



## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A) – v2

### RFSO for Contaminated Site and Major Mine Closure Project & Portfolio Management Support Services

**Date: 2019-08-30**

Department: Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)  
Standing Offer Authority: Shuo Chen  
Solicitation No.: 1000206942  
Telephone No.: 819-953-6910  
Fax No.: 819-953-7721  
E-mail Address: [shuo.chen@canada.ca](mailto:shuo.chen@canada.ca)

#### **DESCRIPTION OF THE AMENDMENT:**

Further to previous Q&A v1 (En), this is to release a new update v2. The Q&As that were revised include:

- Q&A #8
- Q&A #34
- add Q&A #47-54

#### **Q1: Is there associated physical attachments for this RFSO solicitation?**

A1: No. There is no any additional physical attachment for this RFSO.

#### **Q2: This RFSO appears to be focused on advisory-type services. If an Offeror is awarded a Standing Offer under any of the three streams, will it be precluded from future mine closure work at any of the sites included in the portfolio of abandoned mine and other contaminated sites in the territories and provinces listed in Section 1.2.2 of the RFSO?**

A2: Being a Standing Offer holder would not as a matter of course preclude any firm or resource(s) from work at our sites, however work done under a particular Call-up might preclude a firm or resource(s) from bidding on subsequent work at a particular site. Such determinations will be made on a case-by-case basis based on the specific work requirements of each Call-up.

#### **Q3: Regarding mandatory project dollar value requirements and the offering experience requirements in Note 1 (page 18, Section 4.4.1), would CIRNAC consider adjusting these requirements to avoid unnecessarily restricting the pool of available Offerors?**



A3: The dollar value requirements and experience are based on the type and scale of our projects, and are therefore appropriate, and will not be adjusted in Stream 1 and 2. However, we removed the dollar value requirements in Stream 3.

**Q4: What's the definition of "Capital Project" and "Mining Project" as first used in 1-M1 (page 18, Section 4.4.1, item 1.8) of the RFSO?**

A4:

"Project" and "Capital" are as defined in the Statement of Work, Section S.W.4 (pages 83-86/127).

"Capital Project": is a long-term, capital-intensive investment Project with a purpose to build upon, add to, or improve a Capital asset.

"Mining Project": is a Project that occurs related to a mine site, whether operational or post-operational. It may include one or more aspects of the lifecycle of a mine, including: 1) Prospecting and Exploration, 2) Development; 3) Extraction, and 4) Closure/ Reclamation.

Offerors should also refer to the definition of Mine Closure Project as set out in the Statement of Work, Section S.W.4, with respect to Stream 2.

**Q5: Was it CIRNAC's intent to put more emphasis on non-Contaminated Site Project experience (i.e. Capital and Mining Project experience) by requesting 2 of 3 projects as non-contaminated sites projects within Stream 1, even though there is a separate stream (Stream 2)?**

A5:

CIRNAC is seeking Offerors and proposed Resources with relevant experience to the delivery of the Services.

In Stream 1, 1-M1 requires at least one (1) Work Engagement to demonstrate the delivery of services for a client's Contaminated Site Project, and at least two (2) Work engagements to demonstrate delivery of services for a client's Project where Implementation work has been partially or fully completed, and demonstrating the Project is either a Capital Project or Mining Project.

Offerors should note that Stream 1, 1-R1 and 1-R2 further assess the relevance of the Work engagements of Resources and the Offeror to CIRNAC's Project requirements.

Stream 2 focuses on Mine Closure Project experience. Offerors should refer to the definitions in the Statement of Work, Section S.W.4.

**Q6: The Stream 1 indicates a requirement to provide "subject matter expertise on the life cycle of Contaminated Site Projects and the life cycle of mining projects with a focus on mine reclamation and service delivery options for Contaminated Site Projects (including Major Mine Closure Projects). Please clarify how the**



**requirements of the Stream 1 differ from Stream 2, as there seems to be overlap between the two streams.**

A6: Although both Streams require knowledge of Contaminated Sites and Mine Closure/reclamation (because our portfolio consists of Contaminated Sites, including mines in need of reclamation and Closure), Stream 1 focuses on strategic planning and Portfolio management services, while Stream 2 focuses on the technical planning and Project delivery services for the Major Mine Closure Projects themselves.

**Q7: The RFSO requests each member of the project team (i.e., Principal, Senior Consultant, and Senior Subject Matter Experts) to demonstrate experience in “working with Indigenous governments or peoples”. Would CIRNAC consider modifying this mandatory criterion such that only requiring one or two of the team members to demonstrate experience in “working with Indigenous governments or peoples”?**

A7: The requirement for each member of the project team to demonstrate experience in “working with Indigenous governments or peoples” will remain. However, to clarify, in relation to Stream 3, the Principal / Partner and Senior Consultant do not necessarily require experience working with Indigenous governments or peoples, but rather this is one of 5 factors, of which a minimum number must be demonstrated as specified in the criteria.

**Q8: The minimum threshold of \$20M for both individual project experience and resource team member experience is a very high bar. Would CIRNAC consider modifying to a lower threshold - \$5M (preferably) or \$10M?**

A8: We removed the dollar value thresholds in Stream 3. The dollar value thresholds and experience are based on the type and scale of our projects, and are therefore appropriate, and will remain in place for Stream 1 and 2.

**Q9: M3 of each of the streams of work outline the Core team requirements, including the number of resources that must be offered for each resource category and the number that must demonstrate the qualification as per the relevant section in the SOW.**

**For example, 1-M3 requires at least two Core Principle / Project Leaders to be offered, of whom at least 1 must demonstrate the qualifications for 7.3.1.1. Assuming the minimum number of resources for each category that are required to demonstrate qualifications under the SOW are met, can CIRNAC clarify how additional offered Core resources who do not demonstrate the qualifications under the SoW will be treated in the evaluation and eventually under the SO should a bid be successful?**

A9:

As set out in M3, only resources that meet the minimum qualifications will be further evaluated. Following any SOA Award, Resources that do not demonstrate the minimum



qualifications required at time of RFSO may be re-submitted for re-evaluation prior to a Call-up where additional, replacement or substitute Resources are requested by NCSB.

For the RFSO evaluation, for the CORE Team offered in response to M3, on Point-Rated Criterion R1, “Where more than one (1) Resource is offered in and meets the Minimum Qualifications of a given category, each Resource will be scored individually, and the totals for each Resource summed and averaged to arrive at an overall score for the Offeror for that Category”.

Only the minimum number of CORE Team Resources required in M3 and demonstrating the Minimum Qualifications will be evaluated on Point-Rated Criterion R1.

Resources in the CORE Team offered beyond the minimum number required in M3 and demonstrating the Minimum Qualifications will be evaluated on the basis of R4.

**Q10: Please confirm that it is acceptable for a single individual to:**

- **be put forward as both a Principle / Project Leader (or Senior Consultant) and a Senior Subject Matter Expert; and/or**
- **be put forward as more than one Senior Subject Matter Experts (e.g. for Stream 2, one resource is put forth as both a Senior Subject Matter Expert – Mine Closure Project Lifecycle and Senior Subject Matter Expert – Major Project Management, thereby demonstrating compliance with 2-M3 c) and d) as well as contributing towards the relevant rated criteria for both categories).**

A10:

The same individual may be proposed once as a Principal / Project Leader or Senior Consultant, and once as a Senior Subject Matter Expert, however, under any resulting SOA, the Services of that Individual must be provided at the lowest per hour rate of the per hour rates for the Categories in which they are qualified.

The same individual may be proposed as a Senior Subject Matter Expert in more than one Senior Subject Matter Expert category, however, under any resulting SOA, the Services of that Individual must be provided at the lowest per hour rate of the per hour rates for the Categories in which they are qualified.

**Q11: Please advise where I could find a description of the expected works to be undertaken under the above-cited RFSO? Also, any awarded contract could result in works to be undertaken anywhere in Canada?**

A11: Please refer to S.W.13 of the RFSO (en) v3.0 (page 117/127)

**Q12: Page 5 of the Submission Form Templates notes that: “Only Resources identified in this Additional Resources (rated) Section will be considered towards the Offeror’s demonstration of Rated Criterion 1-R1.”**



**This seems to run contrary to R1 which notes that “Resources that are found to meet the requirements of 1-M3 and the category in which they are offered... will be evaluated against #-R1). Please confirm that the above quoted text from the Submission template is a typo.**

A12: As stated in Requirement 1-M3, 2-M3, 3-M3, only the minimum number of Core Team Resources (as applicable to the Stream as defined in the respective Mandatory Requirement) that meet the minimum qualifications will be evaluated on the basis of the Rated Criteria relating to Core Team Resources #-R1).

For Additional Resources, only those Additional Resources that are identified in Table M2 will be evaluated on the basis of #-R4.

**Q13: How does an Offeror demonstrate their Additional Resources (Intermediate and Junior personnel) fulfill the requirements listed in Section 7.3.2.2 (page 104/127)? Should we use Table 3 (Proposed Core Team of Resources – Resource Template) with modifications as necessary?**

A13:

As set out in Table M2 for “Offeror Team Capacity (Rated)”, Offerors should name any Additional Resources in Table M2 for each Intermediate Resource or Junior Resource proposed (if any).

Offerors are not required to provide a completed Table 3 for Intermediate or Junior level Resources. The compliance of any Resources named in Table M2 as Intermediate or Junior Resources with the minimum Resource qualifications of the SOW will be verified prior to any Award.

Offerors are reminded of the Certifications contained in Part 5 of the RFSO “*Unless specified otherwise, Canada will declare an offer non-responsive, will have the right to set-aside a standing offer, or will declare a contractor in default if any certification made by the Offeror is found to be untrue whether made knowingly or unknowingly during the offer evaluation period, during the Standing Offer period, or during the contract period.*”

**Q14: Regarding the requirements listed for Additional Resources in Section 7.3.2.2, are all requirements mandatory?**

A14:

Yes, while proposing Additional Resources is not Mandatory, to be considered eligible to deliver Services under any resulting SOA, the Additional Resource must demonstrate the minimum qualifications for the Resource Category in which they are proposed, as set out in the Statement of Work (Section 7.3.1.2 for Stream 1, 7.3.2.2 for Stream 2, and 7.3.3.2 for Stream 3).

Additional Resources in Intermediate and Junior level Categories are not required to demonstrate qualifications at time of RFSO Proposal submission but would be validated prior to any SOA Award.



**Q15: The CVs and Work engagements of the Offeror's offered Core Team Resources who are determined to meet the requirements set out in Mandatory Requirement 2-M3, will be evaluated on the demonstrated and Substantiated extent and depth of the relevant experience of the Resources in providing services similar to NCSB's requirements as described within the SOW Sections 5.3.1-5.3.8. Are Offerors to provide curricula vitae (CVs) of all Core Team Resources and Additional Resources, or is Table 3 the equivalent of a CV for this RFSO?**

A15: It is up to Offerors how best to present the information on the qualifications of the offered Resources. This may be done using Table 3, CVs, or a combination thereof. Offerors should refer also to R7 – Proposal Quality. Please note there are mandatory requirements for the submission of Work Engagements.

**Q16: Are you referring to a DG role within a client's organization, or within the Offeror's organization? Can you provide an example of a DG (for example, would this be a Vice President or CEO)?**

A16:

DG refers to "Director General". For the purpose of this RFSO, a Director General is defined as a member of the senior management of a public sector organization, typically with direct reports from Directors or Senior Managers each responsible for their own business units, and reporting up to the leadership of a Department/Agency (EX-02 or higher – or "C-Suite" equivalent in the private sector).

Potential equivalents to a Director General in the private sector may include ... "Vice President, Regional Director/Regional Manager, or other positions that report directly to the organization's senior leadership and receive direct report from more than one business unit under its own management."

**Q17: Please confirm that references to "Contaminated Site Project Valuation, Insolvency Management and Re-commercialization Services (as defined in the S.W.5)" should read "Contaminated Site Project Valuation, Insolvency Management and/or Re-commercialization Services (as defined in the S.W.5)".**

A17: The Stream title as set out in S.W.5 "Contaminated Site Project Valuation, Insolvency Management and Re-commercialization Services" is correct. Successful Offerors in Stream 3 may be tasked to deliver any of the Services set out in Stream 3.

For evaluation as set out in the Rated Criteria, the Criteria seek the experience of the Offeror / Resources (as indicated per Criteria) delivering services related to this Stream. The breadth of experience required is as set out in each Criterion.

**Q18: Regarding 3C-1, 3C-2, 3A-1, 3A-2 - b.3). Please confirm that Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) for Stream 3 would include a court of competent jurisdiction.**





A18: Yes. AHJ could include a court of competent jurisdiction.

**Q19: 3-R1, 1.1 a) and 1.2 a) require “additional distinct work engagements (in addition to the three work engagements submitted to the Mandatory Requirements). This requirement removes the evaluation and scoring of the 3 most relevant and pertinent projects completed by our senior resources. We request that, similar to 1.1 b) and 1.2 b), work engagements submitted in response to Rated Criterion and Mandatory Requirements will be permitted for 3-R1, 1.1 a) and 1.2 a).**

A19:

3-R1 1.1 a) and 1.2 a) are seeking to evaluate the depth of experience of the proposed Resources, beyond the minimum number of Work Engagements required in the Mandatory Requirements. For example, for the Principal/Project Leader, 3 Work Engagements are required at a minimum, meeting the requirements as set out in the Statement of Work 3C-1. 3-R1 1.1 a) seeks up to an additional 5 Work Engagements (for a total of 8 Work Engagements for the Resource overall).

Offerors should note that the factors for rating the Additional Work Engagements under 1.1 a) i) and ii) and 1.2 a) i) and ii) are the same as those factors used to assess compliance of the minimum required number of Work Engagements but are rated for these Additional Work Engagements (rather than Mandatory as they are for the Minimum required number of Work Engagements).

**Q20: Regarding 3-R2, 2.1 b) (i and iii),**

**a. please confirm the difference between i and iii.**

**b. please provide us with some examples of client organizations and government or quasi-government organizations other than CIRNAC (formerly part of INAC/DIAND) that have procured similar services (as defined in the SOW).**

A20:

3-R2, 2.1 b) i) evaluates the breadth of the Offeror’s client base for the delivery of the Services (being any client organization to whom those services have been delivered).

3-R2, 2.1 b) iii) evaluates the breadth of the Offeror’s client base to government or quasi-governmental organizations.

Clients used to demonstrate 2.1 b) i) may also be used to demonstrate 2.1 b) iii) or other clients may be used to demonstrate 2.1 b) iii).

“Custodial” organizations with ownership or responsibility for real property/assets require these types of services. Government or quasi-government organizations may be those at a national, territorial, provincial or state level (e.g. any federal government department/agency/commission, provincial ministry/agency/board/commission, territorial department/agency/board/commission, crown corporations, public utilities, regulatory bodies, etc.), or Municipal or Regional government; and may include government or



quasi-government organizations within or outside of Canada. A ‘government’ or ‘quasi-government’ organization may also include working as a representative appointed by and reporting to a judicial body to deliver the services (e.g. Court appointed officer).

**Q21: Please confirm that Table 3, provided within the MPMSS tables should be used when completing Requirement 3-R1?**

A21: Offerors MUST use the Table 2 as the template in their Offers. Offerors should (preferred but not mandatory) use other forms (Table 1, 3, 4) as the templates in their Offers.

**Q22: MPMSS Table 3 requests for “Years’ demonstrated work experience related to Service Stream leading a Portfolio of Projects or a Portfolio of horizontal initiatives”. To respond to Stream 3, please confirm this should read “Years’ demonstrated work experience related to Service Stream leading Contaminated Site Project Valuation, Insolvency Management and/or re-commercialization services”.**

A22:

The wording of the requirements in the SOW for Stream 3 are still “leading a Portfolio of Projects or a Portfolio of horizontal initiatives” and will remain “Years’ demonstrated work experience related to Service Stream leading a Portfolio of Projects or a Portfolio of horizontal initiatives” in Table 3.

The intent of this requirement in Stream 3 is to demonstrate that the resources have worked on/led multiple projects simultaneously. The projects/Work Engagements need not be for a single client but may represent a range on concurrent projects for multiple clients.

**Q23: Given that the insolvency of mines often spans more than 10 years, please confirm that a project that started prior to the 10 year cut-off, yet continues into the last 10 years, would qualify for 3-R1.**

A23: Yes, Projects commencing prior to the last 10 years may still be presented provided that some portion of the work of the Resource has been completed in the last 10 years.

**Q24: Given the stringent mandatory requirements, would CIRNAC consider eliminating the minimum pass mark of 70% for 3-R1 through 3-R6, or lowering the minimum pass mark?**

A24: 3-R1 through 3-R6 is amended as follows: “*The minimum pass mark of 70% for 3-R1 through 3-R6 is amended to 60%*”.

**Q25: In Table 3 – Proposed Core Team of Resources – Resource Template, for Stream 2, you have provided a single resource template to be used for Principal/Project Lead or Senior Consultant categories. This table contains a row**





**for “Years’ demonstrated work experience in a Lead Role related to Service Stream”. As this is a mandatory requirement only for the Principal / Project Lead and not for the Senior Consultant (as per Section 7.3.2 2C-2 on page 101/127), can we remove this row from the resource table for the Senior Consultant category?**

A25: The answer is “Yes”.

**Q26: As per S.W.13, we assume that senior personnel (including Project Lead, Senior Consultant, and Senior Subject Matter Experts) will be required to attend meetings at NCSB headquarters. Please provide an estimate of the number of meetings per year for an individual call-up that the senior consultants will be required to attend at the NCSB headquarters. We need this number to calculate an hourly rate for our consultants that will include the cost of travel to NCSB headquarters from points across Canada. Alternatively, can you strike out S.W.13 and reimburse senior personnel for travel to NCSB headquarters on an as-needed basis?**

A26: The number of meetings at NCSB Headquarters will vary by Stream, as well as by # of actual Call-ups and nature of the work, therefore we cannot provide an estimate of the number of meetings/year for a single Call-up. However, remote/virtual participation in meetings may be arranged with the Project Authority at CIRNAC’s discretion.

**Q27: Section 7.3.2.1 requires the Principal/Project Leader to have at least 10 years’ demonstrated work experience related to Major Mine Closure Project Services (2C-1, a ) AND at least 10 years’ demonstrated in a Lead Role related to Major Mine Closure Project Services (2C-1, b ).**

**Can the years of work experience overlap with the years in a Lead Role? For example, would it be acceptable for one of the proposed Principal/Project Leaders to have 12 years of demonstrated work experience related to Major Mine Closure Project Services, with 10 of those years in a Lead Role?**

A27: Yes, these can overlap.

**Q28: Section 2-R1. 2.1 a) states that up to 60 points will be awarded for demonstrated experience of the Resource on additional\* distinct\*\* Work Engagements... with up to 5 Work engagements to be considered.**

**Do these 5 Work engagements include the 3 Work engagements required under the mandatory requirements in 2-M3? In other words, are you expecting a total of 5 Work engagements for each of our proposed Principals/Project Leaders to achieve maximum points?**

A28:

No, the 3 mandatory ones cannot be used. "Additional" is as defined in each criterion. In relation to 2-R1, 2.1 in particular, this is defined as “\*additional means in addition to the three (3) Work engagements submitted in response to the Mandatory Requirements for



the Resource (as set out in the SOW Section 7.3.2.1)”. For this Resource, this means 3 Work engagements are required to meet 2-M3, and 5 additional\* Work engagements would be required to achieve full points on 2-R1 2.1; for 8 Work engagements overall.

**Q29: Please provide the definition of “remote”.**

A29: “remote” means a location with only seasonal or intermittent road access, or is only accessible by air and/or boat, or any other type of location that poses additional logistical challenges to accessing the site.

**Q30: Section 1.5 of 3-M1 states that “all cited Work engagements must involve the planning and implementation of arrangements under the CCAA and the BIA.” Normally, such arrangements are done under either one or the other, but rarely both. Please confirm that this should read “all cited Work engagements must involve the planning and implementation of arrangements under the CCAA and/or the BIA.”**

A30:

The intention of this requirement was for the Offeror to demonstrate experience in the planning and implementation of arrangements under both the CCAA and the BIA. Individual projects may fall under the CCAA or BIA, but across all cited work, experience with arrangements under both the CCAA and BIA must be demonstrated.

3-M1 item 1.5 is amended as follows:

*Cited Work engagements must involve the planning and implementation of arrangements under the Companies Creditor Arrangement Act (CCAA) and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA).*

**Q31: Regarding 3C-1, 3C-2, 3A-1, 3A-2 - b.2). Given that the processes and policies are similar for mines that have come to the Crown through insolvency or abandonment, please confirm if the Crown would consider changing “At least one (1) work engagement must demonstrate insolvency of a mining project” to “At least one (1) work engagement must demonstrate insolvency or abandonment of a mining project”. Please confirm if the rational can also be applied to 3-R1, 1.1 a) ii (a), 3-R1, 1.2 a) ii (a), 3C-1, 3C-2, 3A-1, 3A-2 - b.2).**

A31:

Statement of Work, Section 7.3.3.1 3C-1 b.2; 7.3.3.1, 3C-2 b.2; 7.3.3.2 3A-1, b.2, and 7.3.3.2 3A-2, b.2 are amended as follows: At least one (1) work engagement must demonstrate insolvency of a Mining Project or abandonment of a Mining Project”.

Amend 3-R1, 1.1 a) ii (a) and 3-R1, 1.2 a) ii (a) to read: “Work engagement involved insolvency or abandonment of a Mining Project”

**Q32: Re: 2C-2 Senior Consultant**



**b) states “at least two (2) distinct work engagements”**

**b.4) states “Each work engagement must demonstrate at least three (3) of the following characteristics (b.4.1 – b.4.8) and across all three (3) work engagements each of b.4.1 – b.4.8 must be demonstrated”**

**Please clarify the minimum number of work experiences the senior consultant must provide – is it two, or three?**

A32:

2C-2 Senior Consultant is required to provide two (2) Work Engagements.

2C-2 Senior Consultant, b.4) is amended as follows:

*b.4) Each work engagement must demonstrate at least three (3) of the following characteristics (b.4.1 –b.4.8) and the two (2) work engagements each of b.4.1 – b.4.8 must be demonstrated:*

### **Q33: 2C-2 Senior Consultant**

**b.3) states that “at least one (1) work engagement must demonstrate the Resource’s experience working with Indigenous governments or peoples”**

**b.3.1) states “the Resource’s experience working with Indigenous governments or peoples (where not already considered in demonstration of the requirement for experience in one (1) work engagement as set out in b.3 above)”**

**If the minimum of projects required for the senior consultant is two, does this mean both projects must demonstrate experience working with Indigenous governments or peoples? If the minimum number of projects required for the senior consultant is three, does this mean two of the three projects must demonstrate experience working with Indigenous governments or peoples?**

A33: Only one (1) Work Engagement is required to demonstrate the Resource’s experience working with Indigenous governments or peoples.

### **Q34: Logistical Considerations**

**Many of the mine sites in the North are near communities and wouldn’t be considered remote. However, completing work at these mines poses many logistical challenges, such as having to ship specialized equipment and material to the site (usually during specific periods) as well as having to transport specialists to the site for specific assessments. Additionally, due to the Northern location, extra time is required to ship samples to qualified labs and this time must be accommodated in the project schedule. Therefore, if a key person had to consider these logistical challenges during the execution of a project in the North, can they claim they’ve had experience in an operational Project environment implementing Remote logistical considerations, even if the project itself was not remote?**



A34: Yes. Any other type of location that poses additional logistical challenges to accessing the site will be considered Remote provided the Offeror demonstrates in the Offer the additional logistical challenges. See also Q&A #29.

### **Q35: Definition of Operational project**

**Because the RFSO concerns mine closure projects, please confirm that the definition of an Operational project is equivalent to a closure project and does not mean an operating mine.**

A35: An “operational” project refers to a project that has moved beyond ‘desktop’ planning and into an operational environment. An operational mine closure project would be considered an operational project.

### **Q36: Capital or liability value to the client**

**Private mining companies don’t have to release financial results, and we work for clients who keep their client records confidential. How can we demonstrate that a project has at least CAD\$100 Million or CAD\$50 Million in Capital or liability value without violating any confidentiality agreements we have with these clients?**

A36: In cases where financial results are not made public, a response indicating that the project capital or liability value is >CAD\$100 Million or >CAD\$50 Million (as appropriate), along with the client contact information that would allow us to verify the project cost meets the minimum \$ value, is acceptable.

### **Q37: Minimum Qualifications for each Resource**

**According to 2-M3, the minimum number of Resources per category specified must demonstrate the qualifications for the category. According to 2-R1, where more than one Resource is offered and meets the minimum qualifications of a given category, each Resource will be scored individually, and the totals for each Resource summed and averaged to arrive at an overall score for the Offeror for that category.**

**Based on the above information, it appears that in categories where there is more than one minimum Resource that not all Resources need to meet minimum requirements. However, it also appears that those who do not meet minimum requirements will not be evaluated. Please clarify if each Resource in a particular category has to meet the minimum qualifications in order to be individually evaluated. For example, for Stream 2, Offerors must offer two Principal / Project Leaders, at least one of whom must demonstrate the qualifications for the category. If our first Principal/Project Leader meets all minimum qualifications but our second Principal/Project Leader is short one requirement, would both personnel be scored individually, and their totals summed and averaged to arrive at an overall score for that category? Or, would the second Principal/Project Leader receive 0 points, which would be summed with the score for the first Principal/Project Leader and then averaged?**



A37: A resource must meet the minimum requirements of their Category in order to be evaluated on #-R1. In the example provided if one (1) Principal/Project Leader demonstrates the minimum requirements and the other does not, this one (1) Resource would be rated on 2-R1. The second Principal/Project Leader would not be rated on 2-R1.

**Q38: In categories where there is a minimum/maximum number of Resources specified, do all Resources have to meet the minimum qualifications for that category, or only the minimum number of Resources? If the optional Resource does not meet minimum qualifications for that category, will they receive 0 points?**

A38: For #-M3, only the minimum required numbers of CORE Resources identified are required to demonstrate the minimum qualifications. In response to 1-R1, 1.4, the OPTIONAL Senior Subject Matter Expert – Strategic Planning, Facilitation and Engagement must demonstrate the minimum qualifications for that category in order to receive the 6 points. If they do not, they would receive 0 points.

**Q39: Please confirm that we provide the names of all Resources who currently have Reliability Status with our proposal submission.**

A39: Security Clearance is required prior to the commencement of Work under a Call-up. Resources do not need to be currently in possession of the requisite clearance.

**Q40: Please clarify the requirements for 7.2.2 - Offeror's Sites or Premises Requiring Safeguarding.**

A40: 7.2.2 (page 73/127) is a requirement of any resulting Agreement. Nothing is required within the Offer at this time in response to 7.2.2.

**Q41: Please clarify what is meant by "Offeror's offered location of work performance."**

A41: This refers to the Offeror's place of business (e.g. Offeror's office), where PROTECTED information/assets may be stored, produced or accessed.

**Q42: 7.3.2- Stream 2 – Core Resources: Referencing the requirement for work engagements to occur in the last 10 years (requirement c for Principal/Project Lead, requirement b for senior consultant, etc.)**

**If a project ends in December 2009, would only the portion between September 2009 (within 10 years of RFSO closing date) and December 2009 be considered, or would the entire project period be considered? For example, if the project started in January 2006 and ended December 2009, would we claim 36 months or 4 months for length of project?**

A42: The requirement for the work engagements to have some portion of work done in the last 10 years is to ensure reasonably recent experience. As long as a portion of the work was completed within the last 10 year period, all of the months of the engagement



including the time that is outside the last 10 years will be considered. This applies to both Offeror and Resource Work Engagements.

**Q43: 2-R1. Please clarify which work engagements will be evaluated for the up to 40 points (for Principal / Project Leader or Senior Consultant) and the up to 60 points (for the Senior Subject Matter Experts) for demonstration of the breadth and depth of the Resource's experience across the Work engagements submitted for the Resource (in response to Rated Criterion 2-R1 or in response to Mandatory Requirements 2-M3). That is, will both the mandatory work engagements and the additional distinct work engagements be evaluated and awarded up to 40/60 points, or only the additional distinct work engagements be evaluated and awarded up to 40/60 points?**

A43: For 2-R1, under a) Additional Work Engagements are required in order to receive points. Under b) either the Work Engagements provided in response to the Mandatory Requirements or the Additional Work Engagements may be put forward for evaluation.

**Q44: Can the same Resource be named in two separate categories? For example, can the Principal / Project Lead also be named as a Senior Subject Matter Expert? Can the same Resource be named as a Senior Subject Matter Expert – Major Project Management, and Senior Subject Matter Expert – Contaminated Site Project Control / Project Health?**

A44:

The same individual may be proposed once as a Principal / Project Leader or Senior Consultant, and once as a Senior Subject Matter Expert, however, under any resulting SOA, the Services of that Individual must be provided at the lowest per hour rate of the per hour rates for the Categories in which they are qualified.

The same Resource can be named in two separate Senior Subject Matter Expert categories, if the Resource meets the mandatory requirements for both categories.

Also refer to Q&A #10.

**Q45: Can Resources list work engagements completed for firms other than the Offeror if the work engagements meet the mandatory requirements?**

A45: Yes. Resource Work Engagements may be those completed with the Offeror or may be those completed with other organizations / employers.

**Q46: The RFSO does not address whether a sub-contracted resource may be included in multiple vendor bids for the same Stream. Could CIRNAC please clarify whether this is permitted or not?**

A46: Yes, a sub-contracted resource may be included in multiple vendor bids for the same Stream.





**Q47: CIRNAC has lowered the minimum pass mark of 70% for 3-R1 through 3-R6 to 60%. Would CIRNAC consider lowering the minimum pass mark for 2-R1 through 2-R6 from 70% to 60%?**

A47: No, the minimum pass mark lowered only for the stream 3.

**Q48: For 2-R1 2.1 a) i) and 2.2 a) i). The RFSO states that 6 points will be awarded per additional\* distinct\*\*\* Work engagements for which the Resources services were demonstrated to have been provided for Major Mine Closure Projects (>\$50 million). Question: If the Principal/Project Leaders' and Senior Consultants' additional distinct Work engagements are valued less than \$50 million, will they receive 0 points? Or is there a sliding scale (e.g. 3 points for projects with a value of \$25 million)? If a project is less than \$50 million, will the project still be evaluated for factors (a) to (h) for the Principal / Project Leader, and for factors (a) to (h) for the Senior Consultant?**

A48: The intent is 0 points if the Project was not a Major Project (as defined for the >\$50 million); there is no sliding scale. The projects would still be rated on ii) for relevance of the project scope.

**Q49: The 2-R1 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, part b) of the RFSO states that up to 60 points will be awarded for demonstration of the breadth and depth of the Resource's experience across the Work engagements submitted for the Resource (in response to Rated Criterion 2-R1 or in response to Mandatory Requirement 2-M3). If our Senior SMEs submit 8 Work engagements (3 to meet the mandatory requirements and up to 5 to meet Rated Criterion 2-R1), and if they can receive up to 10 points per Work engagement, will CIRNAC only be evaluating 6 Work engagements (6x10=60) or will you evaluate all 8 Work engagements (8x10=80)? If it is 6 Work engagements, which 6?**

A49:

Any of the Work Engagement the Offeror puts forward for the Resource would be considered on 2-R1 b) for each of 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 (and 1.3 of 1-R1).

Each Work Engagement is evaluated separately on part b out of 10 points to a maximum of 6 Work Engagements. The Offeror should identify which of the Resources' Work Engagements it wishes to have evaluated.

As written, maximum points would be awarded for 6 Work Engagements (up to 10 points per engagement), for a total maximum of 60 points.

**Q50: With regard to table 3, in the resource work engagement section of the table there is a section for a client contact reference for each work engagement. In the RFSO there is no requirement for client references for each work engagement for each resource. Please confirm if it is mandatory to provide a client reference for each work engagement worked by each proposed resource.**



A50: the only mandatory requirements are those listed in the RFSO document, and that the tables are there to provide a consistent template for the information. In this case, for proposed Resource experience, the client contact information is not mandatory in the Offer but must be provided if requested by CIRNAC.

**Q51: SOW 7.3.\_\_\_ criteria for their resource category.**

**Specifically, the question relates to the requirement that a resource provides:**

- **“At least three (3) distinct work engagements....”**
- **“At least two (2) distinct work engagements....”**
- **“At least one (1) distinct work engagement....”**

**And that “Of these work engagements” or “The work engagement”... (followed by a variety of criteria that must be met).**

**By saying (for example) “at least three (3) distinct work engagements”, is there a maximum limit to the number of engagements that can be used to demonstrate the criteria? i.e. must they only use the three engagements, or can they use more than 3 to meet the criteria?**

**Another example: the S.W.7 Intermediate Consultant requirement is to provide “At least one (1) distinct work engagement...” and that “The one work engagement” must meet a variety of criteria. Does this mean the Intermediate Consultant can ONLY use one project to meet the criteria? Or can they use at least one - (i.e. more than one, if needed)**

A51:

Section 7.3 sets out the minimum qualifications. More work engagements can be submitted. However, of the total number of work engagements provided, the stated number of work engagements must meet the given requirement. Offerors should refer to the Rated Criteria where the maximum numbers of engagements that will be eligible to receive points are identified.

If only one work engagement is required and that one work engagement must meet several criteria (as in the example), the Offeror must provide at least 1 work engagement that meets all the required sub-criteria.

**Q52: As per 7.3.2.1, Senior Subject Matter Experts require at least 15 years demonstrated work experience. Given this requirement, would CIRNAC consider extending the period of eligible work engagements for Senior Subject Matter Experts, as specified in 2-R.1: 2.3 a), 2.4 a), and 2.5 a) to 15 years from 10 years?**

A52: No. The mandatory requirement in 2-M3 to meet the criteria set out in 7.3.2.1 are designed to ensure that the Senior Subject Matter Experts can show a depth of experience in their area of expertise. The requirement for the work engagements to have some portion of work done in the last 10 years, as specified in 2-R.1: 2.3 a), 2.4 a), and 2.5 a) is to ensure reasonably recent experience. Also refer to Q&A #42.



**Q53: Section 5.3.5 refers to the Offeror providing “Planning, development, facilitation and reporting on the conduct of engagement, multi-disciplinary working groups.... “. Could a Call-up therefore include a scope of work requiring the consultant to facilitate the development of a major mine closure plan with a multi-stakeholder group, and if so, would the plan be conceptual, or at the design level?**

A53: Yes, a call-up could include a scope of work requiring the consultant to facilitate the development of a major mine closure plan with a multi-stakeholder group, at either a conceptual or design level.

**Q54: Could a Call-up include the requirement to do an environmental or/and socio-economic impact assessment (including baseline work), or components of one?**

A54: Yes, a call-up could include the requirement to do an environmental or/and socio-economic impact assessment (including baseline work).