

Addendum #4

This solicitation addendum is issued to:

- 1. Delete Section 5.3.2 Stage II – Mandatory Technical Requirements in entirety and replace it with the following:**

5.3.2 Stage II – Mandatory Technical Requirements

Stage II will consist of a review to determine which proposals comply with all of the Mandatory Technical Requirements as follows:

Mandatory Technical Requirements		
MTR.1	The Proponent must be an accredited architectural firm with the Architectural Institute of British Columbia (AIBC)*	Pass/Fail
*Any recognized equivalency in professional licensing registration, certification, accreditation, etc. in architecture, engineering and various other relevant fields concerning this RFP's work scope from different jurisdictions of treaty member countries will be accepted, but Proponents must demonstrate with official record that the Canadian equivalency has been obtained upon submission of proposals.		

Each proposal will be examined to determine compliance (pass/fail) with each mandatory technical requirements identified above. A proposal must comply with all of the mandatory technical requirements in order to proceed in the evaluation process. A proposal which is deemed by CMHC to be non-compliant in one or more mandatory technical requirements will be eliminated from further consideration. A proposal which meets all the mandatory technical requirements will be deemed compliant and will proceed in the evaluation process.

- 2. Add a Second Mandatory Proponents' Site Visit as follows:**

It is mandatory that the Proponent visit the site and examine the existing conditions and the scope of the work proposed in the RFP.

The site visit will be held on February 11, 2020 at 1:00 PM PST. The site is located at the CMHC Granville Island Administration Office at 1661 Duranleau Street, 2nd floor, Vancouver, B.C. V6H 3S3.

The Proponent must send confirmation of attendance, including the name(s) of the person(s) who will be attending, via email to the contact person provided in Section 2.4 by 5:00 PM PST on Friday February 7, 2020.

Proponents who, for any reason, cannot attend at the specified date and time will not be provided with an alternative opportunity to view the site. Mandatory attendance is only required at one of the two site visits (for example, if a Proponent attended Site Visit #1, their attendance at Site Visit #2 is optional). Written Q&A from Site Visit #2 will be published on buyandsell.gc.ca

3. **Extend the Submission Deadline time and date to 11:00 AM PST on March 3, 2020**
4. **Delete Section 5.3.2 Stage II – Mandatory Technical Requirements in its entirety and replace with the following:**

1.6 Schedule of Events

The following schedule summarizes significant target dates for the RFP process. These dates are objectives only, and they may be changed by CMHC at its sole discretion. They shall not be considered terms or conditions under which the RFP will be conducted.

Date (2020)	Activities
January 7	Request for Proposal issued
January 17	Deadline for Proponent’s to confirm attendance for the Mandatory Site Visit (#1) (5:00 PM PST)
January 21	Mandatory Proponent Site Visit (1:00 PM PST)
February 7	Deadline for Proponent’s to confirm attendance for the Mandatory Site Visit (#2) (5:00 PM PST)
February 11	Mandatory Proponent Site Visit (1:00 PM PST)
February 13	Deadline for questions (5:00 PM PST)
February 18	Deadline for issuing addenda (answers to questions)
March 3	Submission Deadline (11:00 AM PST)
March	Evaluation - Selection of Short List Proponents
April - May	Presentations/Interviews
May	Evaluation - Selection of lead Proponent
May	Agreement award and finalization with lead Proponent
June	Announcement of successful Proponent
As Requested	Debriefing to unsuccessful Proponents

5. **Delete Q.3. and A.3. from Addendum #2 in its entirety.**
6. **Provide the following questions and answers:**

Q.6. Stage IV – Presentation Interview. The Table on section 5.3.4 states: “Presentation of Proponent’s approach to the execution of the scope of work, including the Proponent’s vision for the future of Granville Island with examples detailing their vision for items listed in the SOW including the expansion of the Public Market, the redevelopment of the former Emily Carr University of Art + Design, Updated Public Realm Design Guidelines, and Tenant Design Guidelines”.

Under article 28.0 of the Architectural institute of British Columbia (AIBC) Bylaws:

“An architect is not permitted to provide architectural services to a client until the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) All terms and conditions of engagement have been confirmed in a written architectural services contract with the client, executed by the parties; and

(b) The client has been advised in writing:

(i) whether professional liability insurance is in place in relation to the architectural services to be provided for the commission;

(ii) that the professional liability insurance policy in (i) is available for review by the client upon request; and

(iii) that the contract “is in compliance with AIBC Bylaws, including the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct.”

Given that these conditions will not be achieved during the interview phase, please expand on the content and deliverables that are expected from the Proponent for the purposes of the Presentation Interview.

A.6. *As per Section 5.3.4 “These shortlisted Proponents will be invited to make a presentation and introduce the proposed resource(s) to CMHC (the “Presentation”) in person on-site CMHC. The purpose of the Presentation is to allow the Proponents to address the major elements of their proposal, to demonstrate the competencies and plan developed by the applicant to successfully execute the outlined work, to allow a committee of CMHC employees and non-CMHC consultants (the “Evaluation Team”) to obtain any required clarification based on a set of pre-defined questions and to allow members of the Evaluation Team to interact directly with the proposed resource(s).”*

The Presentation/Interview requirements will be reviewed with the shortlisted proponents to ensure compliance with Architectural institute of British Columbia (AIBC) Bylaws.

Q.7. Is it permissible for a design consultant to join more than one Proponent team?

A.7. Yes. Please refer to addendum #3 Question/Answer # 5.

Q.8. Section **3.3.6 Travel** states, “No travel is required in the course of the Term of the Agreement and no compensation will be awarded to the selected Proponent(s) for any travel cost incurred.” Is building those costs into hourly rates as overhead permissible, or including such cost in a lump sum permissible? Are these rules the same for sub consultants as for the prime consultant?

A.8. CMHC is anticipating the Services to be invoiced as billable hours, the Proponent is responsible to inform their sub-consultants as no compensation for any travel costs will be awarded.

Q.9.a) Please confirm if the Proponent is expected to provide a complete team of preferred sub-consultants (outside of a Joint Venture) for the design projects identified as Planned Future Projects in Section 3.3.2 Scope of Work?

A.9.a) The expectation is for Proponents to meet the requirement outlined in Section 4.5 Proponent's Qualifications *"Include a description of any sub-contractor(s) and which portions of the project they will be responsible for."*

Q.9.b) If the answer to the above question is yes, please clarify whether or not the Proponent is expected to provide hourly rates for preferred sub-consultants (as per Section 4.10).

A.9.b) There is no requirement to provide hourly rates for sub-consultants, as detailed in Section 4.10 *"All work will be billed on a time and materials basis as per the pricing submitted in the RFP or in the case of sub consultants or other sub-contractors at the invoiced amount plus agreed mark up costs."*

Q.10. If a Proponent were to work with CMHC to create design guidelines, would the Proponent be still eligible to bid on a buildings project or a masterplan project that incorporated said guidelines as it came up?

A.10. Should a Proponent perform the initial work (for CMHC), they would be permitted to bid on future projects, where CMHC is the procuring entity, that result from the initial work, assuming any requirements in the subsequent work are not defined so narrowly as to restrict competition. Additionally, the solicitation document for any subsequent work will disclose a summary of the initial work done, including the name of the initial contractor, and the scope of the initial work done.

In a situation, where CMHC is not the procuring entity for future projects and the Proponent performed the initial work (for CMHC), they may be permitted to bid on future projects, at the discretion of the procuring entity.

The Proponent is permitted to complete projects for other third parties on Granville Island in addition to working for CMHC.

Q.11. CMHC noted in the Proponents meeting that a strategic advisor was hired to do some current work. Can CMHC share what type of work this is or the scope?

A.11. The link below is to the Request For Proposal (RFP) for the 2040 Development Strategy Consulting Services referenced in the Site Visit:

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/procurement-data/tender-notice/PW-19-00886788>

- Q.12. Section 4.6 asks Proponents to provide a detailed response relative to the specifications listed in Section 3. Items 1- 5 on page 17 and 18 are a mix of ‘design’ led projects and ‘review’ and ‘assist’ type projects with a potential changeable scope. How detailed a response to the Statement of Work is expected on the items that do not have a more definitive scope?
- A.12. The Proponent’s response should fully address the specifications outlined in Section 3 Statement of Work, detailing how the Proponent will meet the requirements. Appendix B – Evaluation Table outlines the Evaluation Criteria used by the team evaluating submissions.
- Q.13. Page 34 section 4.2 notes “The Contractor shall ensure that CMHC Information shall remain in Canada and expressly agrees to segregate CMHC Information, whether electronic format or in hard copy from other info by physical or electronic means.” In the situation where our sub or our affiliate US office could be involved, what provisions would be acceptable to fulfill the physical and electronic segregation of information?
- A.13. At this time, CMHC does not anticipate any Protected Information will be shared with the Contractor in order to deliver the Services outlined in the RFP. The link below provides additional information regarding the Levels of Security and corresponding requirements:
- <https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/protection-safeguarding/niveaux-levels-eng.html>
- Q.14. In section 5.3.4 stage IV under Presentation Evaluation Criteria, it notes that in the interview you would like to see the Proponents approach to the execution of the scope of work including the Proponents Vision for the future of Granville Island with examples detailing the Vision. In the meeting, you also noted that there would be a shortlist of two. What is your expectation with regards to the materials to review during this interview? To ensure we maintain the AIBC integrity bylaws of producing work it would be good to understand what the expectation is for this interview?
- A.14. Please refer to A.6. for the response.
- Q.15. Can CMHC provide a copy of the current *Granville Island Signage Guidelines* mentioned in item 3 on page 16 of the RFP?

A.15. As the Granville Island Signage Guidelines are not required for Proponents to submit a complete written response CMHC will not be providing a copy at this time. If requested, the Granville Island Signage Guidelines may be provided to the Shortlist Proponents ahead of the Presentation/Interview.

7. Provide the following questions and answers from the Site Visit (SV) held on January 21, 2020:

SV.Q.1. Can the sign-in sheet be made available to all?

SV.A.1. As per Addendum #1 Answer #1 *“Proponents interested in partnering opportunities for this RFP can add their name to the List of Interested Suppliers on the Tender notice web page for PW-20-00901661.”*

SV.Q.2. Will proponents or firms that have a stake or interest within this RFP be precluded from bidding on or performing on other work with CMHC either independently or as a sub-consultant.

SV.A.2. Please refer to A.10. for the response.

SV.Q.3. Is there a timeline for the first year deliverable – updating the required design guidelines?

SV.A.3. The timeline for deliverables will be agreed upon with the Lead Proponent.

SV.Q.4. Is there a rough/ general annual projected spending /budget for capital construction projects, on going building repairs and deferred maintenance works?

SV.A.4. As detailed in Section 3.3.2. *“CMHC completes between \$2-6 million dollars’ worth of capital projects and ongoing building repairs annually that include regular ongoing repairs and deferred maintenance items as operational budgets allow.”*

SV.Q.5. The RFP categorize the proponent Resources into three levels with their required experiences respectively, i.e. If proponents have more resource category than the RFP specified or if sub-consultants are included, what is the acceptable format in presenting resources?

SV.A.5. Proponents must provide pricing as prescribed in Section 4.10 to be in compliance with the Mandatory Submission requirements.

As per Section 4.10 *“Should the Proponent have any rates or titles not listed above, and which they intend to charge out, these must be included in the submission. ALL rates must be included.”* Proponents may submit any additional Resources and/or Services in their preferred format.

Set their rates structure to capture all of the Services provided by the Firm and/or Joint Venture within the Level 1, 2, 3 Resources Categories.

- SV.Q.6. As Granville Island is under Federal Jurisdiction, which building/ design / field-specific code or technical standard should proponents’ work fall under?
- SV.A.6. At the start of each project, when the resources are selected, CMHC and the Lead Proponent will determine the applicable codes.
- SV.Q.7. Can CMHC confirm that References must be within the last five (5) years, or can they be from 6+ years ago?
- SV.A.7. The References as requested in Section 4.5 Proponent Qualifications, Item (f) must be “examples of work performed, within the last five (5) years of issuance of this RFP, for other clients similar to the requirements set out in Section 3 – Scope of Work of this RFP.” These references will be evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria in Appendix B.

Proponents may include additional relevant project examples to highlight their suitability, experience and expertise.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.