements and Evaluation, section 3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification (p. 3 of 41 or 81/320 in the PDF):
 - 1 prime consultant, 10 key subconsultant/specialist firms and 13 key discipline individuals
 - SRE 3, Submission Requirements and Evaluation, section 3.4 RT1 Experience of Key Discipline Individuals on Past Projects:
 - 13 key discipline individuals
 - Appendix F, Information Related to Security Requirements (p. 1 of 3 or 74 to 76/320 in the PDF) :
 - 1 proponent, 1 joint venture proponent member, 4 key subconsultants/specialists and 4 key discipline individuals
- A. Could you tell us the minimum number of professionals expected?
- B. Can the 13 key discipline individuals be part of (and sometimes identical to) the key subconsultants (e.g. can the "landscape architecture subconsultant" also be the "prime landscape architect")?

Response 28 :

- A) Refer to SRE 3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification. The Key Subconsultant/Specialist Firms heading under 3.1.2 b refers to the Firms providing the listed services, while the Key Discipline Individuals heading under 3.1.2 c refers to individuals responsible for the various disciplines.

Annex D of the Project Brief and Appendix C Price Proposal Form provide an exhaustive listing of professionals and other Specialty Services that will be required. Of the listed professionals, only the 13 Key Discipline Individuals will be evaluated per SRE 3.4, the others are not evaluated but an hourly rate must be provided.

Appendix F is provided as an optional template to be modified/copied as required by the Proponent to include the required security information for the Proponent, Key Personnel and Sub-Consultants/Specialists as specified in Section 3.1.5 Security Requirement of the SRE.

- B)** The 13 individuals listed are Key Discipline Individuals (individuals and not firms) must all be unique and must not duplicate each other. If the proposal includes an individual in more than one position, only the first position will be evaluated.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

Question 29:

Understanding of the Project

In SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, subsection 3.5 Understanding of the Project (p.25 of 41 or 103/320 in the PDF), it indicates that "This evaluation will only apply to services under **Stream 1 and Stream 3.**"

In the context of responses to this request for proposals, must an understanding of the project be prepared for Stream 2?

Response 29:

No, only applies to Streams 1 and 3 as indicated.

Question 30:

Campus Information Model

The tender documents indicate that Stream 1 focuses primarily on the Campus Information Model. We are having a difficult time discerning the expectations for the model.

Moreover, in the Project Brief, subsection PD 4.1.1 Transitioning into the Digital and "Smart" Age, it indicates that the information model must combine BIM and SIG deliverables, as per the following:

"As **BIM and GIS deliverables** were not included as part of the 2006 LTVP Update, and both have become indispensable technologies for the management of Real Property, it is intended for this update to the LTVP to be captured and centralized in a digitally interactive and usable way using a **hybrid solution of the two** in the creation of a Campus Information Model."

- A. Could you please specify your expectations for the Campus Information Model?
- B. Could you please clarify your expectations concerning the creation of a tool that combines BIM and SIG software?
- C. Considering the need to understand SIG software, what is the anticipated specialist profile related to that expertise?

Response 30:

- A. The Proponent will utilize and build on existing PPB models to create a single and managed 3D virtual campus integrating information from GIS and BIM into one holistic environment. The 3D model will include a level of detail typical to master planning and reflective of the advances in software capabilities since the preparation of the LTVP 2006 Update. The resulting 3D model will be used as a visualization and planning tool to effectively present three-dimensional and time-phased information, enable a comprehensive approach to campus planning and improve access to data for future planning and review.
- B. The Proponent should use of an international and interoperable data format (such as buildingSMART IFC or CityGML), with the chosen compliant BIM and GIS software. A list of compliant IFC software may be found on buildingSMART Internationals Technology site.
- C. A specialist with experience in GIS and 3D modelling is required for this exercise.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

Question 31:

Can the organizational chart (RT4) and the calendar (RT6) be submitted in 11x17 format?

Response 31:

The calendar can be presented in 11x17 format but will be counted as 2 pages, as per SRE 2.1.

Question 32:

Subsurface Investigation Reports

In section 2.4.13 of Appendix D (p.9 or 50/320 in the PDF), it indicates that any "Subsurface Investigation Reports" required shall be included after "Section 31."

- A. We could not find a Section 31 in the tender documents. Does that section apply to this particular mandate? If so, could you please send it to us?
- B. Do the subsurface investigation reports constitute an additional service (not included in the Project Brief)? In the context of this mandate, should we anticipate needing to produce them and thus integrate adequate professional resources?

Response 32:

- A. Section 31 refers to Division 31 Earthworks of the National Master Specification (NMS).
- B. Geotechnical Engineering is a Specialized Service as described in Section RS2.3.3 of the Project Brief.

Question 33:

Meetings via videoconference

In the Project Brief, subsection PA 1.1.3 General Instructions (p.35 of 201 or 155/320 in the PDF), it states that the consultant must "co-ordinate and attend regular meetings every two (2) weeks during the life of the project with members of the core PWGSC Project Team."

Given the large number of meetings that will be held in the context of this mandate, is it possible to hold some of the meetings via videoconference?

Response 33:

For Stream 1, 50% of the bi-weekly team meetings can occur via videoconference. The cost of the videoconference should be accounted for in the Proponents price proposal. Key meetings and workshops must be attended by the Proponent and appropriate team members in-person.

For Stream 2 and 3, all bi-weekly meetings should be attended in person. See Revision in Part 2.

Question 34:

Underground Concourse

In the Project Brief, subsection RS4 (p.57 of 201 or 176/320 in the PDF), it indicates that an "underground concourse report and plan" must be developed as part of the mandate. It also indicates that the consultant must arrive at a "preferred concourse option."

- A. Is this the underground concourse for the Conference Centre?
- B. Could you please elaborate on the types of options?

Response 34:

- A. See Revision in Part 2.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

This amendment constitutes the responses to close to half of the questions received at this time.

Further questions will be responded to in subsequent Request For Proposal Amendments.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

PART TWO: REVISIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

THE RFP IS HEREBY AMENDED TO REFLECT THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:

1. At Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.2.3 RP3 – Achievements of Proponent on Projects relevant to Stream 3:

DELETE:

Describe the Proponent's accomplishments, achievements and experience on comparable projects to the Required Services – Stream 3 section of the Project Brief.

Describe three (3) significant projects completed within the last ten (10) years that will demonstrate the Proponent's past record of experience as Advocate Architect providing services similar to those described in the Required Services – Stream 3 section of the Project Brief.

INSERT:

Describe the Proponent or Sub-Consultant / Specialist's accomplishments, achievements and experience on comparable projects to the Required Services – Stream 3 section of the Project Brief.

Describe three (3) significant projects completed within the last ten (10) years that will demonstrate the Proponent or Sub-Consultant / Specialist's past record of experience as Advocate Architect providing services similar to those described in the Required Services – Stream 3 section of the Project Brief.

2. At Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 2.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format, under "The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above":

INSERT:

- Section Headers/ Dividers, as long as no content is included beyond the section's title and/or number, including any other text and graphics

3. At Terms, Conditions and Clauses, Agreement, 1. (b) the General Terms, Conditions and Clauses, as amended, identified as:

DELETE:

R1210D (2017-08-17), General Condition (GC) 1 - General Provisions – Architectural and/or Engineering Services

R1230D (2016-01-28), General Condition (GC) 5 - Terms of Payment – Architectural and/or Engineering Services

R1240D (2011-05-16), General Condition (GC) 7 - Taking the Services Out of the Consultant's Hands, Suspension or Termination

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003

R1250D (2015-07-03), General Condition (GC) 9 - Indemnification and Insurance

INSERT:

R1210D (2018-06-21), General Condition (GC) 1 - General Provisions – Architectural and/or Engineering Services

R1230D (2018-06-21), General Condition (GC) 5 - Terms of Payment – Architectural and/or Engineering Services

R1240D (2018-06-21), General Condition (GC) 7 - Taking the Services Out of the Consultant's Hands, Suspension or Termination

R1250D (2017-11-28), General Condition (GC) 9 - Indemnification and Insurance

4. At APPENDIX A – TEAM IDENTIFICATION FORMAT:

DELETE:

- I. **Prime Consultant (Proponent – Architect/Urban Planner):**

INSERT:

- I. **Prime Consultant (Proponent – Architect and Urban Planner):**

5. At PA 1.1.3 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

INSERT:

1. For Stream 1, 50% of the bi-weekly team meetings can occur via videoconference. The cost of the videoconference should be accounted for in the Proponents price proposal. Key meetings and workshops must be attended by the Proponent and appropriate team members in-person. For Stream 2 and 3, all bi-weekly meetings should be attended in person.

6. At Submission Requirements and Evaluation, Section 3.1.8 Stream (Advocate Architect) Mandatory Experience, Item 4:

DELETE:

1. The reference project must be related to building type office space accommodation (Not engineering infrastructure, civil works or sports facility)

INSERT:

2. The reference project must be related to a building having any major occupancy defined under the National Building Code of Canada, with the exception of Groups A3, A4 (Arenas and Stadias) and Group F (other than laboratories classified as F2 and F3).

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003**7. At Stream 1 Required Services 4 STAGE FOUR: OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT of the Project Brief, Section 4.2 (French version only):****DELETE:****Rapport et plan de la salle des pas perdus au sous-sol**

En s'appuyant sur les efforts précédents, l'expert-conseil doit élaborer un programme fonctionnel préliminaire et des études conceptuelles pour la salle des pas perdus au sous-sol. Les études doivent répondre aux exigences et aux spécifications de la DGCP et des partenaires parlementaires. L'expert-conseil doit intégrer un examen des plans existants de toutes les infrastructures souterraines, cerner les zones de conflit potentielles avec la salle des pas perdus au sous-sol, évaluer les répercussions potentielles et proposer des mesures d'atténuation possibles. Selon la complexité, l'expert-conseil doit coordonner et diriger trois (3) ateliers pour recueillir la rétroaction de TPSGC et des intervenants afin de parvenir à une option privilégiée pour la salle des pas perdus. L'expert-conseil doit préparer un rapport sommaire à l'appui de l'option privilégiée pour la salle des pas perdus. Le plan définitif doit être coordonné avec le plan de visualisation.

INSERT :**Rapport et plan du réseau de couloirs de raccordement sous-terrains**

En s'appuyant sur les efforts précédents, l'expert-conseil doit élaborer un programme fonctionnel préliminaire et des études conceptuelles pour le réseau de couloirs de raccordement sous-terrains. Les études doivent répondre aux exigences et aux spécifications de la DGCP et des partenaires parlementaires. L'expert-conseil doit intégrer un examen des plans existants de toutes les infrastructures souterraines, cerner les zones de conflit potentielles avec le réseau de couloirs sous-terrains, évaluer les répercussions potentielles et proposer des mesures d'atténuation possibles. Selon la complexité, l'expert-conseil doit coordonner et diriger trois (3) ateliers pour recueillir la rétroaction de TPSGC et des intervenants afin de parvenir à une option privilégiée pour le réseau de couloirs de raccordement. L'expert-conseil doit préparer un rapport sommaire à l'appui de l'option privilégiée pour le réseau de couloirs de raccordement. Le plan définitif doit être coordonné avec le plan de visualisation.

DELETE :**Deliverables :**

12	Production de rapport	Salle des pas perdus au sous-sol	Electronique	Anglais
----	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------	---------

INSERT :**Deliverables :**

12	Production de rapport	Réseau de couloirs de raccordement sous-terrains	Electronique	Anglais
----	-----------------------	--	--------------	---------

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 003**PART THREE: BIDDER'S CONFERENCE ATTENDEES LIST**

Firm / Entreprise	Permission to List Firm as 'In Attendance' Publicly? / Autorisation d'inscrire votre entreprise comme "présente" publiquement?
Republic Architecture	Yes
Watson MacEwan Teramura Architects	Yes
Fotenn	Yes
CSP Security Consulting Inc.	Yes
Provencher Roy	Yes
Morrison Hershfield	Yes
Aecom	Yes
Diamond Schmitt / KWC Architects	Yes
Adjeleian Allen Rubeli Ltd	Yes
IBI Group Architects (Canada)	Yes
+VG Architects	Yes
Perkins + Will	Yes
WSP	Yes
Ojdrovic Engineering	Yes
DTAH	Yes
GRC Architects	Yes
Padolsky Architects	Yes
BPA	Yes
Cima+	Yes
Moriyama & Teshima Architects	Yes
Smith + Andersen	Yes
[in]tempo design studio	Yes
EVOQ Architecture inc.	Yes
Dialog	Yes
ERA Architects Inc.	Yes

Attendees that did not explicitly mark that they gave permission to be listed as in attendance are not included on this list.

Parties that wish to publicly disclose their interest in this Request For Proposal may submit their information for posting on the Buy & Sell portal at:

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/procurement-data/tender-notice/PW-PPS-021-26904/list-of-interested-suppliers/join-the-list-of-interested-suppliers>