



## RETURN BIDS TO:

## RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC

11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

## 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

Consultant Services Division/Division des services  
d'experts-conseils  
L'Esplanade Laurier  
4th floor, East Tower  
140 O'Connor Street  
Ottawa  
Ontario  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Embassy of Canada - Moscow, Russia	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 08281-190510/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20190510	<b>Date</b> 2021-02-18
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$\$FE-180-79641	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fe180.08281-190510	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> Eastern Standard Time EST <b>on - le 2021-03-09</b> Heure Normale du l'Est HNE	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Naufal, Matthew	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fe180
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 296-9346 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

## REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION - SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 003

### **Purpose:**

The amendment is issued:

A) to provide answers to questions raised by the industry

### **A) QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

<b><u>No.</u></b>	<b><u>Question</u></b>	<b><u>Answer</u></b>
<b>30</b>	a) Could PWGSC confirm that Mandatory Requirement M2 only requires one (1) project to be "International" > \$10M CAD? and  b) Could PWGSC confirm that Point-Rated Criteria P1   P4 favour "International" projects?	a) M2 for Team A only requires one project to be International with a minimum construction value of CAD \$10,000,000 excluding taxes.  b) Respondents are scored accordingly based on the project(s) provided. Points are provided based on a number of factors, and a Respondent may receive more points for projects that are International.
<b>31</b>	In Section 7 Response, Section 7.1 Response a. Requirements, it requests the Proponent to demonstrate their understanding of the requirements, and how they will meet the requirements, however that section is not included in Section 9. Technical Evaluation, 9.1 Mandatory and Point-Rated Technical Criteria. Nor is that section referenced in the MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS: TEAM A. It is unclear whether PWGSC is looking for Proponents to include a Project Understanding as part of their submission and included in the 30-page limit. If we are expected to include this information is it included in the 30-page limit, and will this section have a rated criteria component to it?	Section 7.1 are instructions Respondent's should follow in order to provide a complete response to the evaluation criteria included in Section 9 Technical Evaluation. It is not to be answered in a separate section.
<b>32</b>	As noted in the aforementioned sections, there is no requirement for Proponents to include information such as Firm Profile, Firm History, Proposed Personnel, Team Management, etc. Are we to understand the only materials that PWGSC wishes to review and rate as part of this RFQ are the five (5) Past Projects. Said differently, no additional information or content is requested, required, considered or rated, save the mandatory forms, and the licensing information?	Stage 1 - Request for Qualification, is qualifying Respondents on Past Project Experience. The information to be submitted is provided under the mandatory requirements and point-rated Criteria.

<b>33</b>	Can you please clarify if you would like us to include in our proposal submission our full architectural and engineering team, including sub-consultants, OR just key/lead team members (i.e. architectural design team only)?	The requirements to include for Stage 1 - Request for Qualification are stated in Annex D - Submission Requirements and Evaluation.
<b>34</b>	To ensure we will include all required information in our submission, can you please provide a detailed listing of what information you would like us to submit in our proposal, as well as whether or not it will be rated?	It is the Respondents responsibility to determine what should be included in their Response. Refer to Annex D - Submission Requirements and Evaluation for mandatory and point-rated criteria.
<b>35</b>	If we are to include additional information such as firm profile, project understanding, proposed project personnel (CVs, bios, qualifications), etc, can this information be outside the 30-page limit? And will it be rated?	Additional information that is not requested under Annex D - Submission Requirements and Evaluation will not be evaluated. Section 7.3. subsection (d) of the RFQ refers to items not included in the page limitation.
<b>36</b>	Based on uncertain key submission requirements, would you consider granting a 1-2 week extension to the due date so that we have sufficient time to prepare a thorough proposal response that is in line with your expectations?	Refer to Amendment 002, Change 3
<b>37</b>	In Annex D, Criteria M1PB, Licensing, Certification or Authorization: is PWGSC looking to receive current licenses, certification or authorization for Architecture, Structural, Mechanical and Electrical (excluding speciality consultants) only? Can these be appended or not included in the 30-page limit?	Refer to Amendment 001, Change 1 for the license requirement.
<b>38</b>	Can we use our logo and design of headers and footers for proposal and add general information about our company?	A Respondent can include their logo and design of headers and footers in their response. The format of the Response should be in accordance with section 7.3 Format instructions, Subsection (a) of the RFQ.
<b>39</b>	Annex F - Regarding the client signature requirement on the Annex F forms  Possible unforeseen Covid-related or other delays may occur on the client-side, resulting in client signatures to come back late. Due to possible delays in receiving all 5 client signatures back in time before the deadline, we would like to request a deadline extension of 1 week.	Refer to Amendment 002, Change 3

<b>40</b>	In reference to Addendum 2, Change 5. Will PWGSC accept completed Client Reference Forms using the original Annex F? We have received completed forms from our international clients and requesting they complete the updated form will require additional wait time.	Yes, PWGSC will accept the original Annex F - Client Reference Form.
<b>41</b>	In reference to Addendum 2, Question 19. International is defined in the LOI as meaning “a country other than the one in which the Respondent’s corporate headquarters is situated; beyond its national boundary”. However the response to Question 19 indicates that projects completed by the US branch of a firm where HQ is based in Canada do not count as international. Please clarify if projects completed jointly by both the Canadian and US branch of the same firm garner the maximum points as an international project.	Canada is qualifying Respondent’s on past project experience who are submitting the Response, and not a branch that is located outside of the Respondent's location. The Respondent corporate headquarters must be in a different country than the actual project to qualify as an international project.
<b>42</b>	Annex C – Description of Project, Article 1.0 Codes, Regulations, By-Laws: The design is to conform to several Canadian standards, yet based on the Point-Rated Criteria Matrix: Team A, an all-Canadian project would be penalized under criteria P1, P4 and P7. Is there a reason for the diminished recognition of comparable Canadian projects?	The design requires both Russian and Canadian applicable law, codes, and other standards. Additionally, because the embassy is located in Russia, International project experience is required. International projects will score higher due to the multiple complexities related, but not limited to codes, standards, culture, and technology.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**