

This Amendment 01 is issued to answer questions from industry to the Solicitation 84084-20-00092 and to change RFP closing date to October 13, 2020

On page 1

Delete

2020-10-05

Insert

2020-10-13

Under 2.2 Submission of Bids

Delete

Date: October 05, 2020

Insert

Date: October 13, 2020

Under Part 7 – Resulting Contract Clauses

Delete

7.7.4 Method of Payment - Monthly Payment

Canada will pay the Contractor on a monthly basis for work performed during the month covered by the invoice in accordance with the payment provisions of the Contract if:

- a. an accurate and complete invoice and any other documents required by the Contract have been submitted in accordance with the invoicing instructions provided in the Contract;
- b. all such documents have been verified by Canada;
- c. the Work performed has been accepted by Canada

Insert

7.7.4 Method of Payment – Milestone Payments

Payment will be made after completion of each milestone in accordance with the contract as per the payment schedule below if

- a an accurate and complete invoice and any other documents required by the Contract have been submitted in accordance with the invoicing instructions provided in the Contract;
- b all such documents have been verified by Canada;
- c the Work performed has been accepted by Canada

Payment Schedule	Description or "Deliverables"	Firm Amount
Payment 1 50% of total value	Supplier has presented draft risk ranking methodology, tool and flowchart to staff Staff review methodology, tool and flowchart and provide feedback.	TBD
Payment 2 40% of total value	Supplier has finished reviewing contaminated sites information to assign a risk ranking to all sites in the CER database	TBD
Payment 3 10% of total value	Supplier has provided written recommendations on improvements in data collection that could assist in a better ranking in the future. Successful completion of deliverables as required by Project Authority	TBD
Total (GST excluded)		TBD

Under Annex A – Statement of Work

Delete

approximately 500 sites

Insert

approximately 130 sites

Under Annex D Conflict of Interest

Delete

The contractor agrees to maintain financial independence from CER regulated companies for the duration of the contract and agrees to:

- Maintain confidentiality in all work conducted for the CER;

- Maintain the independence of its staff working on CER projects from its staff who may be working for CER regulated companies on other projects;
- Not represent or work for parties or participants involved in any CER proceeding (including the applicant or interveners) if it has been contracted by the CER to provide services on said proceeding.

Under Annex F –M1 and R4

Add

The contractor should also submit resumes of key personnel that will work on the project showing their previous experience and qualifications and involvement in the projects presented in M1 and R4. There is no page limit for the curriculum vitae however it is important to outline in the CV only the education and technical experience that are relevant for this project. We are evaluating bidders both on past experience and the proposed resources. We need to know key personnel that will work on the project and their experience and qualifications. This requires submission of their CVs.

R4 Demonstration of technical capability states that the examples of projects should specify which project team members were involved as key personnel in these projects. This also implies that bidders should submit key personnel resumes showing this experience.

Questions Asked and CER Responses

A compilation of questions asked by bidders and CER responses regarding Solicitation No. 84084-20-0092 Risk Rating of Contaminated Sites is provided below. Company-specific information has been excluded, like questions are grouped, and in the case where the same or similar questions were asked more than once, the questions are not duplicated. There is an attachment showing the type of information provided in a Notice of Contamination to the CER.

Please note, the number of contaminated sites to be ranked has been amended from 500 to a maximum of 130. In addition, the submission deadline for proposals has been extended to October 13, 2020.

- 1) We kindly request a submission deadline extension to October 9.

Would CER consider extending the closing date by one week?

Given the 3-week timeline (Sept.15 to Oct.5) to respond to this RFP, would it be possible to grant a 2-week extension to allow enough time to submit the best quality proposal? This 5-week period would be more in line with what we typically see with PWGSC or other Government of Canada procurement.

The deadline has been extended by one week to October 13, 2020.

- 2) Can you please explain a little more in what your strategic incentives are?

The CER is seeking to better prioritize contaminated sites that are reported to the CER in a systematic manner.

- 3) There is a broadly used and accepted tool for Contaminated Site Risk Rating used in for Federal Sites: National Classification System for Contaminated Sites (NCSCS). Is it the

intent of the CER that the tool to be developed utilize the NCSCS as the backbone of their risk rating tool?

The CER expects that the risk ranking tool will build upon already established methodologies used such as the NCSCS or methodologies used by provincial regulators, as appropriate. The tool will need to be customized to the scope and type of contaminated site that is commonly reported to the CER.

- 4) Looking at the Timelines given, the period from 1 Nov 2020 to 28 Feb 2021 is stated for development, incorporating feedback and finalization of the Risk Rating Tool, and the period for doing the ranking of 500 sites largely overlaps the development, and extends 3 weeks longer. Wouldn't the tool need to be finalized before its application can commence? Is there a typo in the dates for the ranking task? If not, can the timeline for ranking extend at least 3 months longer than stated?

Prior to finalizing the tool, the contractor can start the review of reported contaminated sites to become familiar with the type of information that is reported to the CER. This can be done concurrently with the methodology development. Once the tool is finalized, the CER expects that a few weeks will be sufficient to apply the tool to the reported contaminated sites.

The number of contaminated sites to be ranked has been amended from 500 to a maximum of 130.

- 5) Does CER intend to have a tool to risk rank the sites you operate/own or will this be risk ranking for purpose of evaluating clients' sites?

The CER does not own or operate any contaminated sites. The risk ranking tool will be used to rank contaminated sites that are reported to the CER by companies that own facilities regulated by the CER.

- 6) What is the range of contaminant profiles?

The CER regulates interprovincial energy infrastructure with the range of contaminants aligned with energy infrastructure

- 7) Would the CER be able to provide more detail on the information currently collected by the CER from companies that will be provided to the successful proponent, as referenced in sections 2 and 6 of the Statement of Work? Additional information such as the quantity, type, and format of information that will need to be reviewed as part of this contract would be helpful in assessing the level of effort to effectively execute the scope of work.

What kind of data are we getting in relation to the sites themselves? How detailed is the information we will be given? How is the data organized, in a database?

Can you please provide an example entry from the CER database? Can you please also indicate if this is the typical level of detail available for each entry into the database?

The scope of the project will involve ranking up to a maximum of 130 remediation events that have been reported to the CER. The attachment provides details on the type of information that

is reported in a Notice of Contamination to the CER and that will need to be accessed from the CER internal database and reviewed as part of this contract.

- 8) Are there any programs or systems for which the risk ranking tool must be compatible?

There is not a specific program or system for which the risk ranking tool must be compatible. The risk ranking tool will be incorporated into the CER's current system by internal staff.

- 9) What format is the site-specific information in that will be the basis of the site classifications: If in a database, what software format?

There should be no software required besides Microsoft Excel to complete the site classifications.

- 10) Is there any existing database or compilation of documents for the Sites? If so, what is the format? (i.e. pdf, excel tables, database)

The information is in the CER database.

- 11) Will environmental site assessment reports, and/or other site-specific report information have to be reviewed for each of the 500 sites reported to the CER?

The environmental site assessment reports will not need to be reviewed for purposes of ranking the reported sites.

- 12) Are the anticipated 500 sites located in various or representative regions of Canada or in a single region?

The sites undergoing risk ranking will be from various regions of Canada

- 13) For the application of the tool to the contaminated sites – will this be performed by a single person with access from the contractor or will we work with CER specialists to have the data entered? (For example are their 500 sites with similar information in a database or 500 reports with different levels of reports and information formats)

The expectation is that the contractor will use data that has already been entered for each site in a Notice of Contamination submitted to the CER.

- 14) In section 1.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria of the RFP, under R4, 'Demonstration of Technical Capability', the RFP indicates that the bidder can submit up to 3 example projects. Are we limited to 3 project examples?

Please provide up to three example projects that best demonstrate the technical capability of the project team.

- 15) Evaluation Criteria M1 and R4 refer to “similar work completed in the past for other government authorities or organizations”
- a. Does the term “similar work” mean only prior experience in developing risk ranking criteria and methodologies? Or does it refer also to experience in using and applying risk ranking criteria and methodologies.

- b. Does the word “organizations” also encompass private sector experience? Or is it intended only to cover government organizations?
- c. As the criteria and logic for risk ranking are largely scientific in nature, we also wish to confirm that experience outside of Canada will be considered with equal weight and relevancy as domestic experience. If not, please clarify to what degree it would be relevant in the review/award process.

The term “Similar work” is intended to capture experience developing risk ranking methodologies. Organizations would include private sector experience. Experience from countries outside of Canada will be considered and will be weighted based on applicability to the proposed risk ranking tool.

- 16) Given that the tool is to be developed as part of this contract and the RFP notes that there are close to 500 sites to be classified using the tool, and the complexity of the information to be input into the tool is not known to the bidders, is there potential for this contract to be extended past after April 1, 2021 and with additional budget available?

Please see the amended scope for a revised estimate of a maximum of 130 sites. At this time, extension of the project and additional budget have not been determined.

- 17) Considering the ongoing COVID 19 pandemic and uncertainties around its potential impacts on travel and work restrictions in accordance with local government agency guidelines or directives. XXXX is addressing this matter in its proposal with the aim that any potential impact due to COVID 19 in delivering the services shall be managed collaboratively between the parties. Could you please confirm if you have concerns with this statement and, if so, provide us clarification on what those concerns are?

The CER does not have concerns with this statement.

- 18) As indicated on Page 12 Security requirements, is Reliability Status required at the time of submission in order to be considered for award for any persons assigned to the project or would an in progress application be considered at the time of evaluation?

An in progress application will be considered at the time of evaluation.

- 19) Further on the matter of Section 7.3 and the notion of contractor’s full-time presence at CER premises, can CER provide further insights on COVID-related safety policies that govern ability for a contractor to be on premises full time through to March 31st, 2021? In light of the uncertainty surrounding the coronavirus prevalence, is this a mandatory component of the contract or is CER open to alternative means for project interaction?

Is the successful contractor only allowed one person designated and screened to work on this project for CER with CER IT systems? For examples should we be prepared to work at the CER Calgary office within current COVID and Public Health procedures applying (i.e. are we to expect to be issued a CER laptop)?

Regarding the need for security clearance at CISC Reliability Level for individuals, we wish to confirm that this is not required for the whole team of consultants, but only for those who will be accessing Protected Information.

A CER laptop will be issued. Public Health procedures must be respected. Work can be done remotely and meetings via videoconference.

The Contractor personnel requiring access to protected information, assets or sensitive work site(s) must EACH hold a valid Reliability Status, granted or approved or held by CSP/PSPC or the Canada Energy Regulator.

We expect that a team of consultants will be working on this project, not one person.

- 20) Also, given the limitations on off-site use of Protected CER files, how will this affect off-site work and virtual meetings (per Annex A, Section 3 on Meetings)? More specifically, is the following considered to be “Protected CER Files”: “the information reported to the CER to determine the risk level of all contaminated sites reported to the CER, to date (approximately 500 sites).” (from Annex A, Section 2 on Scope)

The information reported to the CER in the Notice of Contamination is considered protected information at this time.

- 21) If the contractor is not allowed to use our IT systems to process or store the site information, are we able to work on it within our systems under IT secured sharepoint or directories to access the provided information in order to carry out the contract and then return the information in full to CER?

No the contractor should not use their own system to access the information. We are providing a CER laptop.

- 22) Has a budget cap or range been determined? If not, would it be possible to indicate order of magnitude for this mandate? There is reference in Section 7.3 to the Contractor working full-time at CER premises, which suggests a higher level of effort than what is suggested for example in the “basis of payment” or in the section on Meetings (Annex A).

We do not release the budget in this type of RFP. The suppliers can review and propose a price based on their review and their estimated level of effort.

It is expected that the work will be done remotely and meetings will occur via videoconference. The contractor is not expected to work at the CER premises.

- 23) Evaluation Criteria M1 and R4 refer to “similar work completed in the past for other government authorities or organizations”
- a. Does the term “similar work” mean *only* prior experience in *developing* risk ranking criteria and methodologies? Or does it refer also to experience *in using and applying* risk ranking criteria and methodologies.

The scope of work consists of both the development and application of risk ranking methodologies. We expect that the contractor provides examples of previous experience of developing and applying risk ranking methodologies.

- 24) How is « bidder » defined? Does bidder” refer to the company or to its individual specialist(s) in contaminated site?
- Also, is “bidder” the same as “Proponent” mentioned in the Generic Evaluation Table?

Yes, the bidder/proponent is the company, not individual resource. The experience of personnel will be evaluated in M1 and R4 – Demonstration of Technical Capability.

25) We are not clear on how we can facilitate that service with one laptop and no mechanism to have the data temporarily on our network to work on it to best meet your needs. I am wondering if you perhaps intended to answer Question 2 with the line below on the laptop as this seems to leave us with uncertainty on how we could facilitate your project.

With the uncertainty on the range of file formats potentially available, would there be consideration of a time and materials with fixed limit contract arrangement to ensure we have the flexibility to adapt to the data that CER provides?

If there is an opportunity for interested proponents to have a question exchange (on-line meeting or call) with the Scientific Authority or CER Project Manager, we would appreciate being considered.

We can provide more than one laptop, if required. The contractor will have 4 months to review the data and rank contaminated sites. This time should be sufficient to complete the work without copying the data/information to the contractor's network.

We will not have questions exchange (on-line meeting or call) at this time.

Question: Would a time and materials contract be considered for this project instead of a lump sum contract as stated in Annex "B" Basis of payment?

We will do 3 payments. Payment will be done after completion of each deliverable as per the payment schedule.