
PUBLIC WORKS AND
GOVERNMENT SERVICES
CANADA

ADDENDUM NO. 6

COMPLEX REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS
REAL ESTATE SERVICES DIRECTORATE

PROJECT NO. 5225-2-2020-5
599 TREMBLAY ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

DATE: July 8, 2020

The following changes to the Request for Qualification document are effective immediately and form part of the Contract Documents.

This Addendum consists of Two Parts:

PART 1: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question 1

For digital Responses (via USB or submitted via epost Connect service), would PWGSC please advise if confidential financial statements from private companies can be submitted as password protected PDFs, with the password then sent directly from the company's corporate finance representative to the Contact Person via regular email?

This would allow the financial statements of multiple companies within a consortium to be submitted as part of the Response while ensuring that only PWGSC has access to confidential information.

Response 1

Documentation of any kind, including financial statements must not be submitted as password protected documents, including PDFs. As to the issue of confidentiality, please refer to Section 4.11 (8) and Section 7.18 of the RFQ. Please also note that the epost Connect service provided by the Canada Post Corporation does not support password protected document. Responses, including financial statements, can be submitted in hard copy in accordance with Section 4.4.2 of the RFQ.

Question 2

In reference to FORM C-6 — RESPONDENT KEY INDIVIDUALS FORM, could you please provide clarification on the role of the Indigenous Specialist? This clarification is needed to choose and engage the most appropriate consultant for the role prior to RFQ submission.

Question 1

Is the Indigenous Consultant an "outreach" consultant or a "design" consultant, or both?

Question 2

Aside from the development of the noted Indigenous Benefits Plan, what is the scope of the Indigenous Specialist during the RFP Phase? As this is the period the design development is largely completed, engagement and input from the indigenous community would be the most effective at this stage.

Question 3

Could you please comment /elaborate on our assumed possible scope of the Indigenous Specialist below and advise if this scope is to take place during or after the RFP phase:

1. Liaison / negotiations with local indigenous groups on land issues, project social impact / benefit analysis.
2. Plan to maximize engagement of Indigenous persons in design and construction capacity on the project.
3. Assist design team to incorporate Indigenous design principles, material, and techniques into the urban design, built form, landscape etc.
4. Review Building and site layout with engagement with local nations to ensure respect for cardinal direction, orientation to landforms, or other culturally significant landmarks.
5. Engage local indigenous community members to gather cultural input that may inform the character and form of the buildings and open spaces.
6. Review with the design team opportunities for developing programming that can create opportunities for the local Indigenous community. For example, is there an opportunity to provide offices space, or a community function that could be leased out to Indigenous organizations both profit and non-profit?
7. Review materiality, of buildings and see if there is opportunity to use materials, finishes etc. that are both inspired and respect the local indigenous people's traditions.
8. Review the traditional architectural typology of traditional Algonquin architecture such as the wigwam and long house to see if there are passive sustainable strategies such as displacement ventilation that can be integrated into the design of the complex.
9. Review the landscape design to ensure the palette of plant materials is derived from Indigenous sources. Further look for opportunities to use the landscape in and around the buildings to provide education of local indigenous plants etc. that may have cultural significance.
10. Develop a design approach that places nature at the centre of the value system. I.e. sustainable strategies importance of the relationship between buildings and landscape.
11. Through engagement with the indigenous community schedule any site ceremonial functions such as site cleansing etc. that may be deemed appropriate for the site.

Response 2

1. Please refer to response 1 of Part 1 and revision 12 of Part 2 in Addendum 3 in response to this question.
2. Please refer to response 1 of Part 1 and revision 12 of Part 2 in Addendum 3 in response to this question.
3. Please refer to response 1 of Part 1 and revision 12 of Part 2 in Addendum 3 in response to this question. The Indigenous Specialist should have the experience and expertise to help the Preferred Proponent meet its obligations anticipated in the Indigenous Benefits Plan in Accordance with Appendix B, Section 3.3 Indigenous Benefits Plan.

Only the Preferred Proponent will have the contracting authority to initiate project related activities demonstrated in their Indigenous strategy and Indigenous Benefits Plan.

The design proposal will be required to meet the performance specifications that will be provided in the RFP and will be assessed in accordance with the RFP evaluation criteria. This will be addressed at the RFP stage.

Question 3

Upon reviewing the RFQ, we have determined that a number of trade agreements apply, including the North American Free Trade Agreement; the World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement; the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership; and the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (collectively, the “applicable trade agreements”).

Rated Requirement C.2. “Key Individuals” contained at Appendix D of the RFQ requires the Respondent to submit resumes for the three Construction Key Individuals from the Construction Prime Member describing their overall experience within the past ten (10) years from the closing date of the RFQ. One of the evaluation criteria is that the experience presented should demonstrate the Key Individual’s capacity to “deliver on comparable projects, meaning new construction of multiple purpose- built facilities **in various locations across Canada**” (emphasis added).

The requirement that comparable projects have been delivered in Canada is unnecessarily restrictive. Unless this Rated Requirement is clarified to permit comparable projects in Canada or in other countries with similar markets such as the United States, then this provision will violate the applicable trade agreements. Such an approach is consistent with other provisions of the RFQ. For instance, Rated Requirement E.3. “Key Individuals” provides that “experience should include projects that have ... [b]een located in Canada or **in a similar financial market environment**” (emphasis added).

Please amend Rated Requirement C.2. to expressly permit Respondents to submit comparable projects from across Canada or from other countries with a similar market environment.

Response 3

Comparable projects from other countries in similar markets under comparable climatic conditions are acceptable. Please see Part 2, revision 1, of this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 4

Appendix A Definitions – A Design Prime Member is defined as an entity that will be responsible for or undertaking over 50% of the design work for each of the architectural, civil, mechanical, electrical, structural and other design and engineering elements of the Project. If two firms plan to split the design work within their discipline 50/50, would you prefer documentation from both firms, or would you prefer one firm to act as the lead and assume 51% or more of the scope?

Response 4

Both options are acceptable.

Question 5

D-1 Project Template, Part C Design – Could you describe the type of information you anticipate in response to the question “description of any limitations on the scope of the design services”?

Response 5

The Respondent should describe any relevant limitations, if any, encountered in the delivery of the scope of the design services, which could include (but are not limited to the following examples): technical constraints, budget limitations, resourcing/skillset availability, or any other challenges the Respondent would identify as pertinent. In addition, please refer to Form D-1 about describing the lessons learned and challenges faced.

Question 6

Section 4.13 – We understand that there is no requirement for firms to participate in this procurement in a joint venture or other forms of association (RFQ section 4.13(1) and Addendum No. 2, Response 21).

Please clarify the following:

- 1- Is it acceptable for the relationship between the Respondent and the Prime Members to be a prime contractor (Respondent) to subcontractors (Prime Members)?
- 2- Is it permitted to have a Respondent that does not fill any of the Prime Member roles?
- 3- Is it permitted to have a Respondent that fills only one of the Prime Member roles?
- 4- If the Respondent is a corporation incorporated under the laws of Canada for the purpose of this RFQ, can the corporation rely on the experience of its shareholders to qualify for requirements which must be met by the Respondent?

Response 6

Please see below the answers addressing each point of Question 6.

1. Yes
2. Yes, this is possible where the named Respondent is an Equity Member that is not a Prime Member.
3. Yes
4. Only projects from Prime Members will be considered as part of the evaluation in accordance with Appendix D.

Question 7

Definitions in Appendix A

Appendix B, Section 4.7(1)

Appendix D – Package 2 - Submission Description in E.1

Please confirm that an Equity Member can be a special purpose entity and there can be a guarantor or parent company indicated for an Equity Member. While the definitions of Guarantor and Guarantee in Appendix A indicate that the Guarantor and the Guarantee only relate to a Prime Member, the following provisions in the RFQ indicate that an Equity Member can be a special purpose entity and there can be a guarantor or parent company indicated for an Equity Member:

- i. Appendix B, Section 4.7(1) – If the Preferred Proponent is a wholly-owned special purpose subsidiary of another entity, such other entity or other related company

would be required to execute a guarantee and/or indemnity agreement pursuant to which such entity would be required to guarantee all of the obligations of the Preferred Proponent under all agreements executed with or in favour of PWGSC and/or related to the Project.

- ii. Appendix D – Package 2 – Evaluation Criteria in E.1 – The evaluation criteria #1 refers to the Equity Member, **parent company or other guarantors** of the Availability of Funds (emphasis added)

Response 7

An Equity Member can be a special purpose entity and there can be a Guarantor / parent company indicated for an Equity Member. In addition, please refer to Response 15 in Addendum 3 in answer to this question.

Question 8

Appendix D – E. Financial Capability and Financing Experience

In order to keep the various different team member's financial information confidential, please advise if the financial deliverables listed on pages 58-59 of the RFQ can be sent directly to PWGSC instead of including it in the RFQ submission. If so, what is the process to submit them directly to PWGSC?

Response 8

Please refer to Response 1 in this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 9

RFQ Section:

- a. Definitions in Appendix A
- b. Section 7.3
- c. Section 7.12
- d. Section 7.20.3

The RFQ refers to a Key Team Member in section 7.3, section 7.12 and section 7.20.3. However, Key Team Member is not a defined term. Please advise whether the references to Key Team Member should be references to Prime Member.

Response 9

Please refer to Revision 3 of Part 2 in this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 10

RFQ Section:

- a. Definitions in Appendix A
- b. Form C-3
- c. Form C-5
- d. Appendix D – A.2.3(b) and A.3

The RFQ refers to Project Development Prime Member in Form C-3, Development Lead in Form C-5 and to a Project Development Lead in Appendix D, A. 2.3(b) and A.3. However, Project Development Prime Member, Development Lead and Project Development Lead are not defined terms. Please advise whether the references to Project Development Prime Member, Development Lead or the Project Development Lead should be references to Project Lead.

Response 10

Please refer to Revision 11 of Addendum 3 and Revisions 2 and 4 of this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 11

Refer to Appendix G - RFQ Security Guide, Item 4. Security Clearances at Contract Award
Will the Successful Proponent require Designated Organization Screening (DOS) under the JV/Consortium name used for the RFQ submission or, will the clearance that each individual company currently holds fulfill this requirement at contract award?

Response 11

The JV/Consortium will need a security clearance in accordance with Section 4 of Appendix G of the RFQ.

Proponents Key Individuals will also each need a valid security clearance in accordance with Section 4 of Appendix G of the RFQ.

Question 12

RFQ Section: Appendix D section E – Section E.1 requires that for every Prime Member (which includes Financing Prime Members), a CFO letter be provided along with the Prime Member's annual and quarterly financial statements. To the extent that a Financing Prime Member plays a purely advisory role within the consortium and does not lead the consortium nor provide any capital contribution to the Project, can you confirm that the requirement for the CFO letter and financial statements are not necessary?

Response 12

Confirmed. Please also refer to Part 2, Revision 10 of Addendum 3 in answer to this question.

Question 13

Appendix C - Form C-1 - Master RFQ Response Form – The form asks for the name and title of Respondent Representatives and the text below states the "Representatives" are required to have the power and authority to bind the Respondent.

The Representatives with binding authority are not the key contact people within the Respondent organization for this RFQ. Could you kindly consider amending the form to add a Key Contact Person for the Respondent, allowing for one of the Key Individuals to be the Contact Person for PWGSC.

Response 13

Respondents may identify a Respondent Representative Contact Individual. Form C-1 Master RFQ Response Form is amended to add the information for this person. Please refer to Revision 5 of Part 2 in this Addendum 6 in answer to this question. Also, please refer to Appendix A-DEFINITIONS for the definition of Respondent Representative Contact Individual.

Question 14

Appendix D: E. Financial Capability & Financing Experience, E.1: Submission, #2 for Construction Prime Member – This section asks that the Construction Prime Member(s) demonstrate capacity to undertake its project obligations etc. It goes on to state that:

"This information should be substantiated ... through:

1. *Copies of annual audited financial statements and the notes to the financial statements, or other similar financial information, for each of the last three fiscal years (entire annual reports should not be provided)," etc.*

Other than bonding capacity, what financial information do you require to meet this obligation as the company is privately owned and is not accustomed to releasing its financial statements?

Response 14

The request to provide copies (of annual audited financial statements and the notes to the financial statements, or other similar financial information, in accordance with the RFQ submission requirements) applies to any Respondent including private or public companies. Respondents who do not submit copies of annual audited financial statements and the notes to the financial statements, or other similar financial information, in accordance with the RFQ submission requirements may not score as high as those who do.

Question 15

General Planning & Approval Status for 599 Tremblay – Could you provide some detail on the status of your master plan, the intended sequencing of development and construction, and the status of the envisioned parcel for 599 Tremblay Road (the Site). More specifically:

- Has the entire site been subdivided, or is there an intention for it to be by the time the contracts are negotiated?
- Is 599 Tremblay its own parcel, or will the proponent need to oversee a formal subdivision or severance process?
- Has your Master Planning work included a servicing plan, and if so is there an envisioned sharing and/or sequencing among the different parcels that you would be willing to share with the Respondents?

Response 15

- Please refer to Appendix B, section 1 and section 2. Part of the Parcel is intended to be disposed to CLC who will develop it into a mixed use community of residential, commercial and other mixed use components. CLC is in the process of preparing a subdivision application to the City of Ottawa for that part of the parcel.

- The 599 Tremblay Parcel identified as Federal Office in Appendix B, Figure 2, is its own parcel and will remain the property of PWGSC and will not be included or be part of the subdivision application.
- This would be addressed at the RFP stage.

Question 16

RFQ Section: Appendix D; E.2 and Addendum 3, Part 2, Item #10

The RFQ requires that Respondents are to provide copies of annual audited financial statements for the Design Prime Member responsible for architecture components.

As subconsultants to the Design-Builder, the Design Prime Members' scope will not generate a financial situation beyond their delivery of market-standard services and are part of the Design-Builder's risk profile.

It is unusual for design team members to provide financial statements as they will be underwritten by the Design Builder as a sub-consultant to them.

Would PWGSC please reconsider the requirement for Design Prime Members to provide copies of annual audited statements, which is a concern for private architecture firms?

A summary of the financial capacity of the Design Prime Members responsible for the architecture component will be provided in response to RFQ Section E.1.2.

Response 16

Please refer to Response 14 in this Addendum 6 of this day and to Response 12 and Revision 10 in Addendum 3 in answer to this question.

Question 17

RFQ Section: Section 4.4.3 and Addendum #1

Would PWGSC please confirm if .ZIP files can be used when uploading submissions on epost Connect (i.e. can epost Connect and PWGSC accept ZIP files)?

Response 17

Yes, Canada Post ePost Connect accepts .ZIP files and PSPC will accept .ZIP as received.

Question 18

RFQ Section: Appendix D section E

Section E.1 requires that for every Prime Member (which includes Financing Prime Members) and Equity Member copies of annual audited financial statements for each of the last three fiscal years and interim financial statements for each quarter since the last fiscal year are provided.

As the financial statements of private company are highly confidential information and can't be shared even between partners in the same consortium, can you confirm that the hard copies of financial statements can be delivered separately by mail prior to the RFQ submission date to the Bid Receiving Unit at the Response Address?

Response 18

Please refer to Revision 10 of Addendum 3 in answer to this question as to which Prime Member should issue financial statements. Documents should not be delivered separately. All documents must be included and received together as part of the Response. Confidential documents can be provided in sealed envelopes and included in the Response. Please also refer to Response 1 of this Addendum 6 in answer to this question.

Question 19

Appendix D, E.1, Submission, Second paragraph (p. 58)

The RFP **[sic]** originally stated that the information requested under requirement E.1 "should be substantiated, for each anticipated Prime Member and the Equity Member Guarantor(s) (if applicable), through:...". This includes a requirement to provide the information for the Financing Prime Member.

Amendment no. 10 contained in Addendum 3 replaced the above sentence with "This information should be substantiated, for each of the anticipated Development Prime Member, the Equity Member, the Design Prime Member responsible for the architecture components, the Construction Prime Member, and the Property and Facility Management Prime Member, and Guarantor(s) (if applicable), through:...". There is no reference to the Financing Prime Member.

Please further amend this section to confirm that the information should be substantiated for the Financing Prime Member in the same manner as the other Prime Members.

In the alternative, please confirm what information is required to be provided by the Financing Prime Member.

Response 19

Please refer to Revision 10 in Part 2 of Addendum 3 in answer to this question. Points 1 to 4 of the second paragraph under E.1 Submission Requirements are not required for the Financing Prime Member. Financing Prime Member Submission requirements are specified under Evaluation Criteria E.2 and E.3.

Question 20**1. FORM C-4 – CORPORATE**

Does the "Corporate Profile" have to include all key individuals from all firms (Architect, Interior Designer, Urban Designer, Engineers, General Contractor, Property Manager, etc.)? These firms are team members, but not part of any "Corporate" Structure. Please confirm which team members must be included in the "Corporate Profile".

Response 20

Please refer to the Instructions for Form C-4 in answer to this question.

Respondents must provide a corporate profile that will introduce the Respondent and each Prime Member, Equity Member and the Key Individuals (including their respective organizations if not employed by an Equity or Prime Member) and the roles for each as identified in Appendix C – Forms and Certifications.

Question 21

Appendix D – B.1 PROFILE

If an Urban Design Firm and Architectural Design Firm form a team to be the “Urban Design Prime Member”, can past project profiles be from either firm, or can the profiles only be from the firm that will perform that majority of the work?

Response 21

Referenced projects can be from either firm. Please note that the member responsible for design is defined in Appendix A as Design Prime Member, not Urban Design Prime Member.

Respondents may submit up to 3 referenced projects for the Design Prime Member’s experience related to architecture, and up to 3 referenced projects for the Design Prime Member’s experience related to urban design. All projects will be evaluated from a comparability and capability perspective in accordance with the evaluation criteria detailed in Appendix D- Package 2 and the Applicable Scales detailed in Appendix E.

Question 22

Appendix D – E.2/ E.3

The project profiles for construction and development experience are requested to have been ideally completed within 10 years time, however the project profiles for financing experience and financing key individuals is noted that they should have achieved financial close within 5 years time. How many points will be deducted if we present project profiles for financing prime team experience and financing key individuals that achieved close within 10 years and not 5 years time?

Response 22

Please refer to Revision 6 of Part 2 in this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 23

Appendix D – E.2/ E.3

Can you please clarify / provide examples of what is meant by “A regime of performance indicators linked to a payment mechanism”.

Response 23

Please refer to Part 2, Revisions 4 and 5 of Addendum 4 in answer to this question.

Question 24

Appendix D – E.2/ E.3

In some past projects, term sheets for 20 year financing were received, however we elected to go with either 10 or 15 year term financing. How many points will be deducted if we present project profiles for financing prime team experience and financing key individuals that have 10 year financing or 15 year financing in place, and not the noted 20 year financing terms?

Response 24

PWGSC will not provide a more detailed scoring methodology; however, referenced projects with financing terms under 20 years would be considered compliant. Several factors will be considered in the scoring. As noted in Appendix D –Evaluation Criteria and Submission Requirements, the referenced projects will be evaluated collectively against the comparability evaluation criterion, and then be evaluated individually against the capability evaluation criterion, with an average score awarded for Capability. Also please refer to the Applicable Scales detailed in Appendix E in answer to this question.

Question 25

Appendix D – E.2/ E.3

How many points will be deducted if we present projects that have 20 year financing in place but do not meet the criteria of being of a value of over \$350M in capital costs? Very few projects built in Canada in the last 5 years in the private sector outside of residential projects have been over \$350M in capital costs.

Response 25

PWGSC will not provide a more detailed scoring methodology; however, referenced projects with capital costs under \$350M would be considered compliant. Several factors will be considered in the scoring. As noted in Appendix D –Evaluation Criteria and Submission Requirements, the referenced projects will be evaluated collectively against the comparability evaluation criterion, and then be evaluated individually against the capability evaluation criterion, with an average score awarded for Capability. Also please refer to the Applicable Scales detailed in Appendix E in answer to this question.

Question 26

Appendix D – E.2/ E.3

How many points will be deducted if we present projects that have construction bridge financing in place, are under construction, are over \$350M in capital costs, but do not have final 20 year financing in place?

Response 26

Please refer to Responses 24 and 25 of this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 27

3.2 General Timelines and RFQ

Is it possible to change the RFQ due date from July 15th to July 30th 2020?

Response 27

PWGSC has extended the RFQ Response Deadline. Please refer to Part 1, Revision 1 of Addendum 5 in answer to this question.

Question 28

Appendix D, Rated Requirement C.2. "Key Individuals" (RFQ page 55)

Upon reviewing the RFQ, we have determined that a number of trade agreements apply, including the North American Free Trade Agreement; the World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement; the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership; and the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (collectively, the "applicable trade agreements").

Rated Requirement C.2. "Key Individuals" contained at Appendix D of the RFQ requires the Respondent to submit resumes for the three Construction Key Individuals from the Construction Prime Member describing their overall experience within the past ten (10) years from the closing date of the RFQ. One of the evaluation criteria is that the experience presented should demonstrate the Key Individual's capacity to "deliver on comparable projects, meaning new construction of multiple purpose- built facilities **in various locations across Canada**" (emphasis added).

The requirement that comparable projects have been delivered in Canada is unnecessarily restrictive. Unless this Rated Requirement is clarified to permit comparable projects in Canada or in other countries with similar markets such as the United States, then this provision will violate the applicable trade agreements. Such an approach is consistent with other provisions of the RFQ. For instance, Rated Requirement E.3. "Key Individuals" provides that "experience should include projects that have ... [b]een located in Canada **or in a similar financial market environment**" (emphasis added).

In order to maintain compliance with Canada's international treaty obligations, please confirm whether you will accept experience and comparable projects from various locations across Canada or from other countries with a similar market environment such as the United States as meeting the requirements of Rated Requirement C.2.

Response 28

Please refer to Response 3 and Revision 1 of Part 2 in this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 29

a. Form D-1 and Form D-2

Provided we are clearly able to articulate the numbering and/or the content information required in Form Templates D-1 and D-2, are we able to adjust the templates for formatting purposes? (Eg. adjust font style/size and remove columns from tables with headings/questions to provide more space on the page for information).

Response 29

Yes, you may adjust the font style/size and remove columns from tables with headings/questions to provide more space on the page for information. Please also refer to Revision 7 of Part 2 in this Addendum 6 of this day in answer to this question.

Question 30

Addenda 1 - 4.4.3

We submitted an email to the address noted in section 2b a request to open an epost connect conversation in order to submit an RFQ response. We only received an autogenerated response saying the message was received. Do we assume that shortly a second email will come noting how to set up the system to upload the RFQ response?

Response 30

Confirmed. As noted in Section 4.4.3 of the RFQ, an officer of the Bid Receiving Unit will initiate an epost Connect conversation following receipt of the Respondent's request to initiate the process. The epost Connect conversation will create an email notification from Canada Post Corporation prompting the Applicant to access and action the message within the conversation. The Respondent will then be able to transmit its Response prior to the RFQ Response Deadline.

Question 31

Addenda 1 - 4.4.3

Please confirm the email of the "Specified PWGSC Bid receiving Unit" noted in section 2b is the same as the email noted to "initiate the process", in section 1.

Section 4.4.3-9 requires the proponent to verify if the email address is correct. Please confirm the following email address is correct:

tpsgc.dgareceptiondessaoumissions-abbidreceiving.pwgsc@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca

Response 31

Confirmed. The e-mail address in the RFQ Section 4.4.3(1) is correct, as indicated in PWGSC's Standard Instructions 2003 under the following link: <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/1/2003/25>. Please note however that the RFQ Section 4.4.3(9) is an advisory to Respondents to ensure that Respondents are using the correct email address for the Bid Receiving Unit, which can be done by consulting the up-to-date information provided under the PWGSC's Standard Instructions 2003.

Question 32

Addenda 1 - 4.4.3

Please confirm that if a single digital copy of the proposal is submitted through epost, no printed or USB copy is required. This is unclear as sections 4.11 (11- 12) was not deleted by the addenda, and thus the RFQ still instructs the respondent to submit printed copies.

Further, section 4.4.3 -10 of addenda 1 notes that the response must be in accordance with section 4.11. Section 4.11 – (11-12) requires a USB and 6 copies of a printed submission.

Again, please confirm if submitted by epost, no USB or hard copy submission is required and only one digital copy in pdf and or word is required.

Response 32

Confirmed. No USB or hard copy submission is required if the Response is submitted by epost. Please refer to Section 4.4.1(1) in Revision 1, Part 2 of Addendum 1 and Revision 2, Part 2 of Addendum 1 amending Section 4.11(14) in answer to this question.

Question 33

Addenda 1 - 4.4.3

In addition to the bid being submitted through epost, can a usb containing a single digital copy of the submission be sent to the bid receiving unit at the address noted in section 4.11 of the RFQ?

We are concerned that the epost system may fail / crash at the time of submission and want to assure a copy is received by the bid receiving unit.

Response 33

Yes, in addition to epost, a usb containing a single digital copy of the submission can be sent to the bid receiving unit at the address noted in section 4.11 of the RFQ.

Question 34

Appendix D E.2

Please confirm that if there are two financing prime members, that each financing prime member should provide 3 past project profiles using Form D-1, for a total of 6 projects.

Response 34

No. Respondents should submit 3 referenced projects for the Evaluation Criteria E.2 Financing Prime Team Experience. In addition, as noted in Section 1 (3) of Appendix D –Evaluation Criteria and Submission Requirements — “If the quantity of referenced projects in the Response exceeds the limit stipulated by the submission requirements, the projects will be evaluated in the order they are supplied and any additional projects will not be evaluated.”

Question 35

Appendix D E.3

Please confirm that if there is only one financing prime member, only one FORM D-1 resume for one person, noting their 3 projects experience is to be submitted.

Response 35

Yes, if there is only one Financing Prime Member, the Respondent should submit 3 project examples using Form D-1 and identify one Key Individual using Form D-2.

PART 2: REVISIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Revision 1 of this Addendum is to expand the compliant locations of the referenced projects to other jurisdictions under the Evaluation Criteria C.2.

Revision 2 of this Addendum provides a definition for Development Prime Member.

Revision 3 of this Addendum provides a definition for Key Team Member.

Revision 4 of this Addendum provides a definition for Project Lead Key Individuals.

Revision 5 of this Addendum amends Form C-1 Master RFQ Response Form to include information related to a Respondent Representative Contact Individual.

Revision 6 of this Addendum is to amend the requirements under Package 2: Technical and Financial Capability and Experience, for Rated Evaluation Criteria E.2 and E.3.

Revision 7 of this Addendum is to specify format instructions for the Responses.

- 1. Package 2: Technical and Financial Capability and Experience, C. Construction Capability and Experience, C.2 Key Individuals, Evaluation Criteria, point 3 is replaced with the following:**

DELETE

3. Deliver on comparable projects, meaning new construction of multiple purpose-built facilities in various locations across Canada;

INSERT

3. Deliver on comparable projects, meaning new construction of multiple purpose-built facilities in various locations across Canada or in similar markets under comparable climatic conditions;

2. **One point under the definition of Prime Member in this RFQ is replaced with the following:**

DELETE

- will or is expected to lead all Team Members in the delivery of the Project (**Project Lead Prime Member or Development Prime Member**), and may also hold another Prime Member or Equity Member role;

INSERT

- will or is expected to lead all Team **Members** in the delivery of the Project (**Project Lead Prime Member or Development Prime Member, or Project Development Prime Member, or Development Lead, or Project Development Lead**), and may also hold another Prime Member or Equity Member role

3. **The following definition is added to Appendix A - DEFINITIONS of the RFQ:**

INSERT

“Key Team Member” has the same meaning as Key Individuals.

4. **The following definition is added to Appendix A- DEFINITIONS of the RFQ:**

INSERT

“Project Lead Key Individuals” has the same meaning as Key Individuals identified under the Project Development Prime Member.

5. **Form C-1 Master RFQ Response Form is replaced with the following to include additional information related to the Respondent Representative Contact Individual information:**

DELETE

FORM C-1– MASTER RFQ RESPONSE FORM

Name of Respondent	
Name and Title of Respondent Representative(s)	
Address	
Telephone Number(s)	
E-Mail Address	
Registered Address	

The above-named Respondent Representative hereby declares on its own behalf and, for clarity, on behalf of all Respondent Team Members that:

- a) it has the power and authority to bind the Respondent for the purpose of the RFQ;
- b) it has received all Addenda to the RFQ;
- c) the Respondent is a:
- a sole proprietor
 - a limited liability or general partnership
 - a corporation
 - a joint venture
 - an unincorporated consortium carrying on business under the above mentioned Respondent Name
- d) if invited to participate in the RFP, the Respondent would prefer to receive correspondence and associated procurement documentation in the following language during the RFP process:
- English
 - French
- Please select just one (1) language as the Respondent's preferred language.
- e) this Form C-1 – RFQ Master Response Form has not been modified in any manner, except to include the Respondent's required information and the Addenda information required by this Form; and
- f) the Respondent and its Affiliates are in compliance with the Integrity Provisions and with the Code of Conduct for Procurement set forth in Sections 7.10 and 7.11.

In witness whereof, the Respondent Representative has executed this Form C-1 – Master RFQ Response Form as of the date indicated below.

Respondent Representative

Per:

Name:

Title:

Date:

Per:

Name:

Title:

Date:

I/We have authority to bind the Respondent Representative and to bind the Respondent and each Respondent Team Member.

INSERT**FORM C-1– MASTER RFQ RESPONSE FORM**

Name of Respondent	
Name and Title of Respondent Representative(s)	
Address	
Telephone Number(s)	
E-Mail Address	
Name and Title of Respondent Representative Contact Individual	
Telephone Number(s) of Respondent Representative Contact Individual	
E-Mail Address of Respondent Representative Contact Individual	
Registered Address	

The above-named Respondent Representative hereby declares on its own behalf and, for clarity, on behalf of all Respondent Team Members that:

- g) it has the power and authority to bind the Respondent for the purpose of the RFQ;
- h) it has received all Addenda to the RFQ;
- i) the Respondent is a:
 - a sole proprietor
 - a limited liability or general partnership
 - a corporation
 - a joint venture
 - an unincorporated consortium carrying on business under the above mentioned Respondent Name
- j) if invited to participate in the RFP, the Respondent would prefer to receive correspondence and associated procurement documentation in the following language during the RFP process:
 - English
 - French

Please select just one (1) language as the Respondent's preferred language.
- k) this Form C-1 – RFQ Master Response Form has not been modified in any manner, except to include the Respondent's required information and the Addenda information required by this Form; and
- l) the Respondent and its Affiliates are in compliance with the Integrity Provisions and with the Code of Conduct for Procurement set forth in Sections 7.10 and 7.11.

In witness whereof, the Respondent Representative has executed this Form C-1 – Master RFQ Response Form as of the date indicated below.

Respondent Representative

Per:

Name:

Title:

Date:

Per:

Name:

Title:

Date:

I/We have authority to bind the Respondent Representative and to bind the Respondent and each Respondent Team Member.

- 6. Package 2: Technical and Financial Capability and Experience, E. Financial Capability and Financing Experience, point 5 of the Evaluation Criteria under E.2 and point 6 of the Evaluation Criteria under E.3 is replaced with the following:**

DELETE

Successfully secured financing and achieved financial close within the last 5 years.

INSERT

Successfully secured financing and achieved financial close within the last 10 years.

- 7. RFQ Section 4.11 Response Instructions is amended to add the following point 4.11 (15):**

INSERT

- (15) Respondents should follow the format instructions below in the preparation of their hard and electronic copy Responses:
- (a) A page is defined as one side. Double-sided submissions are encouraged (however Respondents should note that wherever page limits apply, each side of paper counts as a page)
 - (b) The text should not be smaller than Arial font size 10 or of equivalent size
 - (c) Use maximum 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper
 - (d) Organizational charts may be provided on 11 x 17 inch (279 mm x 432 mm) paper, with text no smaller than Arial font size 8

The remainder of the Request for Qualifications shall remain unchanged.