



**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> 2019-06-03
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EQ754-193417	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<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 No. - N° de l'invitation  
EQ754-193417/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
003

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

---

### **Solicitation Amendment 003**

This amendment is being raised to provide responses to Requests for Clarification.

#### **Requests for Clarification**

- Q20.** Hypothetical Question 2, Scope of Services required, states “Consultant to review CARQ, Functional program and existing documents for the building **“to”** prepare Fees, Deliverables, Schedule, Construction Budget-Class D.” Would you please clarify what required services the consultant is being asked to prepare a response to? What disciplines are required to be included for this response? Was the use of the word “to” intentional or would the word “and” more accurately represent what is being requested? Would there be additional Deliverables required such as “Schematic Design” services to support the Class D cost estimate?
- A20.** Any disciplines or additional deliverables required are to be determined by the Proponent. In order to clarify your response include any assumptions made about the Hypothetical project. In this Hypothetical Project, the Proponent is required to review the CARQ, Functional program and existing documents for the building as well as prepare Fees, Deliverables, Schedule, and Construction Budget – Class D.
- Q21.** Please clarify whether letters of reference should be included in the Rated Requirements page count of 60 pages maximum.
- A21.** Client reference contact information as identified in 3.2.3.2(e) will count towards the 60 page limit. Letters of reference are not required and should not be provided as part of the bid submission.
- Q22.** For item 3.2.1 Comprehension of the Scope of Services (p. 149) you indicate that the Proponent should provide a “summary of your proposed typical work breakdown structure, ie. resources assigned, time schedule, level of effort”. I can see the benefit of providing a template of our typical work breakdown structure, but you seem to want us to also quantify resources, schedule, and level of effort. That would require a specific scope of work, and this RFSO covers such a wide range of project types and scopes of work that it would be difficult to provide this level of detail as a generic description. Moreover, a project-specific response is what we’re providing with the hypothetical projects. Please clarify what you want for this section.
- A22.** This is to be determined by the Proponent as this criteria allows us to evaluate the Proponents understanding of the requirements.

**Q23.** Within 3.2 RATED REQUIREMENTS under 3.2.3 Past Experience, 2. b) - What the Proponent should provide:

3.2.3

2. b) For the above projects, include the names of senior personnel and project personnel who were involved as part of the project team and their respective responsibilities, as well as the **scope, and budget per discipline;**

We do not have access to the **scope and budget** information at the sub-consultant level. Is an answer to this question (2.b) an essential response?

**A23.** Proponents will not receive full marks if information requested in the SRE section is not provided.

**Q24.** Addendum: Within **SRE 2 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS under 2.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format:**

The **maximum number of pages** (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements

under SRE 3.2 is sixty (60) pages.

My question is, are any types of pages an exception to the maximum page number with the new addendum provided?

**A24.** Under SRE **2.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format** there is a list of items that are not part of the page limitation and these remain the same.

**Q25.** One more question for section 3.2.3, 2. b):

For the above projects, include the names of senior personnel and project personnel who were involved as part of the project team and their respective responsibilities, as well as the **scope, and budget per discipline;**

My question: Is the scope and budget discipline related to the cost of the work or the consultant fees to the work?

**A25.** The scope and budget per discipline refers to the work done by the specific discipline in terms of the consulting fees. For example the scope and consulting fees (budgeted and actual) of the work done by the structural engineer, etc.

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
003

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

---

**Q26.** 3.2.4 Senior Personnel Expertise and Experience – Can a Prime Consultant personnel also be presented as one of the sub-consultants/specialists if they specialize in that area of expertise. For Example, can the Senior Architect also be presented as an Interior Designer?

3.2.5 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience – Can a Prime Consultant personnel also be presented as one of the sub-consultants/specialists if they specialize in that area of expertise. For Example, can the Project Architect also be presented as an Interior Designer?

If the answer is yes to the above questions, do proponents have to present separate resumes for the same person, or can one (1) resume focusing on both their areas of expertise be presented?

**A26.** Please refer to Question 19 in Amendment 002 issued on May 22, 2019.

**Q27.** Could you please confirm if the CVs requested as part of 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 of the Rated Requirements count towards the 60-page limit?

**A27.** Yes, the CVs that will be evaluated under the Rated Requirements will count towards the 60 page-limit.

**Q28.** Is there any difference expected in the CVs supplied by 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 of the Rated Requirements, versus the ones supplied as part of Appendix C: Team Identification?

**A28.** The CVs supplied for Rated Requirements 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 will be evaluated. Additional CVs can be supplied in Appendix C for the categories and roles specified who may do work under the resulting Standing Offer. CVs provided under Appendix C will not be evaluated.

**Q29.** The stepped fee scoring system currently shown in the RFP means that trivial dollar amounts may decide the winning team. The recent SOA solicitation (EP921-193302/A) includes a prorated ranking system for fees (Extract Below) Will PSPC consider changing the scoring system to align with this recent example from PSPC?

**A29.** SRE 4 Price of Services and SRE 5 Total Score will remain as stated in the RFSO.

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