



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving Public Works & Government Services
Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux publics et
Services gouvernementaux Canada

1713 Bedford Row
Halifax, N.S./Halifax,(N.E.)
Halifax
Nova Scotia
B3J 1T3
Bid Fax: (902) 496-5016

**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

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Atlantic Region Acquisitions/Région de l'Atlantique
Acquisitions
1713 Bedford Row
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.E.)
Halifax
Nova Scot
B3J 1T3

Title - Sujet Commissioning Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EA003-210335/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EA003-210335	Date 2020-07-14
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-SPWA-409-6013	
File No. - N° de dossier PWA-0-84017 (409)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-07-16	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Taylor (PWA), Kathie	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur pwa409
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (902) 403-4837 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (902) 496-5016
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Solicitation Amendment #01

I. The following questions have been posed by one of the invited firms:

Q1 Background: Under section 3.2.1, it illustrates that "project schedule control and management - i.e. initial schedule and revised schedule - explain variation" should be supplied.

Question: Project schedule and Schedule variation root cause is not normally under the purview or control of the commissioning agent. The contractor is responsible for it, therefore, commentary ask requested cannot be filled accurately by the commissioning agent. Given this is a commissioning project, we recommend asking for "PROJECT OBJECTIVES, CONSTRAINTS AND DELIVERABLES" as we have seen on other PSPC commissioning RFPs.

R1: "project schedule control and management - i.e. initial schedule and revised schedule - explain variation" has been removed from section 3.2.1

Q2: Background: Under section 3.2.3 indicates: "Information that should be supplied for each key personnel: role, responsibility and degree of involvement of individual in past projects".

Question: What is meant here by "past project". Are you looking for individual experience as it relates to the three reference projects submitted, or are you speaking in general terms, i.e. you are looking for a description of this key individuals general past experience over the years? Please clarify.

R2: We are looking for the key individuals past experience in general terms over the years. This expertise does not have to be related to the three reference projects submitted as part of section 3.2.1.

Q3: Background: Under section 3.2.4, it indicates: "Information that should be supplied: the technical requirements"

Question: What is meant here by "the technical requirements"? Are you looking for the commissioning standards that will be used as a methodology for the project, or are you looking for a reference to the PSPC technical requirements and higher level federal mandates as it pertains to the program of work or commissioning as a discipline? Please clarify.

R3: The technical requirements are related to the project specific Cx requirements. This section is to be used to show the understanding of what Cx standards will be followed and how they relate to this project.

Q4: Background: Under section 3.2.5, it indicates "Information that should be supplied: proposed major milestone schedule"

Question: A project schedule is not normally produced by a commissioning professional. A commissioning professional remains flexible through a project and follows the schedules kept by first, the design consultant, and next, the contractor. Given the commissioning agent bears very little in the way of schedule control, we recommend removing this requirement from the RFP. This will help save page space as well, given the 10 page limit for section 3.2 as indicated. It is also to be noted that a project schedule has already been provided in PR 1.5 Schedule.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EA003-210335/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
EA003-21-0335

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
01
File No. - N° du dossier

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
hal409
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

R4: Section 3.2.5 "Scope of services" has been removed from the rated requirements.

Q5: Background: Under section 3.2.5, it indicates "Information that should be supplied: work plan - detailed breakdown of work tasks and deliverables"

Question: For a commissioning project, this information is not normally asked for given the work plan and deliverables are laid out in a high level of detail by the project scope (commissioning scope requirements outlined in RS 10, the CSA Z320-11 standard referenced, and the PWGSC: Commissioning Standard, all appended). It even defines how many meetings the proponents are to attend during the design phase. Given the 10 page limit for section 3.2, it is recommended to remove this requirement from the RFP as most proponents will likely submit little variance in this area given the prescriptive scope requirements. Perhaps it could be replaced with an ask for key proponent differentiators or value added services.

R5: Section 3.2.5 "Scope of services" has been removed from the rated requirements.

II. For further clarification, the Submission Requirement and Evaluation document has been revised as follows:

At Submission Requirement and Evaluation

Delete: In its entirety

Insert:

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

SRE 1-	General Information
SRE 2-	Proposal Requirements
SRE 3-	Submission Requirements and Evaluation
SRE 4-	Price of Services
SRE 5-	Total Score
SRE 6-	Submission Requirements - Checklist

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

SRE 1 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Reference to the Selection Procedure

An 'Overview of the selection procedure' can be found in R1410T General Instructions to Proponents (GI3).

1.2 Calculation of Total Score

For this project the Total Score will be established as follows:

Technical Rating x 90%	=	Technical Score (90 Points)
<u>Price Rating x 10%</u>	=	<u>Price Score (10 Points)</u>
Total Score	=	Max. 100 Points

SRE 2 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Proposal via Epost Connect service

This bid solicitation allows and encourages proponents to use the epost Connect service provided by Canada Post Corporation to transmit their proposal electronically.

If the Proponent chooses to submit its proposal electronically through epost Connect service, Canada requests that the Proponent submits its proposal in accordance with section GI16, Submission of proposal, of the General Instructions. The epost Connect system has a limit of 1GB per single message posted and a limit of 20GB per conversation.

Canada requests that the proposal be gathered per separate electronic document (attachment) as follows:

Section I: Technical Proposal;

Section II: Price Proposal.

The electronic attachment should be labelled with the name of the section and the Solicitation Number.

If the Proponent is simultaneously providing copies of its proposal using multiple acceptable delivery methods, and if there is a discrepancy between the wording of any of these copies and the electronic copy provided through epost Connect service, the wording of the electronic copy provided through epost Connect service will take precedence over the wording of the other copies.

2.2 Proposal in Hard Copies

If the Proponent chooses to submit its proposal in hard copies, Canada requests that the Proponent submits its proposal in separately bound sections as follows:

Section I: Technical Proposal (submit one (1) bound original plus five (5) bound copies)
Section II: Price Proposal (submit one (1) bound original) in a separate sealed envelope.)

Double-sided submissions are preferred.

2.3 Proposal by Facsimile

Due to the nature of the bid solicitation, proposals transmitted by facsimile is not recommended for administrative reasons but offered to proponents to provide an alternative opportunity in case of incompatibility or inability to transmit by epost Connect service.

If the Proponent submits its proposal by facsimile, Canada requests that the following sections be clearly identified and separated in the proposal:

Section I: Technical Proposal
Section II: Price Proposal

2.4 Requirement for Proposal Format

The following proposal format information should be implemented when preparing the proposal.

- Paper size should be - 216mm x 279mm (8.5" x 11")
- Minimum font size – 11 point Times or equal
- Minimum margins - 12 mm left, right, top, and bottom
- Double-sided submissions are preferred
- One (1) 'page' means one side of a 216mm x 279mm (8.5" x 11") sheet of paper
- 279mm x 432 mm (11" x 17") fold-out sheets for spreadsheets, organization charts etc. will be counted as two pages.
- The order of the proposals should follow the order established in the Request for Proposal SRE section

2.5 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is **ten (10)** pages.

The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above;

- Covering letter
- Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix A)
- Integrity Provisions – Required Documentation
- Front page of the RFP
- Front page of revision(s) to the RFP
- Price Proposal Form (Appendix B)

Consequence of non-compliance: any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the proposal and will not be forwarded to the PWGSC Evaluation Board members for evaluation.

SRE 3 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

3.1 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

Failure to meet the mandatory requirements will render the proposal as non-responsive and no further evaluation will be carried out.

3.1.1 Licensing, Certification or Authorization

N/A

3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification

N/A

3.1.3 Declaration/Certifications Form

Proponents must complete, sign and submit the following:

- Appendix B, Declaration/Certifications Form as required

3.1.4 Integrity Provisions – Required documentation

In accordance with the Ineligibility and Suspension Policy (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html>), the Proponent must provide, **as applicable**, to be given further consideration in the procurement process, the required documentation as per General instructions 1 (G11), Integrity Provisions – Proposal, **section 3a**.

3.2 RATED REQUIREMENTS

3.2.1 Achievements of Proponent on Projects

Describe the Proponent's accomplishments, achievements and experience as prime consultant on projects.

Select a **maximum** of three [3] projects undertaken within the last three [3] years. Joint venture submissions are not to exceed the maximum number of projects. Only the first three (3) projects listed in sequence will receive consideration and any others will receive none as though not included.

Information that should be supplied:

- clearly indicate how this project is comparable/relevant to the requested project.
- brief project description.
- client references - name, address, phone and fax of client contact at working level - references may be checked
- names of key personnel responsible for project delivery

The Proponent (as defined in R1410T General Instructions to Proponents, GI2 Definitions) must possess the knowledge on the above projects. Past project experience from entities other than the Proponent will not be considered in the evaluation unless these entities form part of a joint venture Proponent.

Please indicate those projects which were carried out in joint venture and the responsibilities of each of the involved entities in each project.

3.2.2 Achievements of Key Sub-consultants and Specialists on Projects

Describe the accomplishments, achievements and experience either as prime consultant or in a sub-consultant capacity on projects. If the Proponent proposes to provide multi-disciplinary services which might otherwise be performed by a sub-consultant, this should be reflected here.

Select a **maximum** of three [3] projects undertaken within the last three [3] years per key sub consultant or specialist. Only the first three [3] projects listed in sequence (per key subconsultant or specialist) will receive consideration and any others will receive none as though not included.

Information that should be supplied:

- clearly indicate how this project is comparable/relevant to the requested project.
- brief project description and intent.
- project schedule control and management
- client references - name, address, phone and fax of client contact at working level - references may be checked
- names of key personnel responsible for project delivery
- awards received

3.2.3 Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects

Describe the experience and performance of key personnel to be assigned to this project regardless of their past association with the current proponent firm. This is the opportunity to emphasize the strengths of the individuals on the team, to recognize their past responsibilities, commitments and achievements.

Information that should be supplied for each key personnel:

- professional accreditation
- relevant experience, expertise, number of years' experience
- role, responsibility and degree of involvement of individual in past projects

3.2.4 Understanding of the Project:

The proponent should demonstrate understanding of the goals of the project, the technical requirements, the constraints and the issues that will shape the end product.

Information that should be supplied:

- The technical requirements
- Significant issues, challenges and constraints

3.2.5 Management of Services:

The Proponent should describe how he /she proposes to perform the services and meet the constraints; how the services will be managed to ensure continuing and consistent control as well as production and communication efficiency; how the team will be organized and how it will fit in the existing structure of the firms; to describe how the team will be managed. The proponent is also to identify sub-consultant disciplines and specialists required to complete the consultant team.

If the Proponent proposes to provide multi-disciplinary services which might otherwise be performed by a sub-consultant, this should be reflected here.

Information that should be supplied:

- Confirm the makeup of the full project team including the names of the consultant, sub-consultants and specialist personnel and their role on the project.
- Profiles of the key positions (specific assignments and responsibilities)
- Reporting relationships
- Communication strategies

3.3 EVALUATION AND RATING

In the first instance, price envelopes will remain sealed and only the technical components of the proposals which are responsive will be reviewed, evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Board in accordance with the following to establish Technical Ratings:

Criterion	Weight Factor	Rating	Weighted Rating
Achievements of Proponent	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
Achievements of Key Sub-consultants / Specialists	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
Understanding of the Project	3.0	0 - 10	0 - 30
Scope of Services	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
Management of Services	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
Technical Rating	10.0		0 - 100

Generic Evaluation Table

PWGSC Evaluation Board members will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Proponent's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) using the generic evaluation table below:

	INADEQUATE	WEAK	ADEQUATE	FULLY SATISFACTORY	STRONG
0 point	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements.	Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understanding in some areas of the requirements.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements.
	Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be corrected	No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses

	Proponent do not possess qualifications and experience	Proponent lacks qualifications and experience	Proponent has an acceptable level of qualifications and experience	Proponent is qualified and experienced	Proponent is highly qualified and experienced
	Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements	Team does not cover all components or overall experience is weak	Team covers most components and will likely meet requirements	Team covers all components - some members have worked successfully together	Strong team - has worked successfully together on comparable projects
	Sample projects not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Leads in sample projects directly related to this requirement
	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, should ensure adequate results	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results

To be considered further, proponents **must** achieve a minimum Technical Rating of sixty (60) points out of the hundred (100) points available as specified above.

No further consideration will be given to proponents not achieving the pass mark of sixty (60) points.

SRE 4 PRICE OF SERVICES

All price proposal envelopes corresponding to responsive proposals which have achieved the pass mark of sixty (60) points will be opened upon completion of the technical evaluation. An average price is determined by adding all the price proposals together and dividing the total by the number of price proposals being opened.

All price proposals which are greater than twenty-five percent (25%) above the average price will be set aside and receive no further consideration.

The remaining price proposals are rated as follows:

- A. The lowest price proposal receives a Price Rating of 100
- B. The second, third, fourth and fifth lowest prices receive Price Ratings of 80, 60, 40, and 20 respectively. All other price proposals receive a Price Rating of 0.
- C. On the rare occasions where two (or more) price proposals are identical, the matching price proposals receive the same rating and the corresponding number of following ratings are skipped.

The Price Rating is multiplied by the applicable percentage to establish the Price Score.

SRE 5 TOTAL SCORE

Total Scores will be established in accordance with the following:

Rating	Possible Range	% of Total Score	Score (Points)
Technical Rating	0 - 100	90	0 - 90
Price Rating	0 - 100	10	0 - 10
Total Score		100	0 - 100

The Proponent receiving the highest Total Score is the first entity that the Evaluation Board will recommend for the provision of the required services. In the case of a tie, the proponent submitting the lower price for the services will be selected.

SRE 6 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS - CHECKLIST

The following list of documents and forms is provided with the intention of assisting the Proponent in ensuring a complete submission. The Proponent is responsible for meeting all submission requirements.

Please follow detailed instructions in R1410T General Instructions to Proponents, GI16 Submission of proposal, as amended in SI2 Proposal documents. Proponents may choose to introduce their submissions with a cover letter.

- Declaration/Certifications Form - completed and signed - form provided in Appendix A
- Integrity Provisions – Required documentation – **as applicable** in accordance with the Ineligibility and Suspension Policy (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html>) and as per General instructions 1 (GI1), Integrity Provisions – Proposal, **section 3a**.
- Integrity Provisions - Declaration of Convicted Offences – **with its bid, as applicable** in accordance with the Ineligibility and Suspension Policy (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html>) and as per General instructions 1 (GI1), Integrity Provisions – Proposal, **section 3b**.
- Proposal
- Front page of RFP
- Front page(s) of any solicitation amendment Price Proposal Form completed and submitted in a separate section.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EA003-210335/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
EA003-21-0335

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
01
File No. - N° du dossier

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
hal409
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

For hard copy Proposal:

- Proposal - one (1) original plus five (5) copies
- Price Proposal Form – only one (1) Price proposal Form completed and submitted in a separate envelope

For epost Connect Proposal:

- Proposal - one (1) electronic document attached to the message
- Price Proposal Form – one (1) Price proposal Form completed and submitted in a separate electronic document attached to the message

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.