



**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 / DOCUMENT CONTIENT DES  
EXIGENCES RELATIVES À LA SÉCURITÉ

**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> Architectural and Engineering Servi	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EP751-202885/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 008
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20202885	<b>Date</b> 2020-06-17
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$FE-178-78649	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fe178.EP751-202885	<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 2020-06-26</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Matende, Robinah	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fe178
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 353-8472 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

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/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

### AMENDMENT 008

This amendment is raised to extend the solicitation closing date, respond to questions and make changes to the RFP

**The closing date of the Request for Proposal (RFP) is extended to June 26, 2020 at 2:00 pm**

Western Architectural and Engineering Questions and Answers	
<b>Q1</b>	Please confirm whether or not the independent Commissioning Agent can be employed by the same Firm that is providing the Mechanical and electrical consulting services, provided that this agent is not working directly on the design team?
<b>A1</b>	No the commissioning agent must be independent from the firms performing design work
<b>Q2</b>	Can you give an idea of the budget for the artwork that will be purchased for the Project?
<b>A2</b>	Scope and associated costs for the artwork plan is subject to the design development. Order of magnitude for the Indigenous artwork budget is \$450,000. This amount is anticipated to fund the artwork directly and is not anticipated to fund structural or architectural components that would be considered base components.
<b>Q3</b>	SRE 2 provides detail on the Phased Bid Compliance Process. SRE 3.2.7 indicates how the numerical value (hours for training and labour) and percentage of Total Bid Price (sub consultants and other benefits) will be evaluated (as prorated against the highest numbers offered). As it currently stands, proponents have the ability to provide the four numbers for 3.2.7 for evaluation without providing provable supporting backup arising from discussions with the nations. Rationale being that there are no evaluation criteria set against Appendix F. This could lead to IBP's being developed without engaging the nations and eroding the intent of the socio- economic plans being sought through this procurement model. Can PSPC provide the evaluation criteria that it will use to evaluate and score the supporting information to the IBP in Appendix F?
<b>A3</b>	<p>In the process of developing their IBP, proponents are expected to engage the nations (Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, and Malahat First Nations) to identify business capacity and need for employment, training and other benefits. Nations contact information has been provided in the RFP for that purpose.</p> <p>The Bidder's bid must provide evidence of reasonable effort to engage in a meaningful way with the local First Nations to determine the capacity within the First Nations to provide goods and/or services, for example, correspondence or a letter of support from the First Nation's companies or a record of telephone or e-mail conversations. If the bidder made a valid effort to contact members of the HBFN and the SXFN and is unsuccessful in securing sub-contractors or other elements of the IBP as outlined below, it must still submit a signed IBP Certification form and provide some detail of its indigenous engagement efforts in addition to its contact efforts in order to meet the outlined objectives.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to ensure the Indigenous Benefits Plan provides maximum benefits related to capacity of the local First Nations</p>
<b>Q4</b>	Does PWGSC require \$1 million project-specific insurance from the successful bidder?
<b>A4</b>	<p>Refer to R1250D GC.2 (2017-11-28) Insurance Requirements</p> <p><a href="https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R/R1250D/9">https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R/R1250D/9</a></p>
<b>Q5</b>	Recognizing that local businesses connected to the community are limited within the services required in this RFP, will Indigenous Businesses from the area (nearby municipalities) count under the IBP scoring if they are not connected to the communities identified in this RFP?
<b>A5</b>	<p>The Indigenous Benefits Plan evaluation is limited to the five First Nations communities mentioned in the RFP.</p> <p>Proponents will earn points for programs and team members that include Indigenous people from the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, and Malahat First Nations</p>
<b>Q6</b>	How will section 3.2.7.4 be calculated and will non-monetary options be weighed into this section?
<b>A6</b>	<p>To establish the score for Other Benefits, each responsive bid will be prorated against the Proponent proposing the highest percent of indigenous content, with the proposal committing to the highest percent of indigenous content receiving full points</p> <p>No, non-monetary options will not be weighed into this section</p>
<b>Q7</b>	How will the scoring be weighed if partnerships are not 51% or more in favour of the communities mentioned in the RFP?
<b>A7</b>	<p>The requirement is for a firm, partnership or joint venture to be at least 51% controlled or owned by the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, or Malahat First Nations as stated in this RFP.</p> <p>No score will be given (under SRE 3.2.7.3) for a firm that does not meet this requirement</p>
<b>Q8</b>	Because of difficulties with communications in the COVI-19 environment, timeframes for soliciting information, assembling information and preparing a proposal are taking much longer than under normal circumstances .Therefore we are requesting an appropriate extension to the proposal deadline to adjusted for affects for COVID -19 on proposal response times which we estimate at some 3 weeks worth of time

<b>A8</b>	Bid close has been extended to June 26, 2020
<b>Q9</b>	Can I please request an extension to the closing date of May 25 <sup>th</sup> for the following opportunity:
<b>A9</b>	Bid close has been extended to June 26, 2020
<b>Q10</b>	The RFP lists "Fume hood exhaust air flow modelling" as a required Specialist Sub-consultant under item 6.3.i). Can you please clarify if this refers to interior exhaust airflow modelling, and / or exhaust dispersion and re-entrainment modelling? Is there an anticipated requirement to minimize fume hood exhaust airflows to support the Net Zero design target which would require modelling of the fume hood exhaust discharge and dispersion? Are there specific chemicals, compounds or organics anticipated to be exhausted?
<b>A10</b>	(a) "Fume hood exhaust air flow modelling" refers to both interior exhaust airflow modelling, and exhaust dispersion and re-entrainment modelling. (b) There is an expectation to minimize fume hood exhaust airflows to support the Net Zero design target. (c) There is no specific list at this time regarding specific chemicals, compounds or organics anticipated to be exhausted. It should be noted that products and by-products associated with PPC level 2/2A diagnostic and research laboratories and greenhouse are to be expected.
<b>Q11</b>	Will hazardous materials information already gathered by Island EHS be accepted as reference material for the pre-demolition of buildings at the site?
<b>A11</b>	This is unknown at this time as it is subject to the municipalities review as part of the demolition permit
<b>Q12</b>	Will COVID-19 Exposure Control Planning be part of the Industrial Hygiene Specialist scope of work?
<b>A12</b>	Yes, exposure control planning incorporating the review of all relevant COVID-19 federal and provincial guidelines will be required.
<b>Q13</b>	Is the requirement for the design of the sprinkler systems to complete the full hydraulic calculations and detailed design of the systems? Or to complete the layouts of the systems, with hydraulic calculations and detailed pipe sizing to be done through a design build contractor? The Mechanical Engineer could utilize the pipe sizing tables in NFPA 13 to size piping for BIM modelling, and leave hydraulic calculations up to the contractor and review through the shop drawing phase. Please clarify the Mechanical Engineer's scope.
<b>A13</b>	(a) Full hydraulic calculations and detailed design of the sprinkler system is required. (b) The work in (a) completed by the contractor would need to be determined by the Consultant and CM in accordance with Project Brief sections 1.4.2.1, 10.2.1(b)(i), and 10.2.1(b)(ii). A Record Model of all built works is required as per Project Brief section 1.4.3 and 17.4.
<b>Q14</b>	Refer to 10.1.1.1 Project Meetings, on page 46 of 180, does not specify the location of the Project meetings. Please confirm the location and number of these meetings?
<b>A14</b>	As per Project Brief sections 10.1.1 a) and 10.1.1.6
<b>Q15</b>	Refer to the entire 10.1 Administration Services section. The number of meetings proposed while important also appear to be quite significant in number. The resulting travel time and expenses dollar value is therefore significant. In turn simply passing the cost risk for any undefined additional trips not contemplated onto the proponent team under the expense clause R1230D (208-06-21) Gc 5.12 is not balanced or reasonable. For purposes of preparing a fair and accurate competitive proposal, Please clarify the total number of trips required to the various locations so that a reasonable dollar value can be assigned for this activity? Or alternately we suggest establishing a travel time and disbursement budget against which actual time and acceptable expenses can be charged as incurred at standard hourly rates etc.?
<b>A15</b>	See response to Question 16.
<b>Q16</b>	The RFP proposal evaluation criteria appears to be missing a sub consultant project experience section. Please clarify how the project experience of the various sub consultants will be evaluated without a requirement to submit sub consultant relevant project experience?
<b>A16</b>	Experience of members of sub-consultant teams who are Key Individuals will be evaluated under SRE 3.2.2. Please refer to Appendix A – Team Identification Format
<b>Q17</b>	Related to the inquiry regarding the IBP, would PSPC consider and provide a two week extension to June 8 <sup>th</sup> to allow proponents to continue outreach to the 5 Indigenous Nations that appear to be in lockdown for the coronavirus pandemic?
<b>A17</b>	Bid close was extended to June 22 in amendment 005
<b>Q18</b>	PI11 identifies insurance requirements that the Proponent has to comply with. Some Indigenous businesses either do not carry this level of insurance coverage or will find it cost prohibitive to buy additional insurance to comply with a one off insurance requirement for this RFP, resulting in increased cost flow through to GoC. Additionally, to expect Proponents to carry this insurance liability will also add cost burden to the bid price. Will GoC provide reduced coverage values that it will accept for Indigenous Businesses (under SRE 3.2.7.3)?
<b>A18</b>	For this RFP, Insurance requirements apply to the Proponent. Insurance requirements for Indigenous businesses mentioned under 3.2.7.3 will be determined by the terms of the contract between the successful Proponent and the Sub-consultant.

<b>Q19</b>	SRE 3.2.7.3 indicates that an Indigenous Firm is defined as 51% owned with at least one third of employees (if employing more than six full-time staff) from one of the five First Nations. Outside of this RFP, PSPC has been more clear in the definition of an Indigenous Firm where they state that "A firm must demonstrate, for the duration of the contract, a level of Aboriginal content amounting to 33 per cent of the value of the work performed by the Aboriginal business". In the spirit of the socio-economic benefits that the IBP sets out to achieve for the betterment of the five First Nations, we request PSPC to consider and clarify that at least 33% of the work be undertaken by Indigenous staff of the five First Nations.
<b>A19</b>	Under SRE 3.2.7.3, at least one third of the firm's employees, if it has six or more full-time staff, must be from the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, or Malahat First Nations.
<b>Q20</b>	PI18: Limitations of Submissions states that Proponent firms (including a JV) cannot be members of multiple proponents. Should a Proponent form a JV with either or all nations, then all other proponents would be precluded from submitting a valid IBP. In theory, PSPC could then only receive one qualifying submission under this rule. In the spirit of open competition, will PSPC confirm that no Proponents can form Proponent JV's with any of the five First Nations to submit as a Proponent JV?
<b>A20</b>	This procurement is not limited to indigenous firms or joint ventures only.  See amendment to PI4 – Canadian International Trade Agreement  DELETE This procurement is set aside from the Canadian Free Trade Agreement and the International Trade Agreements under the provision each has for measures with respect to Aboriginal peoples or for set-asides for small and minority businesses.  REPLACE with: "The provisions under Canada's trade agreements providing for measures with respect to Aboriginal peoples or for set-asides for small and minority businesses apply to this procurement."
<b>Q21</b>	Question on SRE 3.2.7 evaluation criteria: SRE 3.2.7.4 relates to commitments to other benefits that include internships, bursaries, scholarships, etc. Will PSPC confirm that sharing profits with the Nations under this criteria will not be considered acceptable? For further context, under the Sarbanes Oxley rules and equivalent in Canada, publicly traded Proponent firms that comply with these rules are prohibited from engaging in such practices (where profits are offered without any commensurate effort from the recipient). To create an equal and transparent competitive RFP process, would PSPC consider removing the possibility of direct profit share with the five First Nations
<b>A21</b>	Profit sharing with the Nations is not acceptable in response to SRE 3.2.7.4
<b>Q22</b>	The terms of the RFP appear to contravene the legislation governing the practice of architecture and engineering in the province of B.C. Per AIBC Practice Bulletin 33: "Architects must confine their practices to exclude engineering, as defined under the Engineering and Geoscientists Act, and are entitled to rely upon a professional engineer's advice in such areas (cf. AIBC Bylaw 33.4). Similarly, professional engineers must confine their practices to exclude architecture, as defined under the Architects Act." (Practice Bulletin attached to this question.) Based on this, no Joint Venture between an Architect and Engineer would be able to register as practitioners in the province under the current legislation. We recommend that Canada considers modifying the terms of the RFP to permit Architect-led teams who engage the services of a Professional Engineer as a sub-consultant, with both parties maintaining professional liability requirements.
<b>A22</b>	Where the Proponent is a firm located in a province or territory which does not provide licences to firms, Proponent should provide as proof of licencing: 1) a statement specifying the province or territory where the firm is located and specifying the province or territory does not provide licences to firms; and 2) proof of licencing of the principals of the firms, where principals shall be stamping or officially reviewing drawings.
	The RFP requires the consultant to engage a geotechnical engineer. Geotechnical analysis is related to defining the characteristics of the owner's site and is not a design consulting. It is typical for the professional liability insurance of an Architect to exclude coverage for the liability associated with a Geotechnical Engineer's services? For this reason, we strongly recommend that Canada directly retains the geotechnical engineer.
	The geotechnical engineer will be required. Canada will not retain a separate geotechnical engineer for the geotechnical analysis.

<b>Q23</b>	<p>As a result of their involvement, I understand the following companies are excluded from participating in the RFP: EP751-202923/A Construction Management Services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KPMG</li> <li>• Deloitte</li> <li>• Stantec</li> <li>• Merrick</li> <li>• Dialog</li> </ul> <p>Can you please confirm if the above are also excluded from participating in the RFP: EP751-202885/A Architectural and Engineering Services?</p>
<b>A23</b>	<p>The following entities Framework Joint Venture will not participate in this RFP because of perceived conflict of interest and/or unfair advantage as per G125 Conflict of Interest – Unfair Advantage</p> <p>Stantec Architecture Ltd., Stantec Consulting, Merrick &amp; Company, Merrick Canada ULC, Dialog Ontario Inc. Dialog Alberta Architecture Engineering Interior Design Planning Inc., Turner and Townsend</p>
<b>Q24</b>	<p>Is a Base Isolation Specialist required? The RFP mentions seismic upgrading with base isolation as an option, but we do not anticipate base isolation would be required for a new building of this type.</p>
<b>A24</b>	<p>The requirement of the Base Isolation Specialist will be subject to the agreed upon mitigations of seismic impacts, if any, determined as part of design development.</p>
<b>Q25</b>	<p>This is a follow-up question related to addendum 4, Q28 and A28. A28 is open ended as far as the extend of travel time and expenses to be allowed for within the fees proposals related to the remaining undefined number of meetings and presentations post COVID-19 . For purposes of a fully defining the scope of services, please provide clarity on the exact number of Post COVID meetings and presentations and their locations that are to be built into our fees proposal ?</p>
<b>A25</b>	<p>See Question 15. Number of meetings that will be held virtually due to COVID-19 cannot be determined at this time.</p>
<b>Q26</b>	<p>SRE 3.2.7.3 &amp; 3.2.7.4 evaluates proponent submissions as a % of their total bid price. We would request PSPC consider changing this to a hard dollar number (\$) based on the following circumstance. It serves to demonstrate that the evaluation scores can be skewed away from the intention of the IBP.</p> <p>Say: Proponent 1 has a total bid price of \$2M and SRE 3.2.7.3 dollar value of \$200,000 ( giving a 10% evaluated value) and a SRE 3.2.7.4 hard value of \$200,000 ( giving a 10% evaluated value).</p> <p>Proponent 2 has a total bid price of \$1M and SRE 3.2.7.3 dollar value of \$100,000 ( giving a 10% evaluated value) and a SRE 3.2.7.4 hard value of \$100,000 ( giving a 10% evaluated value).</p> <p>Whilst Proponent 1 is delivering a higher benefit to the communities, they will get the same evaluation score as Proponent 2 when compared against the highest evaluated proponent numbers in each of the evaluated criteria.</p>
<b>A26</b>	<p>Evaluation of criteria 3.2.7.3 and 3.2.7.4 is changed from percentages (%) to dollar values (\$). Refer to amendment below.</p>
<b>Q27</b>	<p>Will signage be required to follow a pre-existing signage standard? If so, would the signage standard be made available for bidding purposes?</p>
<b>A27</b>	<p>Signage would be required follow the Federal Identity Program Manual (<a href="https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/government-communications/federal-identity-program/manual.html">https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/government-communications/federal-identity-program/manual.html</a>)</p>
<b>Q28</b>	<p>It appears that the total summary of extend fees for Table A for hours and hourly rates is in excessive of upset limit \$1,000,000 for Sidney lab. Please confirm that this is acceptable?</p>
<b>A28</b>	<p>The extended fees are estimated values for evaluation purposes only and are not reflective of the contract totals.</p>
<b>Q29</b>	<p>Refer to Table A. Please confirm that the total number of hours under the various categories like 'General Architecture' for example are for the Sidney lab only and that the total number of hours is not meant to realistically be totals for both the Sidney lab and the Winnipeg combined together ?</p>
<b>A29</b>	<p>Please refer to Table A notes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payment will be based on actual hours spent. Travel time and/or expenses will not be reimbursed separately (Refer to R1230D (2018-06-21), GC 5.12 – Disbursements).</li> <li>• The Total Time Based Fee [a calculation based upon the noted total number of hours] is for evaluation purposes only and has no bearing on Canada's liability to the Consultant.</li> <li>• Estimated number of hours is given for evaluation purposes only.</li> </ul>

<b>Q30</b>	Internally we have several architectural positions that fall under the heading of 'Senior architects' and 'Intermediate Architects'. Can we cite several levels of say 'Senior Architects' provided the total for that particular category does not exceed 150 hours?
<b>A30</b>	A single rate is required to be provided for each position regardless of the number of individuals that may fall under that heading. Estimated number of hours is given for evaluation purposes only.

## AMENDMENTS

## THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY

## 1. RESPONSE TO QUESTION 28

Criteria 3.2.7.3 and 3.2.7.4 have been modified by replacing percentages (%) with amounts in dollar (\$) values as highlighted below

3.2.7.3

SERVICES PROVIDED BY INDIGENOUS FIRMS (subconsulting):  
Proponents will be evaluated on their commitment to offer services from Indigenous Firms as defined below.

For the purposes of this requirement, an Indigenous Firm is defined as a sole proprietorship, limited company, co-operative, partnership, or not-for-profit organization. To be considered an Indigenous Firm the following criteria must be met:

- at least 51 per cent of the firm is owned and controlled by the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, or Malahat First Nations, and
- at least one third of the firm's employees, if it has six or more full-time staff, must be from the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, or Malahat First Nations.

If a firm is starting a joint venture, at least 51 per cent of the joint venture must be controlled and owned by an Indigenous Firm, as defined above.

The Proponent represents and warrants that:

No less than \$ \_\_\_\_\_ will benefit the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, or Malahat First Nations

The dollar values should be supported by a list of specific Indigenous Firms that can be confirmed by the designated representatives of the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, or Malahat First Nations, respectively.

To establish the score for Services, each responsive bid will be prorated against the Proponent proposing the highest value of indigenous content, with the proposal committing to the highest percent of indigenous content receiving full points.

	Proponent 1	Proponent 2	Proponent 3
Amount committed to Indigenous Firms	\$114,000	\$76,000	\$200,000
Calculation of points	114/200 = 57% of total points available = 8.55	76/200 = 38% of total points available = 5.7	200/200 = 100% of total points available = 15

/15

3.2.7.4

Other Benefits

Proponents will be evaluated on their commitment to offer other benefits such as internships, bursaries, scholarships, etc. to Indigenous People belonging to the Pauquachin, Tseycum, Tsartlip, Tsawout, and Malahat First Nations at no additional cost under this Contract.

To establish the score for Other Benefits, each responsive bid will be prorated against the Proponent proposing the highest value of indigenous content, with the proposal committing to the highest percent of indigenous content receiving full points.

	Proponent 1	Proponent 2	Proponent 3
Amount committed to Indigenous Firms in the form of other benefits	\$57,000	\$38,000	\$100,000
Calculation of points	57/100 = 57% of total points available = 8.55	38/100 = 38% of total points available = 5.7	100/100 = 100% of total points available = 15

/15

## 2. CHANGE TO Q42 OF AMENDMENT 006:

The highlighted wording is added to the response.

Question/Answer	Architectural and Engineering Questions and Answers
<b>Q42</b>	The addendum 1 does not specifically answer the following question: Please refer to P19 , 1.and 3.1 .2a) .These clauses require that the proponent to be licenced as both an architectural and engineering firm. The province of British Columbia is the only province in Canada that does not issue 'certificates of practise' for engineering firms. The licences are issued to individuals only. In other words NO Proponent firm can be Licenced directly as an engineering firm in the province of British Columbia and therefore

	this mandatory requirement cannot be met as worded . The licences to practise engineering are only issued to the individual engineers who can then practise under an umbrella proponent firm. This is different from architectural proponent firms who are issued licences(certificates) to practise as an architectural firm and then there are architects who are issued licenced to practise as individuals and who then practice under the umbrella of the licenced architectural firm. Therefore, please clarify how the proponent firm can meet the intent of the mandatory dual licencing requirement?
<b>A42</b>	Where the Proponent is a firm located in a province or territory which does not provide licences to firms, Proponent should provide as proof of licencing: 1) a statement specifying the province or territory where the firm is located and specifying the province or territory does not provide licences to firms; and 2) proof of licencing of the principals of the firms, <b>where principals shall be stamping or officially reviewing drawings.</b>

### 3. AMENDMENT TO SRE 3.1.2

#### **ADD the following highlighted titles to Key Individual**

##### 3.2.1 Consultant Team Identification

The consultant team to be identified must include the following. The information is to be provided as per Appendix B, Team Identification Format.

- a) Proponent (prime consultant)
  - Must be licensed or eligible to be licensed in both Architecture and Engineering. Consider forming Joint Ventures if necessary to meet this requirement.
- b) Key Sub-consultants / Specialists Firms
  - Key Sub-consultants must be identified.
- c) Key Individuals
  - Senior Project Manager
  - **Senior/**Lead Architect
  - Architectural Production Leader
  - **Senior/**Chief Lab Design Specialist
  - **Senior/**Lead Structural Engineer
  - **Senior/**Lead Mechanical Engineer
  - **Senior/**Lead Electrical Engineer
  - BIM Manager
  - Independent Commissioning Agent/**Specialist**

### 4. AMENDMENT TO APPENDIX C – TABLE A

#### **ADD the following resource and level of effort (estimated hours) to the table**

	Architectural Production Leader	150	\$	
--	---------------------------------	-----	----	--

#### **ADD the following bullet points to Table A Notes:**

8. *Lead, Chief, Senior and Leader and associated synonyms are considered equivalent under Table 2 of the Time Based Fee.*
9. *The BIM Manager identified under Table A is considered a senior role.*
10. *Resources are to be billed against their performed function. To clarify with an example, a senior individual acting in a junior role would be considered billable under the junior role.*

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EP751-202885/A  
Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client  
20202885

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
008  
File No. - N° du dossier  
FE178.EP751-202885

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
fe178  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

## 5. AMENDMENT TO THE PROJECT BRIEF:

**DELETE** the table at section 10.1.1.6 and **REPLACE** with the following

### 10.1.1.6 Frequency of Meetings and Workshops

See Project Brief section 11, Pre-Design Services, and section 12, Schematic Design Services, for the Consultant Services associated with the Sidney Science Facility.

	Pre-design stage	SD stage	DD stage	DP stage	Construction and commissioning stages
Meetings:					
Project	Monthly				
Design	Weekly				Until all DPs are awarded
Construction and Commissioning	None			Every two weeks until sub-Project completion	
Submission	None	6	6	As required	
Workshops:					
Subject Matter Specific	None	Per submission	Per submission	4 to 6 estimated	
Functional Program	8-12		As required	None	
Casework and FF&E	As required			Every Casework and FF&E DP	4 to 6 estimated
Constructability	Monthly			Every Base-Building DP	4 to 10 estimated
Project Control	Monthly				
Risk Management and Lessons Learned	Every 4 months				
Value Engineering	None	2		None	
Partnering	1	None			

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THE SOLICITATION MAY NOT BE EXTENDED ANY FURTHER.**