

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A) v1

RFSO for review and recommendation services of major project submissions in Nunavut

Date: 2020-07-27

Department: Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)
Standing Offer Authority: Shuo Chen
Solicitation No.: 1000218516
Telephone No.: 819-953-6910
Fax No.: 819-953-7721
E-mail Address: shuo.chen@canada.ca

Q1: I was looking at this RFSO and think it should be a dedicated set-aside contract. There are lots of Indigenous contractors and Industry representation that could do this type of work or have direct experience with the stuff you're looking into but the way the RFSO is laid out it might be difficult for some Indigenous companies, joint ventures, or partnerships to specifically identify how they fit into this type of work. I imagine communities' economic development offices/organizations could easily undertake the type of work you're requiring under this RFSO as well.

Also, socio-economic impacts of this work in the North directly relates to Indigenous populations, as well as noting the "region of Delivery is 'Aboriginal Lands'", and I think having an Indigenous consultant(s) on this type of work is very much necessary.

A1: This RFSO applies to a CLCA, where the CLCA procurement obligations take precedence over the PSAB set-aside. That's why we conduct CLCA open bidding instead of using set-aside.

In brief, the procurement is reserved for CLCA beneficiaries and the Nunavut Land Claimants have a right of first refusal in competition even it is an open bidding.

Q2: For the mandatory requirement M2, Project Summaries, may we include summaries for projects completed by our resources that were completed at a firm other than their current firm? One of our key resources is relatively new (one year) to our firm, but has completed several relevant projects at her previous place of employment.

A2: Yes, Offerors may include project summaries previously completed by resources from other firms.

Q3: For Item M3 (Project Manager (c) and Senior Technical Expert (b)), may we include project summaries for projects at a previous place of employment?

A3: Yes, summaries of projects / demonstrated experience from previous places of employment will be accepted.

Q4: For Item M3 (Project Manager (c) and Senior Technical Expert (b)), it has been our experience that a good reviewer of a socio-economic impact assessment is one that is a practitioner with direct and varied experience in completing socio-economic impact assessments for public or private sector clients and/or Indigenous groups. May we include experience in leading the preparation of the socio-economic components of Environmental Impact Statements in addition to reviewing such components? How would this experience be rated?

A4: Yes, experience in leading the preparation of the socio-economic components of Environmental Impact Statements can be provided in addition to the review of such components. This experience can be counted toward the minimum timeline/duration requirements specified in M3 for proposed resources. For rated criteria, such experience is acceptable for R3 ii) and R4 i) and the point rating system based on years of experience would not require modification.

Q5. With regard to the potential for a real or perceived conflict of interest, would a company be precluded from supporting CIRNAC on undertaking services for a specific proponent under this SO if they are regularly retained by that proponent to support relevant initiatives and implementation of project certificate requirements?

A5: Companies awarded Standing Offers would be ineligible to support CIRNAC on undertaking services for specific proponents if they are regularly retained by such proponents for projects situated in Nunavut. A one-year limitation (cooling off) period will apply to Standing Offer Holders who have provided services to specific proponents for projects situated in Nunavut before they can receive call-ups against Standing Offers to provide services for the review of these projects.

Q6: PROPRIETARY: Specifically, our company supports mining companies in Nunavut on developing and implementing the socio-economic monitoring programs that stem from the socio-economic predictions of their FEIS and the terms and conditions of their project certificates. Would this preclude us from supporting CIRNAC on submissions relating to those companies due to a real or perceived conflict of interest?

A6: Yes, this would preclude your company from supporting CIRNAC through a call-up against Standing Offer because of a real or perceived conflict of interest. A one-year limitation (cooling off) period would apply before being eligible to receive call-ups to provide services for the review of projects proposals submitted by proponents that your company has provided services for projects situated in Nunavut.

Q7: I have a question regarding Corporate Profile. The requirement in M1 of page 14/39 says businesses need a minimum of five years. My firm has been incorporated for 4+ years but has staff with collectively over 40-year experience of working in Nunavut. We wonder what the flexibility around this requirement might be.

A7: The raised concern is valid. The RFSO will be amended to require Offerors to have been in business for a minimum of two (2) years.

Q8. Please reconcile a conflict in the RFSO: on Page 17/40 it says that the senior technical expert's chronological work experience must be from within the last 10 years, but then on Page 19/40 it says that 3 points will be awarded if it can be demonstrated that the senior technical expert has greater than 10 years of experience. I notice the same conflict exists with regards to the experience of the project manager.

A8: The mandatory technical criteria are evaluated differently than point rated technical criteria. As a result, satisfying the minimum (mandatory) experience requirements for the Project Manager and Senior Technical Experience as specified in section 4.5.1 (M3, page 16 -17) will not result in achieving full points under the point rated criteria specified in section 4.5.2 (R3, page 18; and R4, page 19).

The chronological work experience of proposed resources provided pursuant to section 4.5.1 (M3, page 17) can be greater than 10 years (no limitations). As a result, the final bullet of section 4.5.2 (page 17) of the mandatory technical criteria will be revised. Please see the updated RFSO v1.1.