



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

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

**11 Laurier St. / 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 A SECURITY  
REQUIREMENT

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Consultant Services Division/Division des services  
d'experts-conseils  
L'Esplanade Laurier  
4th floor, East Tower  
140 O'Connor Street  
Ottawa  
Ontario  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TECHNICAL ADVISOR SERVICES	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EJ078-200154/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20200154	<b>Date</b> 2019-10-07
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$FE-181-77692	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fe181.EJ078-200154	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2019-11-07</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b>	
<b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Bergevin, Carl	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fe181
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (343) 549-0747 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> PWGSC The Taxation Headquarters Buildings 875 Heron Road Ottawa, Ontario Canada	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Solicitation No. - N° de Sollicitation**  
EJ078-200154/A

**Amd. No. - N° de la modif.**  
005

**Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur**  
FE181

**Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client**  
20200154

**File No. - N° du dossier**  
fe181-EJ078-200154

**Title of Project – titre du projet**  
875 HERON ROAD REHABILITATION  
PROJECT – TECHNICAL ADVISOR

---

### Document Changes

The following change in the Request for Proposal document is effective immediately. This amendment will form part of the contract documents.

This amendment is being raised to amend the following:

1. **APPENDIX C – PRICE PROPOSAL FROM**

**Add the following to Appendix C:**

The hours in Column A are for bid evaluation purposes only and do not represent any hours or estimate of hours associated with the project. For clarity, hours in column A are for evaluation purpose only, based on the level of effort for Required Services **and** Optional Services for the total Project duration.

Rates in Colum B will be contractually binding and paid on the basis of actual hours worked to the maximum amount payable.

### Inquiries

The following is in response to inquiries received in relation to this solicitation. This amendment will form part of the contract documents.

Number	Question(s)	Answer(s)
8	<i>« Proponents, any of their Sub-Consultants, and any of their subcontractors, advisors, Consultants or representatives should therefore be aware of the possibility of being precluded from submitting a bid or being proposed as a sub-contractor/sub-Consultant on subsequent contracts. In addition, any of their Sub-Consultants, and any of their subcontractors, advisors, Consultants or representatives should be aware of the possibility of being deemed as ineligible for the purpose of participating in solicitations for future design and construction services related to the aforementioned project, including <b>but not limited to</b> the solicitation for the future 875 Heron Road Rehabilitation Project – P3 Consortium project. »</i>	The wording <b>“but not limited to”</b> is meant to capture unforeseen contracts or other contracts directly related to the 875 Heron road contract or a potential change from the project from a P3 to something different. Note that the text qualifies/limits it to <i>“for future design and construction services <b>related to the aforementioned project...</b>”</i>

**Solicitation No. - N° de Sollicitation**  
EJ078-200154/A

**Amd. No. - N° de la modif.**  
005

**Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur**  
FE181

**Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client**  
20200154

**File No. - N° du dossier**  
fe181-EJ078-200154

**Title of Project – titre du projet**  
875 HERON ROAD REHABILITATION  
PROJECT – TECHNICAL ADVISOR

---

	<p>Does « but not limited to » imply that PWGSC could restrict any consultant, sub-consultant, etc., from bidding any future PWGSC design and construction services procurements? It is understood that that P3 Advisory Team members would be ineligible for subsequent contracts on the same project, but “not limited to” expands beyond the project.</p>	
9	<p>Related to SRE 3.2.2: Please confirm you just want information for Architect, Civil Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, IT Engineer and Sustainable Design Specialist AND that you don't want information for Senior Project Manager, Senior Environmental Engineer, Senior Structural Engineer, Landscape Architect, P3 Procurement Advisor or Facility Maintenance Management Specialist.</p>	<p>As per SRE 3.2.2, the Proponent should provide information for the <b>firms</b> of the six (6) Key Sub Consultants and Specialists (as identified in SRE 3.1.2 and Appendix A). For clarity, PWGSC's intent is to evaluate the technical merit of the <b>firms</b> who are proposed to deliver the Sub Consultant and Specialist Services within 3.2.2.</p> <p>In SRE 3.2.3, the Proponent should provide the information and CVs for the six (6) Key Personnel (as defined in SRE 3.1.2 and Appendix A) as well as for the six (6) other Required Personnel mentioned in SRE 3.2.3.</p>
10	<p>Related to SRE 3.2.2 and 3.2.3: Given the nature of the project would it be appropriate to have information submitted on a Heritage Conservation Architect? It seems to be a vital aspect of the project.</p>	<p>Under SRE 3.2.2, only the Key Sub-Consultants and Specialist will be evaluated.</p> <p>Under SRE 3.2.3, only the Key Personnel and other required personnel listed will be evaluated.</p> <p>The Proponent should provide their understanding of project and their Team Philosophy/ Approach/ Methodology in SRE 3.2.4 and SRE 3.2.5 respectively.</p>
11	<p>Related to SRE 3.2.2: Given that the major of the costs of a P3 Project over its long term are Maintenance costs would it be appropriate to have information on the Facility Maintenance Management Specialist?</p>	<p>The Proponent should provide information about the Facility Maintenance Management Specialist as requested in SRE 3.2.3.</p>

**Solicitation No. - N° de Sollicitation**  
EJ078-200154/A

**Amd. No. - N° de la modif.**  
005

**Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur**  
FE181

**Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client**  
20200154

**File No. - N° du dossier**  
fe181-EJ078-200154

**Title of Project – titre du projet**  
875 HERON ROAD REHABILITATION  
PROJECT – TECHNICAL ADVISOR

12	<p>Related to SRE 3.2.2: Some of the experience on project types (Items a) to h)) seem inappropriate to the sub-consultant discipline.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>c) management of a multi-disciplinary team is not something that any sub consultant typically does</p> <p>d) environmental sustainability considerations has little impact of the services of an IT Engineer</p> <p>g) FHBRO approvals has little impact of the services of an IT Engineer</p> <p>h) coordination of approvals is rarely done by IT Engineers or Sustainable Design Specialists.</p> <p>How will PWGSC evaluate experience against non-relevant criteria? Could the criteria be more tailored to the specific services of each sub consultant?</p>	<p>It is expected that each Key Sub-Consultant and Specialist <b>firm</b> demonstrate their experience providing services similar to those identified in the Required Services and Optional Services described in this RFP.</p> <p>It is not expected that every Key Sub-Consultant and Specialist <b>firm</b> will have all experience identified in SRE 3.2.2 a) to h). The SRE 3.2.2 technical rating will collectively consider all Key Sub-Consultant and Specialist <b>firms</b>.</p>
13	<p>Regarding Solicitation No. EJ078-200154/A - Technical Advisor Services, we would formally request a two week extension to the proposal submission deadline, given the size of the team and complexity of the submission effort required.</p>	<p>Canada will extend the closing date of this RFP to November 7, 2019 at 2 PM.</p>

**Solicitation No. - N° de Sollicitation**

EJ078-200154/A

**Amd. No. - N° de la modif.**

005

**Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur**

FE181

**Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client**

20200154

**File No. - N° du dossier**

fe181-EJ078-200154

**Title of Project – titre du projet**

875 HERON ROAD REHABILITATION  
PROJECT – TECHNICAL ADVISOR

14	<p>3.2.1 Achievements of Proponent on Relevant Projects – Proponents are requested to provide three projects that are minimum 1 year into construction, as well as have a P3 Consortium contract greater than \$250 million.</p> <p>Given our understanding of the marketplace and the number of firms that could meet these requirements, will PSPC consider:</p> <p>a. Shifting the timeline to include projects that have reached financial close, as the bulk of the technical advisor’s role is completed prior to construction.</p> <p>b. Reducing the P3 Consortium contract value to greater than \$100 million, as is requested in “3.2.2 Achievements of Proponent Key Sub-Consultants on Relevant Projects”.</p>	<p>No changes will be made to the requirements expressed in SRE 3.2.1.</p> <p>As per SRE, Section 3.2.1, Proponents should clearly indicate how this project is comparable/relevant to the requested project. Given that the criteria is rated (not mandatory), if the proposed projects do not meet the minimum value and progress of services (1 year into construction) as identified in SRE 3.2.1, they would still be considered and rated appropriately in accordance with the approach described within SRE 3.2.1.</p>
15	<p>3.2.3 Achievements and Role of Key Personnel and other Required Personnel – The Key Personnel and other required personnel list in this section does not include a cost consultant. Does this mean that the cost consultant role will not be evaluated, but should still be shown? And would this criteria apply to other roles that the Proponent believes are necessary for the work but not included in the RFP?</p>	<p>Under SRE 3.2.3, only the Key Personnel and Other Required personnel will be evaluated.</p> <p>It is not Canada’s intention to evaluate the technical merit of all Sub-Consultant and Specialists required to deliver the services described in this RFP, but rather evaluate the technical merit of only those Sub-Consultants and Specialists (identified within SRE 3.2.3)</p> <p>Refer to SRE 3.2.5 4) for evaluation of proposed roles envisioned by the Proponent.</p>
16	<p>To date about 30% of the 412 page RFP document has been withdrawn and replaced. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix C – 10 pages</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix D – 33 pages</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix E – 11 pages</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix F – 12 pages</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix G – 48 pages</li></ul> <p>Most of the changes are not clearly identified and this requires a careful</p>	<p>Canada considered your question and wish to clarify that appendix E,F,G were changes to the English documents only for formatting issues only, as per AMD 001.</p> <p>Appendix C was deleted and replaced with changes limited to the pricing Table A as per AMD 004.</p> <p>Appendix D was deleted and replaced in order to resolve a discrepancy between the EN and FR versions of the document, with changes limited to the French document</p>

**Solicitation No. - N° de Sollicitation**  
EJ078-200154/A

**Amd. No. - N° de la modif.**  
005

**Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur**  
FE181

**Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client**  
20200154

**File No. - N° du dossier**  
fe181-EJ078-200154

**Title of Project – titre du projet**  
875 HERON ROAD REHABILITATION  
PROJECT – TECHNICAL ADVISOR

---

	comparison of the original and revised documents to understand the significant changes that warranted the amendment. Will PWGSC provide an extension to the closing date?	only in section 4.2, No changes were made to the English Annex D document.  Canada will extend the closing date of this RFP to November 7, 2019 at 2 PM.
17	Do you have a sign-in sheet for the site visit on September 25 for the Ottawa 875 Heron Road Rehabilitation Project?	As the site-visit on September 25, 2019 was optional, no sign-in sheet was required and is therefore not available.
18	We respectfully request an extension of at least 3 weeks to November 13 <sup>th</sup> , to allow enough time to properly respond to this RFP.	Canada will extend the closing date of this RFP to November 7, 2019 at 2 PM.

**END OF AMENDMENT 005**