



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. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EP750-182231	Date 2018-09-20
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 2018-09-27	
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 007

This Amendment will be presented in two parts as follows:

1. Questions and Responses
2. Revisions to the Request For Proposal

PART ONE: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question 1:

With respect to Stream 3 (Advocate Architect) Mandatory Experience (mandatory criteria Item 4) - Considering AFD projects, DB/P3 (advocate architects) in the office accommodation market sector are very few and not that common, we humbly request that PSPC broaden the criteria to take into account relevant experiences with comparable building types/facilities (similar in scope and complexity - i.e., hospitals, courts and other similar facilities). We would like PSPC to confirm that these relevant comparable building types / facilities be included in the criteria and evaluated equally.

Response 1:

Refer to Amendment 3- Response to Questions 15.

Question 2:

As heritage consultants, are we required to hold FSC and DSC+IT?

Response 2:

The Proponent and Sub-consultant specialists identified in the SRE 3.1.5 1)a., which includes the Heritage Specialist, are required to have FSC Secret before Contract Award.

Question 3:

Does the RFP allow us to be sponsored prior to contract award by the prime consultant (or by the PSPC PM) to upgrade our security clearances?

Response 3:

The Contracting Authority will sponsor interested parties for security clearances as a part of this process. Obtaining security clearances can be a lengthy process, therefore PWGSC recommends interested suppliers apply for appropriate clearances as soon as possible by using a Request for Private Sector Organization Screening, which may be found here:

<https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/formulaires-forms/esosp-psos-eng.html>

PWGSC cannot guarantee requested security screening will be completed before the RFPs bid closing date, refer to response 24 for information on estimated timeframes.

Canada will not delay the award of the contract to allow the Proponent, any subconsultant, or personnel to meet the required security requirement detailed in SRE3.1.5.

Question 4:

Is it necessary to obtain site access clearance for employees **before** contract award?

Response 4:

No.

Question 5:

Based on our review of the RFP, it would appear that the client is looking for firms to enter into a joint venture in order to meet the mandatory requirements for all 3 streams. Would the client accept an association of consultants with a prime consultant rather than a joint venture in order to meet the mandatory requirements? Note that an association would refer to an organizational structure where entities are working together without incorporation, whereas a joint venture would typically have an agreement in place setting out individual participation in profits, liability, responsibilities and governance,

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

involving significant administrative time and expense. If the joint venture is incorporated, there would be further costs.

Response 5:

In the case of an association of consultants with a prime consultant, the evaluation committee will consider only the prime consultant to be The Proponent.

Question 6:

Section 3.1.5, Security Requirements on Page 5 of 41, it clearly states that "...failure to comply (with required security information), will render the proposal non-responsive. Canada will not delay the award of the contract to allow Proponent to meet the required security requirement."

At the proponent's briefing it was clarified that the Proponent, the Sub-consultant/ Specialists and the Key Discipline Leads do not require security clearances at bid closing and that PSPC would facilitate any security clearances at award of contract. These two approaches appear to be in contradiction. Please clarify.

Response 6:

The security requirements detailed in SRE3.1.5 must be met before **contract award** as stated in RFP. Further security clearances required to fulfill the mandate of the contract, as per SC1, may be sought after award of the contract. Please also see Section SI6 related to security clearances and Task Authorizations.

Question 7:

With respect to providing more details within 60 days of award and then implementing the Aboriginal Participation Plan (APP), could PSPC clarify that the preparation of the APP would be considered stream 2 or stream 3 services based on a task authorization. Should the Proponent's proposed implementation of the APP impact stream 1, than this aspect would remain as part of the fixed fee? Please confirm.

Response 7:

Implementation of Proponents proposed draft Aboriginal Participation Plan (APP), annual reporting on the APP, as well as the development of a final APP will not be compensated independently. Based on the finalized APP, Canada may negotiate an incentive program, the type/value will be solely at the Crown's discretion and negotiated post Contract Award.

Question 8:

In preparation for the Interview and to reserve dates in advance, could PSPC advise as to the date (week) of the interview, as well as whether any specific key personnel are required to attend as part of the mandated 4?

Response 8:

The date of the interview will be confirmed once the contract closing date is final. As per Section 4.2 of the SRE, the presenters must be personnel that will form part of the Stream 1 Consultant team and include individuals who will present/lead during the development and implementation of the project. It is up to the proponent to determine who those persons are.

Question 9:

In preparation for the Interview, could PSPC allow 5 personnel to attend?

Response 9:

A maximum of four (4) representatives per Proponent will be allowed.

Question 10:

In order to prepare a fixed price for stream 1, could PSPC provide additional details and requirements for the National Engagement Plan?

Response 10:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

It is up to the Proponent to propose a Public Engagement Plan that reaches nationally along with the associated cost to implement the Plan. Please note that the draft Public Engagement Plan is being evaluated as part of the Technical proposal for its ingenuity, creativity and comprehensiveness as per Section 3.5.1 of the SRE.

Question 11:

With reference to RP1 through RP6, it refers to projects with construction values “in 2017 dollars”. Could PSPC please provide the escalation chart that describes the factors you are using for this escalation?

Response 11:

See revision in Part 2 for escalation chart to use.

Question 12:

With reference to RP1 stream 1 rated projects, we strongly recommend PSPC include Municipalities as a relevant “institutional client” within a “campus setting”, since municipalities have diverse properties that need to resolve issues such as employment and workplace campus and security issues over large urban areas with direct interaction and impact on neighboring institutions and public entities very similar to Parliament Hill and the LTVP.

Response 12:

It is confirmed that municipalities will be considered institutional clients.

Question 13:

With reference to all scoring matrices, we would like clarification on how PSPC is planning on marking the projects and people. As an example, RP1 on page 11 of 41, category “relevance” at 100% scoring is worth 15 points per project. Within this category there are 4 aspects that are clearly indicated that must be met to achieve the 100% marking.

Question: will PSPC mark each of the 4 aspects out of 3.75 (15pts/4)? If for example three of the four points meet 100% scoring and one of these points is not met, but is met in the 80% category, will the proponent’s score for that one aspect be reduced to 80% of 3.75, or a score of 3 for this one point? This would give an overall score for RP1 category “relevance” of $(3 \times 3.75) + 3 = 14.25$ out of the possible 15 points? Or, will the whole category worth 15 points be marked as 80%, or with a score of 12? Or will PSPC mark in a different manner?

Response 13:

The rating methodology that will be used by PWGSC to evaluate all rated requirements in SRE 3.2 is a best fit methodology. Refer to SRE 3.2 on of the SRE. A third party fairness monitor has been engaged to ensure fairness and consistency.

Question 14:

With reference to PD 4.1.2 Stream 1 Consultant Services, the RFP requires that we carry translation services. Due to the unknown quantities of translations and the potential timeframe of the project, we are unable to get fixed firm costs for translations. Since this has little bearing on the ability of a team to perform the work and as stated at the proponent’s briefing that bidders are highly encouraged NOT to lowball their fees and hourly rates, we strongly recommend that translations costs be a disbursement to the contract. Alternatively, please provide a fixed scope of work/ deliverables that the translation specialists are bidding.

Response 14:

Specific to Stream 1, the scope of work and deliverables have been provided as part of the Project Brief including materials requiring translation. On this basis, the cost of translation is included in the fixed fee required to complete all work associated with Stream 1.

Question 15:

With reference to SRE 6 price of Services, page 39 of 41, you indicate that the prices will be added together and that “all price proposals which are greater than 25% above the average price...will be set

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

aside...” and disqualified. . In the example provided, the total price proposals is \$47,700,000 and the average price of the four proposals is \$11,925,000. 25% greater than this average price is \$14,906,250. Therefore Proposal D would be disqualified. Please confirm.

Response 15:

Confirmed.

Question 16:

With reference to SRE 6 price of Services, page 39 of 41, and with reference to the proponent's briefing meeting where Mr. Bennett strongly discouraged proponents from submitting lowball fees, I would suggest that your formula of disqualifying only high bids greater than 25% above the average prices submitted is in contradiction to the statement made at the proponent's briefing meeting. The appropriate formula to avoid lowball fees and our recommendation would be to disqualify any bids 25% below the average bid price. Please consider this and advise if a modification to the evaluation formula is warranted.

Response 16:

PWGSC will not be disqualifying proposals offering lower pricing. PWGSC, at its sole discretion, may audit the Consultants time charged and time recording system among other things to ensure that rates, if low, are not being made up through unrealistic levels of efforts.

Question 17:

With reference to PD 4.1.2 Stream 1 Consultant Services, we note that the inclusion of geotechnical engineering services and environmental engineering services is required. Please note that the Ontario Association of Architects strongly discourages these services being carried by Ontario architects since our insurance does not cover the liability of these specialists. We recommend that PSPC carries these specialists separately.

Response 17:

Geotechnical and environmental engineering services are required per the current RFP.

Question 18:

With reference to Appendix C – Price Proposal Form, hourly rates table:

- a. we are finding the grouping of all the various disciplines is challenging to find a blended hourly rate that everyone can accept. Can PSPC consider revising the hourly rates sheet to allow for smaller groups of disciplines?
- b. The estimated hours column is set at 1000 hours for everyone. This does not provide any factoring of level of importance or sense as to who will be required to provide more services than others. Is this the intent of the bidform?
- c. Requiring a fixed hourly rate for everyone that includes travel and all disbursements for a large group consultants is extremely challenging. Again, so that no one lowballs their fees or tries a “bait and switch” approach to their key personnel, we highly recommend that PSPC do not make travel costs a competitive component to this bid, rather disburse travel costs separately using treasury board standards, in particular for streams 2 and streams 3 services, due to the very undefined scopes of work. This will allow all proponents to bid the project on a level field and ensure that expertise that may be in other provinces will be attending the necessary meetings and providing the required input when PSPC and the team desire.

Response 18:

- a. No change at this time.
- b. Correct.
- c. Fixed hourly rates are to include travel time and/or expenses and will not be reimbursed separately. Refer to R1230D (2016-01-28), GC 5.12 – Disbursements.

Question 19:

Would PSPC please make the proponent's powerpoint presentation available to all bidders?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

Response 19:

Refer to Amendment 3 – Response to Question 7.

Question 20:

With reference to page 12 of 41, Scale RP1, category Project Management under column 100%, the second criteria indicates *“multi-disciplinary team was composed of a minimum of 6 key discipline specialists listed in this RFP in section 3.1.2.b)”*. The third criteria in this same category of Project Management then goes on to state *“a minimum of 1 of the listed sub-consultant entities...are...personnel identified in the RFP (reference 3.1.2 b) and 3.1.2 c)”*.

Question: please confirm to achieve 100% of the points for Project Management category under RP1 our project need not have the same 6 named team key discipline specialists or firms we have proposed for this project, rather the requirement is to demonstrate the complexity of the project through managing a minimum of 6 of the same discipline specialists that are listed in section 3.1.2 b).

Response 20:

That is correct, to score 100, the project requires the involvement of 6 of the disciplines listed (ie to demonstrate MANAGEMENT Capacity). In addition, as stated, at least one of the referenced project sub-consultants or project key individuals, shall be identified/cross referenced under 3.1.2 b and c.

Question 21:

With reference to page 17 of 41, scale RP3, category Relevance, column 100%, third criteria states *“Project is significantly over \$50M in construction (2017 dollars)”*. The dictionary definition defines significantly as being “worthy of attention”. Could PSPC provide some clarification on what they feel is significant or worthy of attention?

Response 21:

See revision in Part 2 of Amendment.

Question 22:

With reference to Appendix A item VIII Key Subconsultants/ Specialists, Civil Engineering, aligns with 3.1.2 b) on page 3 of 41, yet not with 3.1.2 c) 13. key disciplines on page 4 of 41 which identifies the key individual as Lead Transportation Engineer. Is this correct, or should this key discipline and key individual align? Please confirm.

Response 22:

The Lead Civil Engineer and Lead Transportation Engineer are two distinct roles. Of the two, only the Lead Transportation Engineer is being evaluated under SRE 3.1.2 c).

Question 23:

There was mention at the bidders meeting that those sub-consultants that don't require security clearance upon entering the contract can be sponsored by PWGSC afterwards. I just wanted to confirm that this is correct, and that those sub-consultants are personnel *not* named in the table listed on Page 5 and 6 in in Section SR3: Submission Requirements and Evaluation.

Response 23:

Security clearances that are required to complete the mandate of the contract and are not described in SRE 3.1.5 may be sought after contract award.

Question 24:

We have a few potential JV partners who are interested in the project but only have Provincial security clearance at this time. If they applied for FSC Secret and Secret Security status this week, would they be able to obtain Clearance in time for the award of the contract?

Response 24:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

For information on security clearances, please refer to <https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/organisation-organization/enquete-screening-eng.html#s3>. It indicates that the length of the screening process depends on many factors, including completeness of forms and the complexity of the screening required, however that the estimated timelines for organization screenings are:

- Designated organization screening: up to 6 months
- Facility security clearance: 6 months or more

Additional physical security clearances will add to these timeframes.

Question 25:

If the Prime Consultant is composed of joint venture partners, must each of the joint venture proponent members have Organization Security Clearance? Can all Joint Members be covered under one Organization Security Clearance number?

Response 25:

If the Proponent is a Joint Venture, either all members of the Joint Venture must meet the Security Requirements in SRE3.1.5 before contract award or the Joint Venture itself must meet the Security Requirements in SRE3.1.5 before contract award.

Question 26:

Prevention of conflicts of interest

The Notice of Interest published last January contained the following clause regarding potential conflicts of interest:

"In order to protect the integrity of future procurement processes, it is advised that Canada may reject proposals from the Consultant and Stream 3 Key Sub Consultants and Specialists of this contract (please refer to Appendix 1 under Stream 3 for clarification) for future projects utilizing the services of the Stream 3 Advocate Architect. In Canada's opinion, the services would give, or would appear to give, the appearance of an unfair advantage given the specialized role of the Advocate Architect."

- a. We did not find the that clause in the Call for Proposals. Is it still relevant? If so, could you please clarify its scope?
- b. In addition to my first question sent this Thursday, August 9, regarding potential conflicts of interest, would you be so kind as to tell us whether that clause would also apply to engineers (all specialties)?

Response 26:

Refer to Amendment 3-response to Question 3.

Question 27:

Aboriginal Participation Plan (APP)

In the Submission Requirements and Evaluation (p.38 of 45), an Aboriginal Participation Plan (APP) is mentioned.

Is this Plan (IPP) a part of the Public Engagement Plan mentioned on page 50 of the Project Brief or should it be the subject of a separate document and strategy?

Response 27:

It is a separate document and strategy.

Question 28:

Aboriginal Engagement

On page 48 of the Project Brief, it is mentioned that the Consultant must propose 5 one-day bilingual workshops, which will include discussions with Aboriginal communities.

- a. Do the 5 workshops target only Aboriginal participation or are they open to all?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

b. Are the 5 workshops part of the Aboriginal Participation Plan (APP)?

Response 28:

- a. Aboriginal participants only.
- b. No.

Question 29:

Planning summits

On page 50 of the Project Brief, it is stated that the Consultant must plan, coordinate and facilitate three planning summits, each of which must target a specific group. In addition, it is stated that one of these summits will be public.

- a. Other than young people, have other specific groups been identified or is this at the Consultant's discretion?
- b. Are we to understand that the other two summits will be by invitation only?
- c. If so, how is Canada-wide participation planned for these summits? What are the expectations in this regard?

Response 29:

- a. The Public Engagement Plan must reach as many Canadians as possible across Canada.
- b. Two of the three summits are by invitation only. It is up to the consultant to propose a public participation strategy as part of the Public Engagement Plan.
- c. See Response 11.

Question 30:

Number of meetings/workshops

In various places in the Required Services section of the Project Brief, the number of meetings mentioned in the text differs from the number of meetings stated in the Deliverables Table. For example, in the Stage 4 Deliverables (cf. p.60 and 61), the deliverables table mentions five workshops, while the text talks about 2-3 workshops on security, 3 workshops on the landscaping plan, 3 workshops on the concourse plan, and 2 workshops on universal accessibility (totalling at least 11 workshops).

Which information is more relevant, the text or the table?

Response 30 :

Please see Part 2. The expectation is that there will be 5 workshops dedicated to developing the options. In addition to those 5 workshops, the consultant will lead separate workshops to develop the supporting studies on security, landscape plan, concourse plan, universal accessibility. The total number of workshops includes both options development and development of supporting studies.

Question 31:

Visitor experience

One of the strategic directions on p. 12 of the Project Brief is "Enriching the Visitor Experience." In addition, it is noted on page 54 of the Project Brief that [TRANSLATION] "the visitor experience requirement will require consultation with a larger group including parliamentary partners, Canadian Heritage, stakeholders, the public, Aboriginal communities and special interest groups." que « l'exigence relative à l'expérience du visiteur exigera la consultation d'un groupe plus vaste comprenant les partenaires parlementaires, le ministère du Patrimoine canadien, les intervenants, le public, les collectivités autochtones et des groupes d'intérêt spéciaux ». The deliverable product to this effect in the table on page 56 mentions a case study.

- a. Could you be more specific about the expectations for this case study?
- b. To define the visitor experience, do we have to plan satisfaction studies, case studies etc for the mandate?
- c. Is the case study to be planned in addition to the five (Aboriginal) workshops and three summits?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

Response 31 :

- a. The case study should inform the consultants recommendations for new standards, guidelines and best practices for visitor experience.
- b. It is up to the Consultant to propose how this project requirement will be satisfied.
- c. Correct.

Question 32 :

Public information session.

Stages 4.1, 5 and 6 of component 1 provide for a public information session. However, report, consultation or meeting deliverables are not mentioned.

Do we have to plan this deliverable in three stages?

Response 32:

Correct.

Question 33:

On pages 146/346, it is indicated : [TRANSLATION] “the Consultant must provide complete architecture, engineering and specialized services through internal expertise or that of specialists or both in the following areas.” The table that follows (p.147/346) explains the expertise in “Aboriginal affairs.” What is the expected profile regarding this (law professional)?

Response 33:

Aboriginal expertise referenced in the Project Brief, and specifically the Indigenous Affairs Specialist is expected to include a wide range of services required to support the project objectives, and specifically to ensure the proper interface with varied aboriginal interest groups.

Question 34:

SRE 3: Section 3.1.2, c) identifies the Key Sub consultant/Specialist Firms and Key Discipline Individuals; however the listed roles do not match the tables in Section 3.1.5 Security Requirement and the list of Individuals in Section 3.4. Could PWGSC please clarify- the roles required for this project?

Response 34:

The Key Discipline Individuals listed in Section 3.1.2c) and Section 3.4 represent those individuals that will be evaluated as part of the rated technical score under section RP1 to RP3 (Rated Projects) and section RT1 to RT3 (Rated Technical).

Section 3.1.5.b deals specifically with security clearances which due to the nature of the work extend to other members of the multi-disciplinary team in addition to those being evaluated and rated as part of Sections RP1 to RP3 and RT1 to RT3.

Question 35:

Section 3.5.2 Understanding of the Project relevant to Stream 3. Could PWGSC please confirm if this should be “relevant to Streams 2 and 3” which are both architectural elements. If so, the chart in Section 4.1 Technical Rating should be amended to indicate “3.3.5 RT3 Understanding of the Project – Streams 2 and 3”. Please clarify.

Response 35:

Section 3.5.2 will only review understanding of the Project relative to Stream 3.

Question 36:

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 36:

See Amendment 4.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

Question 37:

Considering that proposed team members (cleared with their individual cleared firms) will have secret clearance, please confirm the Joint Venture Proponent firm formed for this opportunity does not need its own Corporate Security/CISD number?

Response 37:

Please see response to Question 25.

Question 38:

Referring to Stream 2 (General Architectural & Engineering Services) Mandatory Experience, a pass/fail criterion requires that the project was completed on behalf of a Federal government department. Could PSPC confirm that a Federal government department from another similar jurisdiction (e.g., General Service Administration in the US Federal government) meets this requirement?

Response 38:

Federal government department includes federal-level equivalents in countries other than Canada.

Question 39:

We will be responding to this rfp as a Sub-consultant. We are of the understanding that we are responsible as a company to protect personal information of our employees, e.g. dates of birth. We are to be a part of a multi-disciplinary team, and thus will be submitting our information to a Proponent first, who will then forward the information to PSPC. The protected personal information would thus be available to various team members of the proponent. As an alternative can an addendum be issued to clarify that our employee's CISD number only is required, with employee names.

Response 39:

Appendix F amended in part 2.

Question 40:

The RFP also requires us to identify the security level, which we have been advised by CISD should not be provided, but rather PSPC can obtain the necessary information from the CISD number provided. We can provide a general statement stating the personnel holds the required level or higher. Please provide an addendum.

Response 40:

Appendix F amended in part 2.

Question 41:

Given the scale of this Call for Proposals and the potential restriction to bid on projects related to this mandate (question asked in a previous email), we were wondering if it was possible to bid under Stream 1 only. Many potential partners in architecture hesitate to bid because of these aspects. This would therefore allow us to put together a highly qualified team whose strengths would perfectly match the required services under Stream 1.

Response 41:

No.

Question 42:

If there is no possibility to bid under Stream 1 only, is it possible for architecture services to be provided by different firms: one for Stream 1 and another for Streams 2 and 3?

Response 42:

Interested suppliers may choose to partner with other firms in Joint Venture to offer the full range of services being required of the Proponent in the RFP, including Streams 1, 2 and 3.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

Question 43 :

Finally, in order to best respond to the CFP and to put together the best team possible, we were wondering if it would be possible to get a 2-week extension?

Response 43:

Please see Amendment 4.

Question 44 :

With regard to putting together our team, we have a question:

Will team members (consultants and sub-consultants) be authorized to propose their services for future projects directly or indirectly related to this mandate?

Response 44:

Refer to Amendment 3 response to Question 3.

Question 45:

We have a number of projects that are extremely pertinent to the RFP process (and would represent high added value to Canada) but some of these fall outside the 10 year window. Will Canada increase the age of projects that are eligible for consideration to 15 years?

Response 45:

The timeframe for eligible projects remains unchanged.

Question 46:

Some team members have existing contracts and standing offer agreements with Canada within the area of the prospective work. Are any firms excluded from participating in this rfp on this basis?

Response 46:

Refer to Amendment 6, response 8.

Question 47:

We understand that the prime consultant would be excluded from the opportunity to bid projects responding to Performance Specification documents prepared as part of Stream 3. It seems unreasonable that this restriction apply to the entirety of the sub-consulting team – but this is not clear in the RFP. Please clarify who will be excluded from future work in the project area associated with Stream 3 as a result of accepting this contract.

Response 47:

Refer to Amendment 3 – response to Question 3.

Question 48:

3.3.1 identifies a total of 3 projects. Is it 3 per discipline (Urban Design, Landscape Architecture), a total of 6? Or is it up to the team to select the best 3 projects from these two disciplines for this section?

Response 48:

A total of 3 projects will be evaluated

Question 49:

3.3.2 identifies a total of 3 projects for the disciplines of Structural, Mechanical and Electrical Engineering. It also identifies further criteria for those 3 projects including one for compliance role and another two related to stream 2. The unintended consequence of following the additional criteria is that if a project (say Structural) is put forward by a specialist as the representative compliance project. The Mechanical and Electrical consultants won't have a compliance project. Should this be 3 per discipline (Structural, Mechanical and Electrical), a total of 9 to match the additional criteria?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

Response 49:

As stated in the SRE, it is a total of 3 reference projects which include all referenced disciplines.

Question 50:

We have a question regarding the eligibility of projects we are submitting to represent experience in Stream 3. We have completed the performance specifications for Advocate Architect services for a project relevant to the assignment – however the realization of the construction project is still in progress. Is this project eligible for consideration?

Response 50:

The project would not satisfy the requirement the mandatory Stream 3 experience requirement (see SRE 3.1.8 1. However, the project would receive consideration as a rated project under SRE 3.2.3 and would be scored according to the RP3 scale (page 17 of 41).

Question 51:

The evaluation of pricing of services has a strong bias to lowest cost. The scope of work contemplated by Stream 1 is, by its nature, somewhat open ended, with the potential for a proponent – by design or interpretation - to table a very low fixed fee based on a minimized level of effort. We are concerned that Canada will not receive proposals that contemplate the same level of effort for Stream 1, and that a very low cost fixed fee proposal for Stream 1 will skew results unfairly. It appears there is a strong incentive to scope the Stream 1 work to achieve lowest cost, rather than price to provide the level of effort required to provide Canada the guidance it requires. Will Canada consider a mechanism to mitigate this issue? For example – putting aside a fee proposal that less than 25 percent below the average price.

Response 51:

Refer to response to Questions 15 and 16.

Question 52:

Notwithstanding the advice that PSPC reserves the right to audit time sheets we are also concerned that evaluation of hourly rates will be skewed to favour unrealistic rates. Will Canada consider a mechanism to mitigate this issue? For example a process by which the hourly rates of the highest ranked team are audited for a reasonable profit level in advance of award of the contract.

Response 52:

If competitive rates are not achieved through the competitive process, PWGSC reserves the right to enter into negotiations with the recommended proponent.

Question 53:

In the submission requirements document, p. 2 of 41, you list the items not included in the 80-page limit. Will you consider adding Front and Back Cover, Divider Pages and Table of Contents to that list please?

Response 53:

Refer to Amendment 3 response to Question 6. In addition, front and back cover and table of contents will not count towards the 80-page limit. See revision in Part 2.

Question 54:

Regarding 3.1.7 Stream 2 Mandatory Experience, requirement #5: "The project was completed on behalf of a federal government department". Could you please reconsider this requirement to include projects completed on behalf of a provincial government department?

Response 54:

No, the mandatory requirement is maintained.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

Question 55:

Regarding proposal format: there is no mention of tab pages/dividers between sections, would you accept their use and if so: use of colour photos on dividers? Use of heavy weight eco-friendly paper for cover and dividers?

Response 55:

Refer to Amendment – Response to Question 6. The use of heavy weight eco-friendly paper for cover and dividers is acceptable.

Question 56:

Regarding 3.4 b): "Degree of involvement in proposed role". Can you please specify what you mean?

Response 56:

The intent is to be able to assess from the CV, the extent of past experience of the proposed individual in the role that they are proposed to fulfill under this contracts mandate.

Question 57:

Under 3.1.7 Stream 2 Mandatory Experience, the RFP asks for the Proponent to demonstrate "experience in providing a broad range of multi-disciplinary architectural and engineering services." Does this question mean that the Proponent must have been directly responsible for delivering all of these services, or could the services have been delivered by a subconsultant acting under the Proponent's direction as Prime Consultant?

Response 57:

See revision in Part 2.

Question 58:

Is there an exclusivity policy? Is a sub-consultant, discipline specialist or consultant authorized to be part of several teams?

Response 58:

Refer to response 2 in Amendment 4.

Question 59:

How can I find the documents in Appendix C?

Response 59:

The list of documents in Appendix C will be made available to the successful proponent only.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

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 RATED REQUIREMENTS – RATED PROJECTS (RP) COMPARABLE PROJECTS RELEVANT EXPERIENCE – PROPONENT**, following first paragraph of this section:

INSERT:

The following escalation chart, “Building Construction Price Index (BCPI), Non-Residential, Canada” is to be used to calculate the “2017 dollars” construction value of reference projects. Source: Statistics Canada Table 18-10-0135-01 Building construction price indexes, by type of building.

Year	BCPI
	Canada
2007	84.9
2008	93.6
2009	88.1
2010	87.7
2011	90.9
2012	93.5
2013	94.3
2014	95.6
2015	96.5
2016	97.5
2017	100

Formula for Calculating 2017 Escalated Cost:

2017 Construction Cost = (100/BCPI Year X) x Construction Cost @ Year X

Example:

Reference project was completed in 2009 at a cost of \$17,457,930

2017 Construction Cost = (100/88.1) * \$17,457,930 = \$19,902,040

2. At **Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.2.3, RP3 – Achievement of Proponent on Projects relevant to Stream 3, Scale RP3, Relevance criterion, 100% :**

DELETE :

Project is significantly over \$50 million in construction value (2017 dollars).

INSERT:

Project is over \$65 million in construction value (2017 dollars).

3. At the **Project Brief, at Required Services 4, Stage Four: Options Development, Deliverables:**

DELETE:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007**Section in its entirety.****INSERT:**

RS4	Deliverable (all deliverables must be provided in draft and final version)	Title	Format	Language
Options Development				
1	Three (3) Concept Plan Options/Models Support by Views as Listed Above	Concept Plans	Electronic (PWGSC to specify software format)	English
2	5 workshop presentations	Workshop (presentation tailored for each workshop)	PowerPoint	Bilingual
3	Report	Options Summary Report	Electronic	English
Supporting Studies				
4	Report	Transportation Impact Study	Electronic	English
5	Report	Transportation Demand Management Study	Electronic	English
6	Report	Parking Utilization Study	Electronic	English
7	Report	Geotechnical Conditions/Slope Stability	Electronic	English
8	Report	Site Servicing Study	Electronic	English
9	Report	Security Strategy	Electronic	English
10	3 workshop Presentations for Security Strategy	Workshop (presentation tailored for each workshop)	Powerpoint	Bilingual
11	Plan	Landscape and Open Space Plan/ Grading Plan and Landscape Material	Electronic (PWGSC to specify software format)	English
12	3 workshop Presentations	Workshop (presentation tailored for each workshop)	Powerpoint	Bilingual
13	Plan	Public Space Plan	Electronic (PWGSC to specify software format)	English
14	Report	Underground concourse	Electronic	English

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

15	Plan	Underground concourse	Electronic (PWGSC to specify software format)	English
16	3 workshop Presentations for Underground Concourse Report	Workshop (presentation tailored for each workshop)	Powerpoint	Bilingual
17	Report	Universal Accessibility	Electronic	English
18	Plan	Universal Accessibility	Electronic (PWGSC to specify software format)	English
19	2 workshop Presentations for Universal Accessibility Report	Workshop (presentation tailored for each workshop)	Powerpoint	Bilingual
20	Report	Strategic Environmental Assessment	Electronic	English
21	Meeting Agendas/Minutes		Electronic	English

4. At SRE 4.0: Evaluation and Rating, Technical Rating,

DELETE:
Section in its entirety

INSERT:

Criteria	Weight Factor	Max Raw Score (MRS)	Max Weighted Score (WS)
EXPERIENCE OF THE PROPONENT			
3.2.1 RP1 - Achievements of Proponent - Stream 1	3.0	150	450
3.2.2 RP2 - Achievements of Proponent - Stream 2	3.0	150	450
3.2.3 RP3 - Achievements of Proponent - Stream 3	3.0	150	450
EXPERIENCE KEY SUB-CONSULTANTS / SPECIALISTS			
3.3.1 RP4 Achievements of Key Sub-consultants and/or Specialists Stream 1	1.5	150	225
3.3.2 RP5 Achievements of Key Sub-consultants and/or Specialists Stream 2 and 3	2.0	150	300
EXPERIENCE OF KEY DISCIPLINE INDIVIDUALS			
3.4 RT1 Experience of Key Discipline Individuals on Past Projects	3.0	130	390
UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT			
3.5.1 RT2 Understanding of the Project - Stream 1	1.5	100	150
3.5.2 RT3 Understanding of the Project - Stream 3	1.5	100	150
MANAGEMENT OF SERVICES			
3.6.1 RT4 Team Composition/Org Structure/Capacity	1.0	100	100

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 007

3.6.2 RT5 PM Approach and Methodology	1.0	100	100
3.6.3 RT6 Work Plan and Scheduling	1.0	100	100
TOTAL POINTS			2865
TECHNICAL RATING (TR) = TOTAL POINTS DIVIDED BY 44.07692			65

5. 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:

- Front cover, back cover and table of contents

6. At Appendix F - Information Related to Security Requirements,

DELETE:

Appendix in its entirety.

INSERT attached revised **Appendix F - Information Related to Security Requirements:**

7. At SRE 3.1.7 Stream 2 (General Architectural & Engineering Services) Mandatory Experience,

DELETE:

The proposal must demonstrate the Proponent's experience in providing a broad range of multi-disciplinary architectural and engineering services by providing a reference project meeting the following mandatory requirements:

INSERT:

The proposal must demonstrate the Proponent's experience in providing and/or coordinating a broad range of multi-disciplinary architectural and engineering services by providing a reference project meeting the following mandatory requirements:

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED