

## Solicitation No. 1000211698

To All Offerors:

Please be advised that the Department has been asked for clarification relative to Solicitation 1000211698 and we would like to submit the following information to all prospective offerors to assist in the formulation of bid packages:

### Corrections:

- a) Point Rated Technical Criteria R2.1 Qualifications and Experience, note that the first sentence should read, "The evidence within the Offeror's corporate profile, provided in response to **Mandatory Requirement M1...**"
- b) Point Rated Technical Criteria R2.2 Project Summaries, note that the first sentence should read, "The evidence within the Offeror's written project summaries, provided in response to **Mandatory Requirement M3...**"
- c) Point Rated Technical Criteria R2.3 Proposed Resources, note that the first sentence should read, "Resumes of the Offeror's proposed resources for the Senior and Intermediate Project Professional and/or Engineering Personnel categories as submitted in response to **Mandatory Requirement M2** will be evaluated.
- d) Part 7 Standing Offer and Resulting Contract Clauses, 7.4.1 Period of the Standing Offer should read, "The period for making call-ups against the Standing Offer is from Standing Offer Award to **July 31, 2021**."
- e) Part 7 Standing Offer and Resulting Contract Clauses, 7.4.2 Extension of Standing Offer should read, "If the Standing Offer is authorized for use beyond the initial period, the Offeror offers to extend its offer for up to two additional one year periods, from **August 1, 2021 to July 31, 2022** and from **August 1, 2022 to July 31, 2023** under the same conditions..."
- f) Annex B, Basis of Payment table, Option Year 2 Per Hour Rates (Can\$) dates should read August 1, 2022 to **July 31, 2023**.

### Offeror's Questions:

#### **Question #1**

Section R2.2 – Project Summaries Table (page 18 of 50) of the RFSO breaks down how points will be awarded for the project summaries. Following the descriptions for each of the point levels is a bracket indicating how level of complexity will be assessed (i.e. Partnership, Working group, Meetings, Information letters and Indirect engagement participation). Is the assessment of the complexity of experience limited to the levels of interaction highlighted in the brackets, or is this one example of how complexity will be assessed?

#### **Answer to Question #1**

The levels of interaction highlighted in the brackets are examples of activities that would qualify as being at a level of complexity required to demonstrate the satisfy points will be awarded. Activities other than those cited could qualify if demonstrated that those activities meet the same or similar level of complexity.

#### **Question #2**

Section R2.3 – Proposed Resources (Page 19 of 50) of the RFSO indicates that for the Intermediate Project Professionals 2 points will be awarded for (vii) evidence of adequate health and safety training for the proposed role. What does CIRNAC require as evidence of training? Is it sufficient to state the title of the training and the year the training was taken and/or the validity period for the training on the individual's résumé (as requested in M2 proposed resources (page 12 of 50 of the RFSO)?

### **Answer to Question #2**

Yes. Either will be sufficient. As stated in Section R2.3 – Proposed Resources, The proposed resources will be evaluated based on the information provided in the resumes of the Offeror's proposed resources that are to be submitted in response to Mandatory Requirement M3.

### **Question #3**

Annex A, SW5 Resource Category Definitions, Section 5.2 (Page 45 of 50 of the RFSO) states "The Offeror's Intermediate Project members MUST each have: a) A minimum of five (5) years demonstrated experience in environmental or engineering fields; and, b) Professional accreditation in, but not limited to Engineering, Biology, Chemistry or Geology; or Bachelor's degree in a scientific discipline.

a. Is a Registered Occupational Hygienist (ROH), certified by the Canadian Registered Board of Occupational Hygienists an acceptable professional accreditation for an Intermediate Professional?

### **Answer to Question #3**

The intent of this criteria is that the resource has met the requirements of an accredited University program or technical institution. If the individual above holds a Bachelor's degree in Science (i.e. health science), that would qualify, while the registration in the organization would contribute towards skills, experience, training to support the role, rather than the educational requirement.

### **Question #4**

RFP rated requirement R2.2 – Project Summaries states, "The following rating scale will be used to evaluate the Offeror's experience and understanding with points for demonstrating evidence as follows: 10 points - Provides complete and extensive details and demonstrates project is very relevant and similar to SOW requirements; complexity of experience described is exceptional (i.e. Partnership)."

- a. Please clarify if points for R2.2 are awarded based on level of Indigenous involvement on the project, or if it is just one factor in the evaluation.
- b. If a Partnership level of indigenous engagement is ideal, please indicate what constitutes a Partnership for the evaluation. As an example, what level of engagement is the employment of local indigenous persons, on a project?

### **Answer to Question #4**

The Project Summaries are being evaluated based on the overall experience and understanding of the unique nature of work described in the Statement of Work. Experience in terms of engaging with stakeholders (which could be Indigenous or not) would be a factor considered in the evaluation to demonstrate a level of complexity for managing a project.

### **Question #5**

Regarding resumes to be included for Senior and Intermediate personnel, please confirm if CIRNAC would like resumes for backup senior and intermediate personnel in addition to the 2 required senior

personnel and 2 required intermediate personnel? In particular, does CIRNAC want to see resumes for named senior or intermediate personnel with experience to cover the various disciplines listed in Task 6?

#### **Answer to Question #5**

Resumes should be provided for all proposed team members. Only the first two Senior and Intermediate resumes will be evaluated against the point rated Criteria, although all proposed team members will need to meet the minimum requirements in the Statement of Work, SW5 Resource Categories to be eligible to perform work under the standing offer.

#### **Question #6**

Regarding resumes, could CIRNAC quantify the number of resumes to be included for junior, technical and admin/clerical support personnel?

#### **Answer to Question #6**

No specific number, as many as you wish to propose in your team.

#### **Question #7**

Does CIRNAC require proof of education and accreditation for all resources or just the 4 evaluated senior and intermediate personnel?

#### **Answer to Question #7**

Yes, as stated under M2, "The Offeror MUST include a copy of the degree(s)/accreditation(s) received by each proposed resource except for the Administrative and Clerical Support category."

#### **Question #8**

Could you please confirm if Junior Project members are evaluated. In R2.3 Proposed Resources category it notes that resumes for Junior Project Professionals, Technical, Administrative and Clerical support categories will not be evaluated, however, under the Mandatory section M2 Proposed Resources (page 12 para. 4) it states that for Juniors, if CVs are more than 2 pages in length only the first two pages will be considered and that Resumes for the Technical, Administrative and Clerical support categories will not be evaluated in the rated requirements.

Should this last sentence have included Juniors as well?

#### **Answer to Question #8**

All team members resumes are evaluated as per M2 to ensure they demonstrate the minimum education and experience requirements to be eligible to perform work under the standing offer (as per Statement of Work SW 5 Resource Category Definitions), however only the Senior and Intermediate Project Professional and/or Engineering Personnel resources will be evaluated against point-rated criteria.

### Question #9

Could you please confirm if the required years of experience to be demonstrated for Intermediates is min 5 years or min 7 years. In R2.3 Proposed Resources for the Intermediates it states greater than 7 years, and in the SOW section SW5 Resource Category Definitions 5.2 Intermediate Members it states a minimum of five years demonstrated experience.

### Answer to Question #9

A minimum of 5 years demonstrated experience is required as per the Statement of Work SW 5 Resource Category Definitions. However to obtain the maximum points on R2.3, greater than 7 years would need to be demonstrated in each of the key areas.

### Question #10

Annex A, SW5 Resource Category Definitions, Section 5.4 (Page 45 of 50 of the RFSO) states "The Offeror's **Technical Support** Project members **MUST** each have: a) A minimum of three (3) years demonstrated experience in environmental or engineering fields; and, b) Professional accreditation in, but not limited to Engineering, Biology, Chemistry or Geology; or Bachelor's degree in a scientific discipline, or Certified Technician or Technologist, and may also include CADD/Draftspersons, GIS Specialist."

- i. With respect to the Technical Support Project members, would CIRNAC consider accepting a Diploma from a College in a technology or environmental discipline as an alternative to the Bachelor's degree in a scientific discipline?
- ii. With respect to the Technical Support Project members, would a licensed well technician (certified in Ontario) be acceptable as an alternative to a Certified Technician or Technologist?

### Answer to Question #10

i. Yes, a Diploma from a College in a technology or environmental discipline would be accepted.

i.i. Certified Technicians or Technologists will be considered as is stated.