



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

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

11 LaurierSt./ 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 DOCUMENT CONTAINS SECURITY
REQUIREMENTS.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Infrastructure Maintenance and Solution Services
Division (FK)

L'Esplanade Laurier,

East Tower 4th Floor

L'Esplanade Laurier,

Tour est 4e étage

140 O'Connor, Street

Ottawa

Ontario

K1A 0R5

Title - Sujet PMSS SPIB	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP747-200162/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20200162	Date 2019-06-14
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FK-290-77223	
File No. - N° de dossier fk290.EP747-200162	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-07-15	
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: Ghoumrassi, Hakim	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fk290
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 664-7321 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

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

THIS AMENDMENT 003 IS RAISED TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING BIDDER'S QUESTIONS:

Question 03:

Within the pricing schedule on page 12, the Claims Analyst under years 7 and 8 has no level of effort indicated; could the Crown please confirm the level of effort?

Answer 03:

Please see attached revised "Price Schedule" indicating that the level of effort for the Claims Analyst is 110 hours for years 7 and 8.

Question 04:

Under RT 2.3 – Achievement of Bidder on Projects. We wish to confirm our understanding of achievement and therefore value to the Crown.

- a. Please explain the value of RT2.3. "Title of the Project" (1 point). What value is being demonstrated here?
- b. Please explain the value of RT2.3. "Name of Client" (1 point). What value is being demonstrated here?
- c. Please explain the value of RT2.3. "Location" (1 point). What value is being demonstrated here?

Answer 04:

Please see revised RT2.3 values in the attached 2 to Part 4 TECHNICAL CRITERIA"

Question 05:

Can the Crown confirm it is possible to score zero in a rated section and still be considered a compliant bid?

Answer 05:

Yes, as long as the required minimum number of points (i.e. 318 points) is met.

NO OTHER CHANGES APPLY.

ATTACHMENT 1 TO PART 3 PRICING SCHEDULE

The Bidder should complete this pricing schedule and include it in its financial bid once completed. As a minimum, the Bidder must respond to this pricing schedule by including in its financial bid its quoted all-inclusive fixed hourly rate (in Can \$) for each of the resource categories and levels identified.

The volumetric data included in this pricing schedule are provided for bid evaluated price determination purposes only. They are not to be considered as a contractual guarantee. Their inclusion in this pricing schedule does not represent a commitment by Canada that Canada's future usage of the services described in the bid solicitation will be consistent with this data.

The rates included in this pricing schedule exclude the total estimated cost of the authorized travel and living expenses.

The rates included in this pricing schedule include the total estimated cost of any travel and living expenses that may need to be incurred for the Work described in Part 7 of the bid solicitation required to be done, delivered or performed inside the National Capital Region (NCR) defined in the National Capital Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. N-4), available on the Justice Website

<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-4/page-4.html#docCont>

Under any resulting contract, Canada will not accept travel and living expenses that may need to be incurred by the contractor for any relocation of resources required to satisfy its contractual obligations.

TABLE 1 - PRICING SCHEDULE

Consultant Category	Level of Expertise	Estimated Level of Effort (days)					(E)	(F) TOTAL ESTIMATED COST = (A+B+C+D) x 7.5 hrs x (E)
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	FIRM HOURLY RATE		
		Initial Contract Period Years 1 & 2	Option Period 1 Years 3 & 4	Option Period 2 Years 5 & 6	Option Period 3 Years 7 & 8			
Quality Assurance / Management Specialist	Senior	87	110	110	110		\$	\$
Risk Management Specialist	Senior	87	110	110	110		\$	\$
Technical Writer	Intermediate	87	110	110	110		\$	\$
Project Administrator for Real Property	Intermediate	696	660	440	440		\$	\$
Project Manager for Real Property	Senior	696	880	880	880		\$	\$

Project Manager for Real Property	Intermediate	348	0	0	0	0	\$	\$
Project Manager for Real Property (Construction)	Senior	348	220	0	0	0		
Project Leader for Real Property	Senior	348	440	440	440	440	\$	\$
Project Planner for Real Property	Intermediate	40	50	50	50	50	\$	\$
Financial / Cost Specialist for Real Property	Intermediate	348	440	440	440	440	\$	\$
Claims Analyst	Senior	87	110	110	110	110	\$	\$
TOTAL BID PRICE FOR EVALUATION (BIDDER'S EVALUATED PRICE) = (F)								

TOTAL BID PRICE FOR EVALUATION (BIDDER'S EVALUATED PRICE) = \$------(F)

Definition of a Day/Proration

A day is defined as 7.5 hours exclusive of meal breaks. Payment shall be for days actually worked with no provision for annual leave, statutory holidays and sick leave. Time worked which is more or less than a day shall be prorated to reflect actual time worked. All-inclusive hourly rates are applicable to both a day, as defined, and any other shift work exceeding 7.5 hours per day as required, seven (7) days per week.

Costs shall not appear in any other area of the proposal except in the financial proposal section.

ESCALATION CLAUSE

The firm hourly rates detailed in Table 1 – Pricing Schedule will be adjusted annually on the start date of each new Contract Year (starting with Contract Year 2 and for the whole period of the contract including the option periods) by the amount established based on the annual average percentage increase (decrease) in the monthly index of the Consumer Price Index for Canada, All-Items (Not Seasonally Adjusted), published in Statistics Canada Catalogue no.62-001-X, Table 5, for the 12-month period ending 2 months prior to the new Contract Year Start date.

Example:

Contract Start Date: March 1, 2016

At the start of Contract Year 2 (i.e. March 1, 2017), the Contract Year 1 rates as stated in the Additional Bidders Services Table would be increased by 1.3% based on the following assumptions:

% Change in Monthly CPI	
February 2016	1.1%
March 2016	1.2%
April 2016	0.9%
May 2016	0.9%
June 2016	1.1%
July 2016	1.0%
August 2016	1.4%
September 2016	1.6%
October 2016	1.6%
November 2016	1.7%
December 2016	1.5%
January 2017	1.7%
15.7% / 12 = 1.3%	

To determine the Contract Year 3 rates, the Contract Year 2 rates calculated above would be adjusted using the same Statistics Canada Table and same formula with data for the February 2017 - January 2018 12-month period.

ATTACHMENT 2 TO PART 4 TECHNICAL CRITERIA

It is recommended that the Bidder include a grid in their proposals, cross-referencing statements of compliance with the supporting data in their proposals. Note: the compliance grid, by and of itself does not constitute demonstrated evidence. The Bidder must submit a detailed CV for each of the proposed resources.

In order to obtain points for education and professional accreditations, the Bidder must include photocopies of certificates. If not provided with the bid, Bidders will be deemed non-compliant.

Interpretation of the Requirement by the Evaluation Team

1. The statements and requirements in this article apply to the information provided by the Bidder for each of its proposed personnel (*i.e. consultant(s)*).
2. To demonstrate the experience (as defined in Attachment 1 to part 4 "Experience" of personnel), the Bidder should provide complete project details as to where, when (month and year) and how (through which activities/responsibilities) the stated qualifications/experience were obtained. The Bidder is advised that only listing position or assignment titles without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties, and relevance to the requirements will not be considered "demonstrated" for the purpose of this valuation.
3. The Bidder is advised that the month(s) of valid experience listed for a project whose timeframe overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once. For example: Project 1 timeframe is July 2001 to December 2001; Project 2 timeframe is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months.
4. The Bidder is advised that, if the experience description only contains years, and does not specify any months within the year, then a maximum of only one month of experience will be allowed by the evaluation team if the experience starts and ends in the same year; and if the experience starts and ends in different years, only one month for the beginning year and one month for the end year of the range specified.
5. For example, if the experience description states that a particular position or assignment was undertaken during:
 - (a). "2004", then only one month will be allowed for 2004, provided that the experience is applicable;
 - (b). "2004-2005", then only one month will be allowed for 2004, and one month for 2005, for a total of two months, provided that the experience is applicable;
 - (c). "2003-2005", then only one month will be allowed for 2003, and one month for 2005, and 12 for 2004, for a total of 14 months, provided that the experience is applicable. In cases where the number of years is longer, the first and last year will still be counted as one month each, provided that the experience is applicable.
6. Phrases such as "within the last sixty (60) months" are used mean "within the sixty (60) preceding the closing date of the RFP". In the event that the RFP closing date is changed after the initial publication of the RFP, the Bidder may choose to interpret the phrase as being measured from either the initial closing date or the final closing date, unless otherwise directed in an RFP amendment.

7. Phrases such as "experience working as a Manager" (or other resource category title) mean that the experience must match, to the satisfaction of the evaluation team, the requirements for such a resource category as stated in the Statement of Work provided with this RFP.
8. Phrases such as "experience dealing with matters related to the Statement of Work" mean that the experience must match, to the satisfaction of the evaluation team, the nature of the requirements for the work being done by PSPC as described throughout the Statement of Work, including but not limited to background and introductory and other descriptive information.
9. The Bidder's proposed resources must not exceed the required number per resource category and level. In some cases, more than one resource is required to be proposed for a category (e.g. five (5) Senior Project Managers are required to be proposed). In such cases, the Bidder may NOT propose the same individual for more than one of these Resource Categories. Additional resources will not be evaluated.
10. Unless otherwise stated, the Bidder's proposed individuals' experiences for the optional resources as per Table 1, sub-section 1.2, section RS 1 General Services, Annex "A" Statement of Work, will not be evaluated in the following mandatory and point-rated technical criteria.
11. Definitions:

"federal" means working within the legislative framework of the Canadian federal government.

"public sector" means municipal and/or provincial and/or federal government.

"heritage projects" means a project where the asset is either "classified" or recognised (usually older than 40 years old) and interventions were aimed at preserving the heritage aspect. In this context, the definition of heritage building shall follow the Canadian Historic Places Register or any equivalent national level designation for projects outside Canada.

1. MANDATORY TECHNICAL CRITERIA

The bid must meet the mandatory technical criteria specified below. The Bidder must provide the necessary documentation to support compliance with this requirement.

Bids which fail to meet the mandatory technical criteria will be declared non-responsive. Each mandatory technical criterion must be addressed separately.

MANDATORY TECHNICAL CRITERIA (MT)

#	Description	Met/Not Met	Substantiation
MT1	<p>The Bidder must submit resumes for ALL resource categories and levels listed as Required and Optional Resources. Refer to Table 1 in sub-section 1.2, section RS 1 General Services, Annex "A" Statement of Work for a complete list.</p> <p>Any individual may be proposed for no more than ONE resource category. It is a mandatory requirement that the Bidder meet the minimum requirements of the flexible grid.</p>		
MT2	<p>Each of the two (2) proposed "Project Manager for Real Property – Senior" (SPM), excluding the SPM for Construction, must demonstrate the following:</p> <p>a) Be a certified professional engineer or architect in good standing in Canada. Photocopies of certification as proof must be submitted with the bid.</p> <p>To demonstrate proof of good standing with a professional order, Bidders must provide, in addition to clear copies of certification, a valid and clear copy of the resources membership card for the current year or other similar proof.</p>		
MT3	<p>The proposed "Project Manager for Real Property – Intermediate" (IPM) must demonstrate the following:</p> <p>a) Be a certified professional engineer or architect in good standing in Canada. Photocopies of certification as proof must be submitted with the bid.</p> <p>To demonstrate proof of good standing with a professional order, Bidders must provide, in addition to clear copies of certification, a clear and valid copy of the resources membership card for the current year or other similar proof.</p>		

MT4	The Bidder must submit information related to three (3) projects that have been completed within the last fifteen (15) years prior to the solicitation closing date, or that a minimum have attained substantial completion of construction within the last (15) years, prior to the solicitation closing date if contracts are not fully invoiced. Minimum duration for each project has to be 2 continuous years or more. Joint venture submissions are not to exceed the maximum number of projects. Only the first three (3) projects listed in sequence will receive consideration		
------------	---	--	--

2 **POINT RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA – Written**

Bids which meet all the mandatory technical criteria will be evaluated and scored as specified in the tables inserted below.

Bids which fail to obtain the required minimum number of points specified will be declared non-responsive. Each point rated technical criterion should be addressed separately.

Instructions to Bidders for responding to point rated technical criteria:

1. In addressing the point rated evaluation criteria, the Bidder should supplement the information supplied in response to the rated requirements with details outlining the depth and extent of the relevant experience, qualifications and specialized expertise of the proposed resource. All claims with regard to resource experience, qualifications or expertise must be substantiated through the provision of detailed project descriptions of how and where the claimed experience, qualifications or expertise were gained. Unsubstantiated claims of experience, qualifications or expertise will not be considered by the evaluation team during the point rated evaluation.
2. The Bidder's Score will be based on the evaluation scale provided below for the following Point Rated Technical Criteria – Written (RTW):
 - RT1 – Management of Services
 - RT2 – Achievement of Bidders on Projects
 - RT3 – Achievement of Resources on Projects

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for responding to the parts RT1 and RT2 of the Point Rated Technical Criteria – Written is 10 (ten) pages (including text and graphics).

The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above;

- RT3 - Proposed Resources CV's
- Attachment 1 to Part 3, Pricing Schedule
- Certifications and proof of education
- Integrity Provisions - Associated Information

Any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the proposal and will not be forwarded to the PSPC Evaluation Board members for evaluation.

3. As applicable, the Bidder should indicate the location in the proposed resources' resumes of supporting information to substantiate relevant experience for each point rated evaluation criteria.
4. A pass mark of 318 points or a minimum required score of 318 points out of 489 applies to the sum of the written technical proposal (Point Rated Technical Criteria – Written). Proposals for which evaluated scores fail to achieve this pass mark, as a minimum, will be deemed non-responsive.

POINT RATED TECHNICAL CRITERIA – WRITTEN (RTW)

The Bidder:

#	Description	Max Score	DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (CONTRACTOR TO INSERT DATA)	INSERT PAGE # OF RESUME (when Applicable)
RT1	<p>MANAGEMENT OF SERVICES</p> <p>The Bidder should substantiate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) How it proposes to organize the PMSS Team, and how the PMSS Team will fit within: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the firm's (or joint venture's) existing organizational structure and internal governance; <u>(30 Points)</u> - the Project Team identified in section PA 2 of Annex "A" – Statement of Work. <u>(30 Points)</u> b) How it proposes to effectively manage communication between the PMSS Team and the members of the Project Team identified in section PA 2 of Annex "A" – Statement of Work. <u>(30 Points)</u> c) Its proposed methods for preventing financial disputes/claims against PSPC by A&E consultant firms and construction firms. <u>(30 Points)</u> d) Its proposed quality management processes that will be in place for this requirement. <u>(30 Points)</u> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <p>➤ he Generic Evaluation Table at the end of Attachment 2 to Part 4 – Technical Criteria will be used to evaluate each of the criterion in this section RT1.</p>	150 Points		
RT2	<p>ACHIEVEMENTS OF BIDDER ON PROJECTS</p> <p>The intent of this section RT2 is to evaluate the Bidder's accomplishments, achievements, and experience in the project management, planning, and delivery of real property projects which should be of similar scope, complexity, and scale as the projects stated in Annex "A" Statement of Work. This will be evaluated using criterion RT2.1 to RT2.4 below.</p>	150 Points		

RT2.1	<p>Bidders must substantiate the experience using the three (3) projects submitted as part of MT4. A combination of information from these three (3) projects can be used in response to the criterion below.</p> <p>The Bidder should substantiate that one of the projects submitted as part of MT4 included project management services and had a contract value for project management services of \$5 million or higher. <u>(15 Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Contract included relevant project management support services and the contract value is under \$1m = 0 points ➤ Contract included relevant project management support services and the contract value is between \$1m and \$2.5m = 3 points ➤ Contract included relevant project management support services and the contract value is between \$2.5m and \$5m = 6 points ➤ Contract included relevant project management support services and the contract value is of \$5m or higher = 15 points 			
RT2.2	<p><u>One of the projects submitted by the Bidder as part of MT4 should have a project dollar value of \$50 million or higher. <u>(15 Points)</u></u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project value under \$10m = 0 points ➤ Project value between \$10m and \$25m = 3 points ➤ Project value between \$25m and \$50m = 6 points ➤ Project value of \$50m or higher = 15 points 			
RT2.3	<p><u>Information to be supplied for each project submitted by the Bidder as part of MT4 should include, the following: <u>(30 Points)</u></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title of the project / program; 2. Name of the client; 3. Location; 4. Duration (start and completion dates – minimum 2 years); 5. Scope summary (short description); 6. Final cost of the project; 7. Value of the Bidder's contract for real property project management services; 8. Role of the Bidder in the project; 9. Responsibilities of principals on the project; and 10. Client references - name, address, phone, and email of client contact at working level - references may be 			

RT2.4	<p>checked.</p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Two (2) points per project will be awarded for each of items number 5 to 9 that is clearly identified (i.e. 2 points per item per project, for a maximum of 30 points). ➤ If any of items 1, 2, 3, 4 or 10 is missing, 5 points per project will be deducted. <p><u>One of the projects submitted by the Bidder as part of MT4 should also clearly substantiate their experience pertinent to:</u></p> <p>a) Bidder's experience to manage rehabilitation project(s) in heritage building(s) over a continuous duration of two (2) years or longer. <u>(15 Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = 15 points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points <p>b) <u>Bidder's experience to manage project(s) related to the renovation or construction of a building in the public sector over a continuous duration of two (2) years or longer.</u> <u>(15 Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = 15 points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points <p>c) <u>Bidder's experience over a continuous duration of two (2) years or longer within a Program of Work context with multiple contracts, with numerous inter-related projects underway at the same time, and at various stages of advancement.</u> <u>(15 Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = 15 points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points <p>d) <u>Bidder's experience in managing project(s) within demanding environments (e.g. high visibility, public setting, multiple stakeholders, time pressure, etc.) over a continuous duration of two (2) years or longer.</u> <u>(15</u></p>			
-------	---	--	--	--

	<p><u>Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = 15 points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points <p>e) <u>Bidder's experience in managing project(s) with multiple conflicting objectives (e.g. heritage conservation, security requirements, sustainability targets, etc.) over a continuous duration of two (2) years or longer. (15Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = 15 points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points <p>f) <u>Bidder's experience over a continuous duration of two (2) years or longer in managing project(s) in an occupied building, with construction occurring at the same time as the building was being used by tenants. (15 Points)</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = 15 points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points 			
RT3	<p>ACHIEVEMENTS OF RESOURCES ON PROJECTS</p> <p><u>For each of the following Required Resources proposed by the Bidder that meet the minimum points from the Flexible Grid in Attachment 1 to Part 4, the Bidder should clearly substantiate experience that is pertinent to the following criteria, and that has been acquired over a duration of at least two (2) years within the past fifteen (15) years prior to the solicitation closing date.</u></p> <p>Submissions will be scored in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each criterion (i.e. (a), (b), (c), and d) listed under each of the Required Resource categories identified in RT3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for two (2) years or more = full points ➤ Substantiated relevant experience for less than two (2) years = 0 points 	189 Points		

	<p>3.1 Project Leader for Real Property – Senior:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Leader for Real Property – Senior” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(9 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Leader” on projects valued over \$50M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Leader” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> d) Experience working as a “Project Leader” on <i>heritage projects</i> valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.2 Project Manager for Real Property – Senior #1 (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Manager – Senior” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on projects valued over \$50M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> d) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>heritage projects</i> valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.3 Project Manager for Real Property – Senior #2 (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Manager – Senior” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on projects valued over \$50M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> d) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>heritage projects</i> valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.4 Project Manager for Real Property – Construction-Senior (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Manager – Senior” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on projects valued over \$50M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> d) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>heritage projects</i> valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> 			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>3.5 Project Managers for Real Property – Intermediate (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Manager” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on projects valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Manager” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.6 Project Administrator for Real Property – Intermediate #1 (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Administrator” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Administrator” on projects valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Administrator” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.7 Project Administrator for Real Property – Intermediate #2 (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Administrator” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Administrator” on projects valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> c) Experience working as a “Project Administrator” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.8 Financial/Cost Specialist for Real Property – Intermediate (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Financial/Cost Specialist” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Financial/Cost Specialist” on projects valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> (a) Experience working as a “Financial/Cost Specialist” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u> <p>3.9 Project Planner for Real Property – Intermediate (as per the Flexible Table in Attachment 1 To Part 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Experience working as a “Project Planner for Real Property” in real property projects of similar scope and complexity as the projects stated in Annex “A” Statement of Work. <u>(6 Points)</u> b) Experience working as a “Project Planner for Real Property” on projects valued over \$10M. <u>(6 Points)</u> 			
--	--	--	--	--

	c) Experience working as a “Project Planner for Real Property” on <i>public sector</i> projects. <u>(6 Points)</u>			
--	---	--	--	--

Point Rated Technical Criteria Evaluation Scale:

Point Rated Technical Criteria and Scores	Required Minimum Number of Points	Maximum Number of Points
Technical Proposal – Written (RTW)	318 points	489

Generic Evaluation Table

PSPC Evaluation Board members will use the generic evaluation table below to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Bidder's response to evaluation criterion RT1. This criterion will be rated with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) and then multiplied by its respective weighting.

	INADEQUATE	WEAK	ADEQUATE	FULLY SATISFACTORY	STRONG
0 point	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements.	Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understanding in some areas of the requirements.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements.
	Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be corrected	No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses
	Bidder do not possess qualifications and experience	Bidder lacks qualifications and experience	Bidder has an acceptable level of qualifications and experience	Bidder is qualified and experienced	Bidder is highly qualified and experienced
	Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements	Team does not cover all components or overall experience is weak	Team covers most components and will likely meet requirements	Team covers all components - some members have worked successfully together	Strong team - has worked successfully together on comparable projects
	Sample projects not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Leads in sample projects directly related to this requirement
	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, should ensure adequate results	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results