Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Regional Manager/Real Property Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle du département(OCID)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Regional Manager/Real Property Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

Title - Sujet Electrical Engineering Service RFSO	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ754-191576/A	**Date** 2018-11-30
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20191576	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 003
File No. - N° de dossier PWL-8-41079 (023)	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$PWL-023-2412	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer **Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale**	2018-10-24
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2018-12-11**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Standard Time EST
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Lau, Karen	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** pwl023
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (416) 512-5297 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** (416) 512-5862
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: **Destination - des biens, services et construction:** Ontario Region	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required **Accusé de réception requis**	**Yes - Oui** ☐	**No - Non** ☐

The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.
Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.

Signature **Date**

Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print)
Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant.
(taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)

For the Minister - Pour le Ministre

Canada

Amendment No. 003

This amendment is being raised for 1) Extension of Time and 2) to provide responses to Requests for Clarification.

1) EXTENSION OF TIME

Notice is hereby given that the closing date for the reception of tenders previously due Thursday December 6, 2018 is extended to **14:00 hours, Tuesday December 11, 2018**.

2) REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

1. Please confirm that as long as 1 member of the proponent's team and engineering firm meets the licensing requirements under article 3.1.2, this meets the mandatory requirement.

   a) Under Senior Personnel article 3.2.4 c) and similarly under Project Personnel 3.2.5 c)
      i. The statement identifies "Professional accreditation", will the evaluators be interpreting this in both article 3.2.4 or 3.2.5 statement to mean "Professional Engineer", because professional accreditation does not mean P. Eng.
      ii. Will the evaluators deduct points for personnel in the category who are not a P. Eng
      iii. Please confirm if project personnel's accreditation such as, CET, CTech, P.Tech, RCDD, Eng.L , LEED, PMP, etc will be rated lower than a P.Eng with similar or less experience.

   b) Under Project Personnel 3.2.5 c) Project Personnel
      i) Please confirm if project personnel's accreditation such as, CET, CTech, P.Tech, RCDD, Eng.L , LEED, PMP, etc will be rated lower than a P.Eng with similar or less experience.
      ii) Will the evaluators deduct points for personnel in the category no being P.Eng, but have vast experience.

A1. All member of the proponent's team and engineering firm must meets the licensing requirements under article 3.1.2.

   a) i) Professional accreditation include P. Eng.
      ii) Yes, all members of the Proponent and Sub-Consultant should be a P.Eng.
      iii) Yes.

   b) i) See answer above for question 1a iii.
      ii) See answer above for question 1a iii.

2. Please confirm if the "professional accreditation" is the criteria for evaluation and it overrides the senior or project personnel's experience.

A2. Both "professional accreditation" under SRE 3.2.4 .2 c) and SRE 3.2.5.2 c); and senior or project

personnel's experience under SRE 3.2.4.2 b) and SRE 3.2.5.2 b) are part of the evaluation criteria.

3. Please confirm if "professional accreditation" can be removed as an evaluation criteria.

A3. No, it will not be removed.

4. How proponents should respond to Submission Requirements and Evaluation in the case where the Architectural and Structural Key Sub-Consultants/Specialists are not members of the same firm, but are NOT responding as a joint venture, and notwithstanding the definition of Proponent in General Instructions GI 1 which is:

"Proponent" means the person or entity (or, in the case of a joint venture, the persons or entities) submitting a proposal to provide services under a call-up resulting from a standing offer. It does not include parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the Proponent, or its sub-consultants.

a) With respect to SRE 3.2.2 specific subpoints a, b and c, should the prime consultant *include* the Key Sub-Consultants and Specialists in its response, or exclude them?

We has its own management structure and organization that is stand-alone from that of its intended Architectural and Structural Sub-Consultants who are their own separate firms yet will respond to call-ups under my Prime Consulting approach and as if they were a cohesive project team.

b) With respect to SRE 3.2.3 *Past Experience*, more to confirm, is PWGSC asking for five (5) total projects that are attributable to the Prime Consultant, or does it mean that each discipline – Electrical Engineering (Prime), Mechanical Engineering, Architectural and Structural – should respond with five (5) significant projects *each* for a total of twenty (20) significant projects completed over the last 5 years (i.e., 4 x 5 = 20)?

c) In the event GI 1 definition of "Proponent" holds, how then will the evaluation committee evaluate Proponents' sub-consultants/key specialists that the RFSO document asks for under Agreement Description, specifically AD 1.2 CONSULTANT TEAM and per Appendix C – Team Identification, clause 3 that states *"C.V's provided under Section C- Team Identification, <u>will not form part of the evaluation</u> or page limitation identified under 3.2 Rated Requirements section, and are to appear under the Appendix C only."*

A4. a) The Prime Consultant should include the Key Sub-Consultants and Specialist identified in the Team Identification Form in Appendix "C".

b) In SRE 3.2.3, we are seeking a maximum of five (5) significant projects completed over the last five (5) years by the Proponent, i.e. the Prime Consultant.

c) One (1) c.v. of senior personnel for each Sub-Consultant/Specialist of the Consultant Team under SRE 3.2.4, and one (1) c.v. of project personnel for each Sub-Consultant/Specialist of the Consultant Team which will perform the majority of the work resulting from the individual Call-ups under SRE 3.2.5 will be evaluated.

C.V. provided under the Appendix “C” Team Identification will not be evaluated as this section is for the Proponent to identify all of their proposed team members, which may compose of more than the ones under evaluation in SRE 3.2.4 and SRE 3.2.5. Proponents should clearly identify which C.V.s are for Appendix “C” and for SRE 3.2.4 and SRE 3.2.5.

All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain the same.