



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

**Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement**

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

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Marine Machinery and Services / Machineries et
services maritimes

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
6C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau
Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TIES CCG Supply Arrangement	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F7012-190001/A	Date 2020-01-29
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F7012-190001	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
File No. - N° de dossier 029ml.F7012-190001	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ML-029-27552	
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement 2019-12-23 Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-02-13	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Guay, Yvan	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 029ml
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-2907 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-0897
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

This Amendment 002 to the Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA) is issued to provide the Questions and Answers Set 2.

Questions and Answers Set 2

Question 10:

1.7.1.1. Mandatory Technical Criteria

A. Personnel Evaluation

i. Existing Pre-qualified Personnel

The supplier must provide pre-qualified personnel that meet the technical requirement of this contract. The CCG Contracting Authority must contact the SA Authority to verify that the proposed resource is on the pre-qualified list.

ii. New Personnel

If pre-qualified personnel is not available, the supplier must provide a copy of the resume of the new resource to the SA Authority and CCG Project Authority for evaluation. If the new resource meets the RFSA Mandatory Technical Criteria for the occupational category, the name will be added to the pre-qualified personnel list.

Questions:

Q1. Do we contact the Contracting Authority directly, to obtain the list of pre-qualified personnel, or do we submit a list of names to CCG CA asking for verification that the proposed person is on the pre-qualified list?

Q2. Assuming we will use some or all of the resources listed in our last TIES submission, do we need to submit all the same documentation (CV, Grid etc.) if they're on the pre-qualified list?

Answer 10:

A1. Your Question is about the Appendix 1 Template of SA RFP page 4 of 13. No. SA RFP will be issued under Supply Arrangement (SA) once the SA is in place after 1 April 2020. The Supplier is not allowed to contact any CCG Contracting Authority during this RFSA Solicitation process. The Criteria 1.7.1.1 is from the Template SA RFP to be used in future SA RFP. Prior to enter into a SA Contract, the CCG Contracting Authority is required to verify with the PWGSC Supply Arrangement Authority that your proposed resource for a SA Contract is qualified under the Supply Arrangement.

A2. Yes. The Supplier is required to submit the documentation such as CV and template of this RFSA Solicitation process F7012-1900001/A. Also, see Answer 4.

Question 11:

It is noted that a technically compliant response to this RFP:

- calls for Suppliers in their response to the RFP to demonstrate Candidate experience in up to 12 Areas of Expertise;
- these 12 Areas of Expertise comprise up to 121 Fields of Specialty of which a minimum of 65 must be demonstrated; and
- a Supplier is allowed to provide the Curriculum Vitae of up to 6 qualified Candidates for each Area of Expertise.

Consequently, to be fully compliant, a supplier must prepare and submit as many as 72 Curriculum Vitae each one individually tailored to the respective Area of Expertise and its respective Fields of Specialty, along with their mandatory educational and professional credentials.

As well, it is noted that a technically compliant response to this RFP:

- calls for Suppliers in their response to the RFP to demonstrate Supplier experience in 2 Types of Work for each of the 12 Areas of Expertise; and

- the Types of Work themselves comprise up 20 Sub-Types of Work of which a minimum of 10 must be demonstrated;

The foregoing constitutes a meticulous, voluminous, and complex process and a bidding period of four normal working weeks is insufficient (the RFP was released just prior to Christmas). Therefore, it is requested that the closing date of this RFP be amended to 2020-03-31 in order to provide all bidders with a fair opportunity to compete.

Answer 11:

An extension until 13 February 2020 was granted with solicitation amendment 1. Templates were provided in solicitation amendment 1 to indicate which information is required to submit a technically compliant response.

Question 12:

1. We are requesting clarification of PART 5 CERTIFICATIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION page 12 of 33, (5.2.2.4) and page 17 of 33 (6.12 (1)) Restrictions on bidding.

Answer 12:

Canada confirms that restrictions on bidding will apply to future SA contracts to avoid any unfair advantage or conflict of interest.

Question 13:

2. Reference: "Annex A "SOW" Section 4.1 The supplier proposed candidates must be its own employees or subcontractors. The supplier must qualify as a minimum one (1) of its own employee within the required occupational category of a given area of expertise offered."

For the qualifications of 4.4.2 Marine Mechanical Engineering and 4.4.3 Marine Electrical Control and Power Systems, one employee of the company must be a P. Eng OR Technical Specialist with 1st Class Engineer (TCMS or equivalent).

This is very limiting for smaller companies who would not necessarily have the range of personnel on staff, and who would typically hire independent professional subcontractors to meet different project technical requirements.

We propose modifying the requirements to allow for a greater and more robust response to your RFP by allowing access to a qualified range of professionals with equivalent expertise in these categories.

Answer 13:

See Answers 8 & 9.

Question 14:

3. Education Requirements "4.4.4 Intermediate Engineer" states the Intermediate Engineer is required to meet the same education and certification requirements as the Senior Engineer, with the only difference being minimum years of experience.

Is it acceptable to propose an individual who is currently in the process of receiving their Professional Engineer license to practice, who also has over 12 years' experience? If this is not allowed, will there be an opportunity for suppliers to further qualify when the RFP is republished in September to new suppliers?

Answer 14:

No. Unchanged. As per RFSA Annex A, SOW pages 11 & 12 of 16, articles 4.4.1 Senior Engineer and 4.4.4 Intermediate Engineer, require a Certification of Professional Engineer. As per RFSA page 16 of 33, On-going Opportunity for Qualification, a notice will be posted once a year around September.

Question 15:

4. Regarding the requirement for Professional Engineer designation within the "Areas of Expertise" or "Field of Study", if a P. Eng designation under a specific Area of Expertise does not exist within Canada,

how can a company meet that occupational requirement? For example, Marine Informatics Technology, or Aids to Navigation.

We recognize the objective of the requirement but believe the intent of the requirement to be in error. Could you please confirm if the intent is to seek a P. Eng who is willing to take on the responsibility of sealing engineering documents that are produced under the categories of Area of Expertise and Fields of Study?

Answer 15:

Unchanged. As per RFSA Annex A, SOW pages 11 & 12 of 16, articles 4.4.1 Senior Engineer, The mandatory technical criteria about Certification describes a designation of Professional Engineer within the Area of Expertise and/or Field of Specialty. Canada clarifies that Professional Engineers with various education and experience backgrounds are qualified to work within the Area of Expertise and/or Field of Specialty and take the responsibility of sealing engineering documents under the Areas of Expertise and/or Fields of Specialty.

Question 16:

5. Regarding the requirement for membership in a chartered provincial society for Certification of Technologists and Technical Specialist, this not a mandatory requirement to practice in most provinces. This is a new requirement when compared to the last RFP for TIES. Our company employs many technical persons with the necessary education and over 20 years' experience, however, they are not presently registered in a chartered provincial association and will not be by the time of this submission.

We would like to propose relaxing the requirement for this membership based on the fact that Technicians and Technologists are very rarely required to seal engineering documents. As required by the Canadian Engineering Society, it is the Professional Engineer that is required by the regulations to seal an engineering document. In the majority of provinces this requirement has been written into the Criminal Code. Also, insurance for Errors and Omissions for an Engineering Company is based on the number of certified and qualified engineers, not technologists.

Answer 16:

Your question refers to RFSA Annex A, SOW page 4 of 16, article 4.2 and page 11 of 16, article 4.4.2 Senior Technical Specialist. When a Supplier respond in an Area of Expertise which requires either an Engineer or Technical Specialist. The work in that applicable Area of Expertise could be completed under the supervision of an Engineer (P.Eng.) or Technical Specialist (accreditation to a chartered provincial association) and the other Technical Specialists and Technologists of the team are not required to comply with this additional Certification criteria.

Question 17:

The current closing date does not leave sufficient time to respond. Given the complexity of the response and the number of Areas to respond to, will Canada extend the closing date to 30 March 2020?

Answer 17:

No. The closing date remains 13 February 2020.

Question 18:

We plan to submit a proposal for the CCG TIES Supply Arrangement. I have a few questions from our insurance provider.

1. Our insurance policy includes the standard contractual liability but not contractual liability on a blanket basis. Will this be a problem?
2. Annex C, Section 2.1.2 states:
The following endorsement must be included:

Notice of Cancellation: The Contractor will provide the Contracting Authority thirty (30) days prior written notice of policy cancellation or any changes to the insurance policy.

The Underwriter won't agree to provide an endorsement for this because it is X's responsibility to maintain the insurance policy not the Underwriter's. Can the requirement for an endorsement be waived? X will be contractually bound to provide notice of cancellation or change to Canada.

Answer 18:

RFSA Page 25 of 33, Annex "C", 2.0 Additional Insurance Requirements. Unchanged. Canada clarifies that the clause 2 of article 2.1 describes the Contractor notification of the errors and omissions liability insurance coverage of the Engineers.

Question 19:

1. Would you be able to revise the solicitation closing date to a later date, to provide additional time for a proper response to the solicitation?

Answer 19:

No. See Answer 17.

Question 20:

2. Sections 3.1 and 4.1 (b) of the SOW state that the Supplier and the Candidates must have a minimum of two years of experience within the last five years. Do you require identification of specific project start and finish dates (month and year) that would amount to a total of two years minimum, or would provision of a number of sample projects within last five years be sufficient?

Answer 20:

The beginning and start dates (month and year) of projects that would amount to 24 months could satisfy this criteria. A number of sample projects within the last five years in the same position for the employer could also satisfy the criteria.

Question 21:

4.1 (a)

The Supplier proposed Candidates must be its own employees or subcontractors. The Supplier must qualify as a minimum one (1) of its own employee within the Required Occupational Category of a given Area of Expertise offered.

Section 4.2

Table states that for Area of Expertise #5 Non Destructive Test Analysis states that only candidates of Engineer, Senior or Intermediate are required.

We would propose nominating a subcontractor in the area to supplement our in house capability however together these requirements exclude us for proposing candidates as both the prime and the sub would require a Professional Engineer (P.Eng) with qualifications in NDE.

Would the CCG please consider relaxation of this requirement in this Area of Expertise and in subcontractor requirements.

Answer 21:

See Answers 8 & 9.

Question 22:

Neither your email, nor the attachments fail to respond to my question. There is no templates for bidders in the attachments that you have sent. What you have sent seems to be rather templates that evaluators SPAC will use to evaluate the bids.

I am therefore asking again my question: Please provide the templates that bidders are to be used to present a service offering. If there is not, it must be clear to all bidders and confirm that bidders are to set up their own templates.

Answer 22:

Templates were provided in Solicitation Amendment 1. A detailed template will not be provided. The following path is explained to facilitate the preparation of your Technical response.

If a Supplier offers Areas of Expertise 1 and 2, that Supplier includes the Resumes of Personnel as per Resume Template. A maximum of 6 Resumes per Area of Expertise.

The resumes of candidates meet the education, certification and experience requirements, and contains details the Area of Expertise and/or Field of Specialty requirements.

If one candidate resume qualifies a Field of Specialty having 2 years within the last 5 years, another resume is not required for that Field of Specialty.

The Supplier completes the Fields of Specialty Template for Areas of Expertise 1 and 2 to facilitate verification that the group of Candidates meet the minimum number of Fields of Specialty.

The Supplier completes Sub-Types of Work Template for the Area of Expertise 1 and another Sub-Types of Work Template for the Area of Expertise 2.

The Supplier will provide a Supplier Profile to describe that he meet the minimum number of Sub-Types of Work for each of these 2 Areas of Expertise by having 2 years within the last 5 years to qualify a Sub-Type of Work.

Question 23:

Annex E. 4.0 Mandatory Technical Criteria Extract

The Suppliers are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe how the relevant experience was gained for the Mandatory Technical Criteria will not be considered "demonstrated" for the purpose of this evaluation. In order to demonstrate compliance, the Supplier must provide the information as requested in section of the Statement of Work (SOW Section).

Question:

- A) This sentence seems to be somewhat incomplete: Specifically "in section of the Statement of Work (SOW Section)." This extract would appear to be missing the section # being referred to.
- B) What is the supplier expected to deliver with their proposal that satisfactorily demonstrates the relevant experience?

Answer 23:

- A. The section # are within each Technical Evaluation Criteria of the Table that follows.
- B. See Answers 20 & 22.

Question 24:

Part 6, A, 6.12 Restrictions on Bidding. The vast majority of TIES tasks will not provide an unfair advantage for future work. Industry needs to know which tasks will result in a restriction on bidding, and what exactly they are restricted from. Bidders will be reluctant to bid on new work if there is uncertainty on future restrictions. It is recommended that the RFP be modified to indicate that each task will state if there is a restriction or not and define the scope of the restriction if it is restricted. Will Canada consider amending the clause to allow for restricted and non-restricted tasks?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
F7012-190001/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
F7012-190001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
002
File No. - N° du dossier
029ml.F7012-190001

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
029ml
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Answer 24:

As per Answer 12, Restrictions on Bidding apply to future SA contracts to avoid any unfair advantage or conflict of interest. Le Canada is reviewing opportunity to clarify non applicability of this clause in the SA RFP Template when a future SA contract does not confer any unfair advantage or conflict of interest.

Question 25:

Part 6, A, 6.13 Pre-Qualified Personnel List. This is new to TIES and seems to be an unnecessary burden both on Industry and Canada. Given the many companies that will qualify on TIES and the amount of tasks on a yearly basis, the constant checking of names against lists for every proposed resource will result in a heavy administrative burden for both Industry and Canada and may cause unnecessary delays . Canada always has the right to audit companies to ensure all staff used were qualified. Will Canada consider removing this additional administrative burden to Industry and Canada?

Answer 25:

No. The administration of the SA will contain this constraint. Canada anticipates benefits by having the same candidates proposed to qualify a Supplier under the Supply Arrangement as the ones proposed on SA Contracts.

Question 26:

Part 6, B, Bid Solicitation Process 6.2.3 The wording of this clause appears to eliminate the ability to do a sole source contract under \$25K since the CCG Project Authority will add 2 additional suppliers. This is counter to recent initiatives to increase the sole source value. Sole sourcing work under \$25K is commonplace within the Crown. It recognizes that as tasks values get smaller ie \$1-2K, the effort to run a competition is not cost effective, both for the Crown and Industry. When the CCG client wants competition under \$25K they always have the right to solicit more than one company. The current wording seems to unnecessarily limit CCG's options. Will Canada consider allowing sole source tasks under \$25K at the sole discretion of CCG?

Answer 26:

No. The administration of the SA will contain this constraint.

Another Questions and Answers Set 3 is in Preparation.