



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Regional Manager/Real Property  
Contracting/PWGSC  
Ontario Region, Tendering Office  
10th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M2N 6A6  
Toronto  
Ontario  
M2N 6A6

**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**

Address Enquiries to:  
E-mail: Lauren.Woodhall@pwgsc.gc.ca

**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  
10th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M2N 6A6  
Ontario

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Architectural Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EQ754-193417/A	<b>Date</b> 2019-05-22
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EQ754-193417	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWL-8-41133 (035)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWL-035-2451	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale	
2019-04-15	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2019-06-11</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Woodhall, Lauren	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwl035
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (416) 230-9083 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> Ontario Region	
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> 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**

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b>	<b>No - Non</b>
<b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
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)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

## **Solicitation Amendment 002**

This amendment is being raised to 1) incorporate an Extension of Time for the receipt of proposals, and 2) provide responses to Requests for Clarification.

### **1. Extension of Time**

Notice is hereby given that the closing date for the reception of proposals previously due Tuesday, May 28, 2019 is extended to **14:00 hours, Tuesday June 11, 2019.**

### **2. Requests for Clarification**

**Q2.** SRE 3.2.1.2 b) asks for our “proposed typical work breakdown structure”. A WBS, by definition is specific to a particular project. The WBS for a study will be fundamentally different than one for a design and construction project. The WBS for a design and construction project involving renovation will be very different than one for all new construction. There is simply no such thing as a “typical” WBS. We can provide a sample WBS from an actual project to illustrate our competence to produce them.

We suggest that the requirement be revised to read:” b) a typical work breakdown structure from a past project (similar to those contemplated by this Standing Offer) to demonstrate methods for establishing resources, schedule and level of effort;”

Alternatively, given that a WBS is required for each of the Hypothetical Projects, perhaps they can be considered to be a sufficient demonstration of abilities. In this case the WBS diagram could be removed from SER 3.2.1.2. Consider revising the requirement to read: “b) approach to assigning resources, scheduling time and assessing level of effort utilizing a work breakdown structure,”

**A2.** SRE 3.2.1 will remain as stated.

**Q3.** SRE 3.2.3 ask for five projects completed over the past seven years. On past PSPC Standing Offers we have found that 60% of the call-ups are for studies and 40% involve design and construction. The phrase “requiring a full scope of services” suggests only design and construction type projects. We presume that PSPC will accept a combination of studies and design and construction projects for evaluation. Please confirm this.

We suggest the requirement be revised, in part, to read ”Demonstration that over at least the past seven (7) years, the Proponent has participated in a range of projects (including both studies and design and construction projects) and that these projects have involved an appropriate range of services in accordance with the Required Services (RS) section.”

**A3.** A range of projects may be submitted for evaluation under this criteria. SRE 3.2.3 will remain as stated.

**Q4.** SRE 3.2.6 – Hypothetical Project 1

We need clarification of the sentence “Your firm has been asked to meet with the DND team to prepare the scope of work that will form the Terms of Reference to secure the end-state design of the project requirements.” The intent is unclear and it can be interpreted two ways. A TOR, which in part identifies a detailed scope of work, is provided for a prospective team of architects and engineers to rely upon in the preparation of a fee proposal. It is not usually created after the fact.

Are we engaged to work with DND only to assist in the preparation of a TOR that will be used as part of a RFP process to select another team of architects and engineers to undertake the design and construction project?

or

Are we engaged to undertake the design and construction project and as part of that process validate/finalize the scope of work that was identified in the original TOR?

We ask this because the list of questions for the preparation of a TOR for the purposes of engaging another team of architects and engineers is very different from those that would be posed to validate/finalize the scope of work in a design and construction project.

**A4.** In Hypothetical Project 1 the work required is to prepare a ToR that will be used as part of an RFP process.

**Q5.** SRE 3.2.6 – Hypothetical Project 2

We need clarification of the sentence “Consultant to review CARQ, Functional program and existing documents for the building to prepare Fees, Deliverables, Schedule, Construction Budget-Class D.”

From the description it seems that we, as the consultant, would already have a contract in place to do the work. Why would we be asked to “prepare Fees”?

A Construction Budget – Class D is usually produced at the outset of a project and before any significant design is done. Class C, B and A estimates are done as the project progresses to tender. Are we to assume this project is only a study?

We suggest this be revised to read “Consultant to review CARQ, Functional program and existing documents for the building to prepare Deliverables, Schedules and Estimates.”

**A5.** In this hypothetical project you are responding to the request for a call-up and would need to prepare fees based on the review of the scope of work provided. You would be required to assign personnel and determine the level of effort using the rates provided in the Standing Offer agreement. The project is not only a study and should be responded to as a full project.

**Q6.** Appendix C – Team Identification:

Each of the 12 disciplines identified has 5 categories of personnel identified. The form refers to “Key Individuals” but also mentions “Category of Personnel (i.e. Principal, Senior, Intermediate)”. This suggests that only these three categories are considered “key” personnel. This would generate, with only one named person per the three categories at total of 36 CV’s that need to be prepared and included. Given that most disciplines have a pool of personnel that fit into these classifications we may find ourselves with two to five persons to identify and this translates into 72 to 180 CVs to be produced – none of which are evaluated or scored.

Please note that our team has more than 400 personnel in total, any of whom could be assigned to the call-ups.

We fail to see any reasonable need for this information and are mindful of the amount of time it would take us to prepare.

Might we suggest that the individuals identified are restricted to the 26 Senior and Project Personnel identified under SRE 3.2.4 and 3.2.5. Given that our submission will demonstrate their expertise and experience (essentially a CV), then the Appendix C simply needs to identify their provincial licensing status as may be applicable.

On past RFSOs with PWGSC in Ontario Region and the NCR these added CVs were not required.

**A6.** CVs should be provided for each identified team member as stated in Appendix C Team Identification.

**Q7.** The RFSO indicates how to calculate the distance that travel-related expenses will be based on, but neither the RFSO nor the referenced Travel Directive provide clarification on other travel-related issues. For example:

- a. To be claimed as disbursement, are travel, meal and accommodation expenses subject to a minimum travel distance from the applicable PSPC Office or Consultant Office to the project?
- b. Would the distance used to determine these expenses always be based on the project location, or would some other location, i.e. nearest PSPC office, be used for tasks (i.e. meeting with PSPC during design) where travel is to somewhere other than the project site?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EQ754-193417/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
PWL035

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
EQ754-193417

File No. - N° du dossier  
PWL-8-41133

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

c. Are there specific criteria to determine when car rental charges are legitimate (as opposed to private car use), or when train/air travel are allowed?

- A7.** a. No, travel expenses are not subject to a minimum travel distance.
- b. Travel-related expenses associated with the delivery of services will be calculated from the applicable government location and/or from the Consultant's closest branch office to the project site, whichever is closer.
- c. Car rental charges will not be reimbursed. Only the applicable kilometric rate will apply. Reimbursement for air and rail travel will be determined at the time of the Call-up
- Q8.** Should we assume all meetings prior to the construction site meetings be in person, requiring travel to the project site (or PSPC regional office)? We're doing a number of projects at the moment wherein most of the design progress meetings are handled by conference call, which drastically reduces travel costs.
- A8.** This will be determined at the time of the call-up.
- Q9.** In the case that key specialists are provided in house by the prime consultant, should C.V.'s be provided for both project personnel *and* senior personnel in that discipline? Or should section 3.2.4 still only include a maximum of two prime consultant senior personnel C.V.'s, with the in-house key specialist's c.v. being included in section 3.2.5?
- A9.** C.V.'s should be provided for both senior and project personnel for the Proponent (Prime Consultant) and all Key Sub-consultants/Specialists for any individual proposed under this Solicitation for evaluation under SRE 3.2.4 and 3.2.5.
- Q10.** If we have a Consultant (IT/AV) on the project as part of our team, are they allowed to do the Supply and Installation too? Or would it be a conflict of interest?
- A10.** This would be determined on case by case basis.
- Q11.** To clarify – AD 1.2 Consultant Team – The listed services (a – l), are the only consultants to be included in our RFSO submission though we may be required to retain/engage the services/consultants identified in RS 2.3 Specialized Services ie: Landscape Architectural Design / Geotechnical Engineering / Civil Engineering / Building Code / Food Service / Kitchen Consultant / Vertical Transportation Specialist / Way Finding & Signage Specialist / Roofing Specialist / Master Planning Services, etc.

**A11.** Yes, only the Proponent and Key Sub-consultants/Specialists included in SRE 3.1.4 Consultant Team Identification need to be included in the RFSO submission.

**Q12.** We have concerns regarding the apparent requirement in this RFSO for the Consultant to provide services for Designated Substances and geotechnical information/soils reports. Information about properties typically provided by owners to architects includes land surveys, geo-technical analyses, and the work of hazardous materials specialists, including the provision of Designated Substances Reports (DSR's). The Ontario Association of Architects recommends that these services be provided by the property/building owner, and there are potentially serious implications for Architects' Liability Insurance when these services are included in the Consultant's scope of service.

Accordingly, on all of our previous projects for PSPC, PSPC has engaged environmental consultants separately to produce DSR's, which were provided to us along with any required abatement specifications, for insertion in the project specification. These PSPC-supplied consultants also reviewed the work called for by the DSR and abatement specifications during construction.

Similarly, geotechnical/soils reports have always been provided to us by PSPC. Testing services – compaction testing, soil testing, etc – have also been arranged separately by PSPC when they pertained to existing conditions, or included in the Contractor's scope of work when they covered construction tasks.

We note that the RFSO currently calls for the Consultant in a number of instances to provide these services. For example:

- pages 71 and 72 list soil investigating and designated substance survey reports among the deliverables
- page 120 calls for the Consultant to procure Testing Services (i.e. concrete testing, rebar installation, compaction testing, soil testing, domestic water line testing, sprinkler water line testing during construction)
- page 131 Indicates that the "Consultant shall ensure that appropriate recycling initiatives are undertaken, and that asbestos and other designated substances are properly removed and disposed of in accordance with provincial and federal standards and regulations."

We request that you clarify that all information and services related to designated substances and soils testing will be provided by PSPC, and that testing services will be procured either by PSPC or the Contractor, as appropriate.

**A12.** Soils testing, DSR, specific investigations and related reports will be the responsibility of the owner.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EQ754-193417/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
PWL035

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
EQ754-193417

File No. - N° du dossier  
PWL-8-41133

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**Q13.** We have offices in Ottawa, Toronto and Waterloo, and wish to respond as one firm for **Eastern Ontario, Central Ontario and Western Ontario**. Please clarify if you anticipate a Team Leader in each Region – since it would not be feasible for a team leader located in Central Region (Ottawa) to be responsible for a project in Southwestern Ontario. The expenses to attend meetings, etc. for the duration of each call-up project. In addition, call up fee proposals would not be competitive in this case for regions other than the one where he/she is located.

**A13.** As long as the person identified can complete the duties for the Call-up Team Leader it is up to the Proponent to determine if they are required to be located in each of the regions

**Q14.** Is the deadline for questions May 15<sup>th</sup>? (the date is dependent on the Victoria Day Stat, and we have not counted week-ends.)

**A14.** The deadline for questions is ten working day prior to the closing date of the Solicitation.

**Q15.** **GI 2 Introduction**, paragraph 2 indicates that “demonstrate successful delivery..... variety of projects over the last 5 years”. However **Rated Requirements** – 3.2.3 Past Experience requests projects “at least the past seven (7) years”. Please clarify which is correct.

**A15.** In response to SRE 3.2.3 Past Experience proponents should submit projects over at least the past 7 years.

**Q16.** **Call up Team Leader** – is this person an Architect, Engineer, Senior Technologist?

**A16.** The expectation is that the call up Team Leader responding to the RFSO for Architectural services is an Architect.

**Q17.** **Appendix F Ontario Region Geographic Boundaries** excludes the municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. Will Ottawa-Carleton be the subject of a separate RFSO?

**A17.** The National Capital Region including the municipality of Ottawa-Carleton is not included under this RFSO.

**Q18.** Re: page 152 of 188: Project 2

Your “Scope of Services Required” indicate preparation of, “*Fees, Deliverables, Schedule, Construction Budget-Class D.*” Are we to assume that the hypothetical project is for the preparation of the project proposal only? OR Are other deliverables (Design, Contract Documents, Contract Administration ) assumed to be required following the acceptance of a proposal?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EQ754-193417/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
PWL035

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
EQ754-193417

File No. - N° du dossier  
PWL-8-41133

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**A18.** Please refer to Question 4.

**Q19.** If one of the named prime consultants is also fulfilling roles for other disciplines do they need to repeat the CVs?

**A19.** No, however this must be made clear in the submission.

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