



Date: February 5, 2021

Title: Energy Audit and Microgrid Feasibility Assessment of the Embassy of Canada to Haiti

Solicitation Number: 21-178705

The following Questions & Answers is in link with the solicitation document mentioned above.

Questions & Answers # 3

- Q1.** “On page 35 of 48, an in-depth audit of the existing electrical distribution in buildings, including thermal imagery, is requested. Does this work require the presence of an electrician to assist us? If so, will this resource will be provided by DFATD?”
- A1.** Yes, we expect an electrician or electrical engineer to perform the survey. We expect the bidder and/or their partners to have the expertise required.
- Q2.** Can you clarify expectations on cybersecurity and IT infrastructure? In particular, are the existing infrastructure is deemed adequate and are we are being asked to assess whether any installations associated with the microgrid would be compatible and adaptable? Or do we have to review the compliance of existing infrastructure?”
- A2.** There is no need to review the compliance of the existing IT infrastructure. The consultant is to include information of what is available in the North American market and compliant with the standards listed in section 3 of the SOW, to ensure that the microgrid proposed will “include processes to secure control/communication systems from cyber-intrusions/disruptions and protect the privacy of sensitive data.” These items apply to point 6.6.3 of the SOW to “Compile a list of potential contractors (manufacturers, installers) (at least 3), products, and associated costs.
- Q3.** Is the existing mechanical and electrical documentation in mechanical for the existing buildings complete and true to the reality on the ground (plans, specifications, operation manuals, maintenance records, etc)?”
- A3.** The electrical drawings will not be accurate; the structural drawings may be more accurate but will still require verification. It is not the consultant’s responsibility to provide updated as-built drawings; however, is part of Section 6.4 of the SOW to perform a detailed survey in order to ensure that the energy audit is accurate, the proposed microgrid solution is feasible, and that any upgrade to the system is covered in the recommendations and to “Provide a condition report with recommendations resulting from a building systems analysis of the electrical infrastructure” (point 6.4.2 of the SOW).
- Q4.** “Where it says “At least one sample report must be submitted to represent any of the projects identified” [Section SR4.1], are you asking that we submit a report from a previous client to showcase the ability to perform this type of projects? If so, how can this be done without infringing on the privacy and proprietary entitlement of the previous client? Many of the clients are commercial/businesses who prefer not to have descriptions and solutions for their facilities shared without their consent. Is there a



way to modify this requirement, for example, submitting a table of contents, or redacting identifying information for clients in the report.”

- A4.** DFATD understands that limitations may exist on the information that can be shared within the reports. We would accept a report that has redacted/blocked off information that would otherwise identify a client. We are looking for reports that demonstrate the bidder’s ability to analyze a given location and produce sound recommendations for energy-conserving measures and/or microgrid design feasibility.
- Q5.** “SR5.7 reads: “The travel plan must detail a back-up plan for a site visit if travel conditions (related to COVID-19 or otherwise) do not allow for travel by the primary project team. This can entail partnerships or subcontracting to specialists located closer to Port-au-Prince, or a virtual visit”: Last week the Federal government indicated that additional restrictions are being added to limit international travel, and airlines have been asked to halt flights to many international destinations. If our team cannot travel to site until these restrictions are lifted, and we have a partnership with a local North American certified personnel in Port-au-Prince, does this necessarily imply we will lose all the 10 points, or completely disqualified if project schedule is maintained regardless of COVID19 implications? Are there additional statements that DFATD needs to add regarding COVID19 to demonstrate collaboration with GOC efforts to limit devastation due to COVID19?”
- A5.** GAC recognizes that the ongoing pandemic situation can make it challenging to forecast and plan for travel. Having a partnership with local companies/personnel who can conduct the site visit in the place of the primary project team is a demonstration of sound contingency planning and would not lose the 10 points. Bidders will not be penalized for travel restrictions outside of their control.
- Q6.** “It states on page 5 of 48 of the RFP [SR4 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS]: The Proponent must fill in all the fields in the template “Mandatory Requirements”. What “template” are we talking about here? We do not see anything in the RFP that may constitute a template. Must the mandatory requirements be answered in a different document from the rated requirements, and if so, are they part of the maximum 30 pages allowed for the technical proposal?”
- A6.** DFATD apologises for this error and confirms that the information provided for the mandatory requirements can be in the same document as the rated requirements and forms part of the maximum 30 pages allowed for the technical proposal. There is no template to fill out. DFATD hereby amends Section SR4 (Mandatory Requirements) as follows:

DELETE:

“The Proponent must fill in all the fields in the template “Mandatory Requirements”.”

All other conditions and requirements remain unchanged.