

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #6

This document addresses **two (2)** additional questions (highlighted) that Infrastructure Canada (INFC) has received regarding RFP # INFC-2019/20-PS2011.

NOTE: The bid solicitation period has been extended (see Q15).

NOTE: Criteria MC1 (see Q3 and Q10), PRC2 (see Q6), and PRC1 (see Q9) have been modified as well as the Proposed Resource Credentials Form (see Q7). These changes have been reflected in amendment 1 of the RFP.

Q15:

Will INFC consider extending the solicitation period?

A15:

Yes, INFC hereby extends the solicitation period **to 11:59pm E.D.T. on September 23, 2019**. This overrides INFC's response to Q2.

Q14:

Please clarify INFC's expectations for travel for audits.

A14:

Outside of initial kick-off meeting(s) in Ottawa, it is expected that the Senior Auditor(s) will be doing most of the travel required for audits while the Project Manager/Lead may travel for an audit if the Senior Auditor is unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances.

Q13:

How many project summaries are required for criteria MT3 and PRC1? How will points be allocated for PRC1 if two teams are proposed?

A13:

These two criteria do not pertain solely to the experience of any proposed resources. These two criteria address the bidder's understanding of INFC's requirement and what approach the bidder's proposed resources and team(s) will take regardless of who is proposed or how many teams are proposed. No specific form is required to be used, only a written piece attached to the bidder's technical proposal.

Q12:

Given that up to two Project Manager/Leads can be proposed, how will points be awarded for PRT1 if only one is proposed versus two?

A12:

Each proposed Project Manager/Lead who meets all the mandatory criteria will be evaluated for PRT1. If two are proposed and they both (a) meet all the mandatory criteria and (b) obtain the minimum pass mark for PRT1, then the average of their combined scores (= 0.5 * ([score of PM/L1 out of 20] + [score of PM/L2 out of 20])) will be the final score awarded for PRT1. If one of the two does not meet the minimum pass mark for PRT1, then only the full score of the one who obtained at least the minimum pass mark will be the final score awarded for PRT1.

Q11:

How are bidders to provide information only in the Proposed Resource Credentials Form when, at article d) in Attachment 1 to Part 4 (page 16 of the original RFP), it states that bidders are recommended to use a grid when cross-referencing statements of compliance with supporting data?

A11:

While providing the required info on the Proposed Resource Credentials Form is required, bidders may list audits by a unique identifier on that form that refers to a particular section on an attached list. The attached list **MUST NOT** be in resume/CV format and must only contain the information suggested in the example. Bidders may list more or less than three activities for each audit conducted by the proposed resource depending on the specifics of the audit.

Q10:

May INFC also allow for the Project Manager/Lead to also be a member of both teams (not just the Partner/Managing Director) for criterion MC1?

A10:

Yes, INFC amends the note at the bottom of MC1 as follows:

| Original Text | <u>Revised Text</u> |
|---|--|
| Note: Only the Partner/Managing Director may be a member of both teams. | Note: Only the Partner/Managing Director and Project Manager/Lead may be a member of both teams. If two Project Managers/Leads are proposed then each team may only have one Project Manager/Lead on it. |

Q9:

For criterion PRC1, can the phrase “for each audit” be removed?

A9:

Yes, INFC amends the note at the bottom of criterion PRC1 as follows:

| Original Text | <u>Revised Text</u> |
|---|--|
| Note: The Bidder must score the full 2 points for “liaising and debriefing Project Authorities” for each audit in addition to the minimum overall pass mark for this criterion. | Note: The Bidder must score the full 2 points for “liaising and debriefing Project Authorities” in addition to the minimum overall pass mark for this criterion. |

Q8:

Are bidders required to submit proof of education credentials? If yes, where?

A8:

Bidders must be able to supply any supporting documentation for Canada’s verification upon request. If bidders wish to include this in advance, then copies of education credentials and professional certificates may be attached as separate pages in their technical proposal. By supplying these credentials in

advance, bidders are NOT exempt from filling out the details on the Proposed Resource Credentials Form (Attachment 3 to Part 4).

Q7:

For criterion MT2, bidders must provide the info in the Proposed Resource Credentials Form (Attachment 3 to Part 4). On that form, it asks for “work experience (in months) in the stated resource category (above)”. May INFC change the wording to include experience at any level (e.g. Senior Auditor’s experience need not be limited to experience only at the senior auditor level but also include at the auditor level)?

A7:

In response, INFC changes the wording in the Proposed Resource’s Credentials sub-section on the Proposed Resource Credentials Form (Attachment 3 to Part 4) as follows:

| Original Text | Revised Text |
|---|---|
| Work experience (in months) in the stated resource category (above) | Audit experience (in months) completed by the proposed resource |

Furthermore, INFC stresses that the experience contained on this form for any proposed resource must not overlap in time. For example, if the last month of audit 1 overlaps with the first month of audit 2, then that month cannot be double-counted and INFC will only count that as one month of experience when calculating the total audit experience of that proposed resource.

Q6:

For bidders submitting two teams, would INFC consider modifying PRC2 such that both the Partner/Managing Director and the Project Manager/Lead do not need to be located in the regions proposed?

A6:

In response, INFC hereby amends criterion PRC2.ii accordingly:

| Original Text | Revised Text |
|---|--|
| ii. All resources proposed for a region, with the exception of the Partner/Manager Director, must be located in the regions proposed. | ii. Both the Senior Auditory and Auditor proposed for a region (east or west) must be located in that same region. (The Partner/Manager Director and the Project Managers/Leads can be located in any region.) |

Q5:

Please provide clarification regarding article b) in section 1.4 Point-Rated Criteria in relation to criteria MT2, MT3, PRC1, and PRC2.

A5:

That article pertains only to the technical criteria, MT1 and PRT1, which pertain solely to the Project Manager/Lead’s experience.

Q4:

May INFC add a point-rated criteria to have more than 1 resource for the eastern team be bilingual given that audits will be performed in New Brunswick?

A4:

A point-rated criterion for the language requirement will not be added at this time. The adjustment to mandatory criterion MC1, detailed in question 3 (below), will be sufficient to meet INFC's requirement.

Q3:

In the statement of work, at least one individual (on either team) must be fluently bilingual. Must that individual be the Partner/Managing Director or may that be any of the other proposed resources?

A3:

In response to this request for clarification, INFC amends mandatory criterion **MC1** by adding the following statement:

For each team proposed, either the Senior Auditor or Auditor must be fluently bilingual in English and French in both speaking and writing. The Bidder must indicate any proposed resources that are bilingual by writing "Bilingual" in the Category field on the relevant Proposed Resource Credentials Form (Attachment 3 to Part 4) in addition to the general category of the resource (e.g. Auditor).

The above statement is inserted because the people doing the fieldwork being bilingual will result in the most effective means of completing the required audits (described in the Statement of Work in Annex A).

Q2:

Will INFC consider extending the solicitation period by 1 week?

A2:

No. INFC needs to start the work sooner rather than later.

Q1:

Please confirm that the solicitation number of the RFP is supposed to match INFC-2019/20-PS2011.

A1:

INFC acknowledges that a typo was made on page 1 of the RFP (in both official languages) regarding the year. The solicitation number on page 1 should read INFC-2019/20-PS2011.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS BID SOLICITATION REMAIN
UNCHANGED**

Procurement Services – Services et Approvisionnement
Infrastructure Canada
Visit our – visitez-nous [INFRAnet sub-site](#)
or contact us at – vous pouvez nous rejoindre:
infc.procurement-appvisionnement.infc@canada.ca