



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

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT / DOCUMENT CONTIENT DES
EXIGENCES RELATIVES À LA SÉCURITÉ

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

Title - Sujet TSTS Architectural and Engineering Services	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP938-212564/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20212564	Date 2021-11-26
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FE-178-80481	
File No. - N° de dossier fe178.EP938-212564	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Standard Time EST on - le 2022-01-12 Heure Normale de l'Est HNE	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Matende, Robinah	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fe178
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 353-8472 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: PSPC PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT BRANCH DIRECTION GENERALE DE LA CITE O CONNOR ST OTTAWA-ON K1A 0R5 CANADA	

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

AMENDMENT 006

This amendment is raised to answer questions and to make the following changes to the RFP.

The bid closing date is hereby extended to January 12, 2022 at 2:00 pm Eastern Standard Time (EST)

1. Questions and Answers:

Questions and Answers	
Q26	<p>For all three representative projects to be presented by the Proponent (ref. sections 3.2.1.2.a., 3.2.1.2.b. and 3.2.1.2.c.), the following characteristic is required:</p> <p><i>ii. Implementation via construction management, or design-build, or private-public-partnership, or engineer-procure-construct project delivery model;</i></p> <p>a) Construction Management project delivery model: In many private sector projects implemented via construction management project delivery model, the Owner chooses to separately contract for architectural and engineering services. Further, for the vast majority of architectural and engineering services contracts awarded in Quebec by institutional clients other than the federal government and municipalities, for projects to be implemented via construction management (or design-bid-build) project delivery models, architectural, mechanical/electrical and structural/civil consultants are engaged separately by the Owner. This would be the case for projects relevant to this Request for Proposals. The Architect acting as lead consultant cannot and does not hold the engineering subconsultant contracts but is responsible for overall technical coordination of the project. In such a case, for a project submitted by a Proponent (Architect), would the Proponent be considered as having rendered engineering services as required in section 3.2.1.3.b?</p> <p>b) Design-Build or Private-Public-Partnership project delivery model: In the majority of projects implemented via a design-build, or private-public-partnership project delivery model, the design-builder (the project owner until turnover) typically separately engages architectural and engineering design disciplines. The Architect acting as lead consultant does not hold the subconsultant contracts but is responsible for overall technical coordination of the project. In such a case, for a project submitted by a Proponent (Architect), would the Proponent be considered as having rendered engineering services as required in section 3.2.1.3.b?</p> <p>c) Engineer-Procure-Construct (EPC) project delivery model: In projects implemented via an engineer-procure-construct (EPC) project delivery model, the Owner typically engages an architectural and engineering team for design services and for construction services and delivery. In the case of industrial projects, the EPC team may be engineer-led. An Architectural firm not part of an integrated A/E Firm would provide architectural services as a subconsultant to the lead engineering consultant. In such a case, would the project submitted by a Proponent (Architect) be evaluated? <i>(Note that in Québec, due to professional regulatory restrictions, engineering firms cannot offer architectural services directly to clients. Integrated A/E firms are few in number, typically architectural firms offering limited engineering services. Consequently, most EPC mandates in this jurisdiction, relevant to the present request for proposals, are engineering led, with an architectural subconsultant.)</i></p>
A26	<p>Please refer to the RFP, section 3.2.1 Experience and Achievements of the Proponent, paragraph 4 a), b) and c) which clearly indicates that if the entity is not directly involved in the delivery of the services under the representative project, the representative project will not be evaluated; and Experience claimed by a subsidiary, an affiliate or a subcontractor will be evaluated as experience by a member of the Proponent's team but not as experience of the Proponent.</p>
Q27	<p>(a) Section 3.2.1.4.b. states in part "For a Joint Venture, experience by any member of the Joint Venture will be evaluated as experience of the Proponent." Please confirm that this would apply to the experience of all members of an architectural and engineering joint venture Proponent, regardless of whether the services of the member were provided as prime consultant or as subconsultant.</p> <p>(b) Please also confirm that this would apply regardless of whether more than one member of the A/E JV proponent rendered services on a project submitted, and whether or not those services were rendered under a single or separate professional service contract(s) with the Owner.</p> <p><i>We are seeking clarification on how the contractual relationships on a submitted project would affect the scoring/evaluation of the contributions of the members of an A/E Joint Venture. Please consider the examples below and advise if in each case the contribution of the participating partner in the A/E JV would be evaluated as Experience of the Proponent:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If more than one member of the A/E JV worked on a submitted project for 3.2.1, both in lead positions direct to the project owner, with one holding responsibility for technical coordination? 2. If more than one member of the A/E JV worked on a submitted project for 3.2.1, both in lead positions direct to the design-build contractor, with one holding responsibility for technical coordination? 3. If the architecture JV partner was prime consultant, responsible for the overall technical coordination, but engineering was subcontracted to a firm not part of the present A/E JV? 4. If the engineering JV partner was prime consultant, responsible for the overall technical coordination, but architecture was subcontracted to a firm not part of the present A/E JV?
A27	<p>(a) The experience of a member of a Joint Venture Proponent will be considered and evaluated as long as they were the prime consultant on the proposed representative project.</p> <p>(b) The experience of a member of a Joint Venture Proponent on projects will be considered and evaluated as long as they were the prime consultant and meet the criteria described under SRE 3.2.1.3 as well other criteria pertaining to project experience</p> <p>In this context "prime consultant" refers to the entity that was in direct contractual terms with the owner.</p> <p>Please refer to amendment of SRE 3.2.1.4 (b) below.</p>

<p>Q28</p>	<p>We respectfully request clarification on the following question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2.5.2.i) Process and Methodology of the Proponent The evaluation criteria in the table for 3.2.5.2 i) Information Management appears to be a duplication of 3.2.5.2 c) BIM Management criteria. Please advise if this is correct and/or provide the correct evaluation criteria for 3.2.5.2 i) Information Management. 																
<p>3.2.5.2 c)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Did not submit information which could be evaluated</td> <td>Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements</td> <td>Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements</td> <td>50 points</td> </tr> </table>	Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements	Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements	Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements	50 points									
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements	Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements	Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements	50 points											
<p>3.2.5.2 i)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Did not submit information which could be evaluated</td> <td>Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements</td> <td>Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of</td> <td>50 points</td> </tr> </table>	Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements	Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements	Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of	50 points									
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements	Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements	Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of	50 points											
<p>A28</p>	<p>At section 3.2.5 Process and Methodology of the Proponent, Scale 5</p> <p><u>Delete:</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3.2.5.2 i)</td> <td>Did not submit information which could be evaluated</td> <td>Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements</td> <td>Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements</td> <td>Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements</td> <td>50 points</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Replace with:</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3.2.5.2 i)</td> <td>Did not submit information which could be evaluated</td> <td>Extremely poor process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.</td> <td>Limited process and methodology for information management and transfer to new members.</td> <td>Adequate process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.</td> <td>Good process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.</td> <td>Very good process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.</td> <td>50 points</td> </tr> </table>	3.2.5.2 i)	Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements	Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements	Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements	50 points	3.2.5.2 i)	Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	Limited process and methodology for information management and transfer to new members.	Adequate process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	Good process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	Very good process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	50 points
3.2.5.2 i)	Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements	Poor process and methodology for BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates. Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understandings in some areas of the requirements	Adequate process and methodology for on- or off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the requirements	Good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements	Very good process and methodology for on- and off-site BIM management and design prioritization or re-prioritization, and production to meet defined project milestones and key intermediate dates; Demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements	50 points										
3.2.5.2 i)	Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Extremely poor process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	Limited process and methodology for information management and transfer to new members.	Adequate process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	Good process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	Very good process and methodology for information management and transfer to new team members.	50 points										
<p>Q29</p>	<p>In reference to RFP section 3.2.6 Indigenous Participation Plan (IPP), there are 15 points Bonus Points identified for an IPP in excess of 5% of Total Contract Value. There is however a discrepancy between the wording and the table presented below the heading "Total IPP Score Calculation Example". The wording indicates that "Total IPP Score (maximum 60) = Section 3.2.6.1 Score + Section 3.2.6.2 Score + Section 3.2.6.3 Score + Section 3.2.6.4 Score IPP Rating (maximum 10) = Total IPP Score/60 *10". However, the example table adds the bonus points to the raw score and then divides the total by 75, rather than 60 as per the wording.</p> <p>While we initially assumed that the intent is to use a denominator of 75, upon reflection it has occurred to us that PWGSC's intent may well be to use 60 as the denominator. This approach would have the effect of compressing the scoring among proponents with significant commitment such that any total score greater or equal to than 60 receives 10 points, while any score less than 60 can "top up" with the bonus points to improve their score. If this is the intended approach, Bonus Points for proponents with significant IPP investment are permitted to achieve competitive IPP scoring, even if they score low on one or more of the four core evaluation criteria under 3.2.6.1, 3.2.6.2, 3.2.6.3 & 3.2.6.4.</p> <p>Can PWGSC please clarify this point?</p>																

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP938-212564/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client

20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

006

File No. - N° du dossier

FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fe178

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

A29	The maximum total IPP Score (including bonus points) is 75 points. Please note changes to the total IPP Score Calculation Example below.
Q30	Amendment 004 adjusted the requirements for 3.2.1 Project C - performance based building. With the requirements adjusted to having completed design development, limited peer recognition/awards would be available to firms for these projects. Would PWGSC consider removing or reducing the evaluation requirements for Project C - performance based building related to 3.2.1 f) industry/peer recognition to increase fair evaluation to those submitting a project with design completed and construction ongoing?
A30	No. The criteria will not change.
Q31	If our company is creating a joint venture with our parent company for the sole purpose of showing relevant project experience under SRE 3.2.1 Experience and Achievements, is there a requirement to have security clearance for our parent company for the purpose of submitting an RFP response.
A31	If the joint venture is a separate legal entity, it will need to be registered and sponsored into the Contract Security Program as such in order to apply for the security clearance. The joint venture will be expected to meet security requirements by Contract Award. If the joint venture is not a legal entity but only 2 organizations that are bidding together on a contract then both organizations need to meet the security requirements indicated on the SRCL. If there is a Document Safeguarding Capability (DSC) security requirement on the SRCL and only one of the organizations has DSC, it will be indicated on the contract that the work can only be performed at a specific address where the DSC is approved.
Q32	With regard to section 3.2.1.4.a) Our team is a JV consisting of architectural firm and multidisciplinary engineering firm, to reflect the importance of engineering in the design and construction of laboratory buildings. If one of the submitted projects is from a multidisciplinary engineering firm, will it be evaluated in the same way as the projects submitted by the architectural firm. Namely, will the project be allowed to score full marks given that a) the architectural firm from our JV was not involved, and b) the multidisciplinary engineering firm did not perform architectural services? This, of course, with the understanding that for full marks we would need to fully describe the services rendered for the engineering components and all other project requirements to the satisfaction of Canada?
A32	In order to score full points, the representative project must fully meet the requirements for a science or research-based laboratory building project, a complex project and performance based building project and must exceed the complexity of the project as described in Appendix H – Project Brief
Q33	With regard to section 3.2.1.4: "If the Proponent is composed of multiple entities, the Proponent is requested to clearly identify who in the teaming arrangement was the design authority and who was responsible for delivering the services in the representative project" If we submit a project delivered only by the multidisciplinary engineering firm in our JV, will simply naming the architect involved in the project suffice (along with our fully describing the aspects of the project that the multidisciplinary engineering firm can speak to) allow us to receive full marks?
A33	In order to score full points, the representative projects must fully meet (i) the requirements for a science or research-based laboratory building project, a complex project and a performance based building project and must exceed the complexity of the project as described in Appendix H – Project Brief. The projects must also meet other characteristics pertaining to project experience such as service delivery and roles and responsibilities described under SRE 3.2.1.3 (b) at various stages described under 3.2.1.3 (c).
Q34	With regard to section 3.2.1.3.c - our team is a JV consisting of architectural firm and a multidisciplinary engineering firm, to reflect the importance of engineering in the design and construction of laboratory buildings. If one of the submitted projects is from a multidisciplinary engineering firm, will the project be allowed to score full marks, assuming we fully describe the multidisciplinary engineering services rendered across all of the phases of the project outlined in this section?
A34	In order to score full points, Proponents must present projects that fully meet the requirements for a science or research-based laboratory building project, a complex project, and performance based building project and must demonstrate that they provided services in six project stages (Schematic or concept design, Design Development, Construction documents, Tender and award, Field or site supervision, Post-construction warranty review) described under 3.2.1.3 (c) i.e.
Q35	With regard to section 3.2.1.3.b. – we note that architect of record and/or engineer of record are acceptable. Our team is a JV consisting of architectural firm and multidisciplinary engineering firm, to reflect the importance of engineering in the design and construction of laboratory buildings. If one of the submitted projects is from a multidisciplinary engineering firm, will the project be allowed to score full marks, i.e. would the following list be equally accepted by Canada? 1. Design Authorship of multidisciplinary engineering scope 2. Managerial Control of multidisciplinary engineering team 3. Architect or Engineer of Record, as applicable; 4. Individual structural, mechanical and electrical design leads; 5. Construction documents production for multidisciplinary engineering documents; 6. Quality management lead for multidisciplinary engineering team; 7. Resident site services lead for multidisciplinary engineering scopes
A35	In order to score full points, Proponents must present projects that fully meet the requirements for a science or research-based laboratory building project, a complex project and a performance based building project and must demonstrate that they provided services under at least six specific roles and responsibilities described in 3.2.1.3 (b). The above list would be equally acceptable
Q36	Would Canada consider relaxing the criteria that the performance based project was delivered by implementation via construction management, or design-build, or public-private partnership, or engineer-procure-construct project delivery model? It will be difficult to find projects that meet both net-zero carbon and alternative delivery models of delivery, as the vast majority of projects that achieve net-zero carbon are delivered via a traditional model with an architect lead, not a contractor lead.
A36	PWGSC will accept projects that have been implemented via a Design-Bid-Build model.
Q37	With the high complexity of the security design and consultation scope, will PWGSC require a certified physical security professional, certified protection professional or equivalent similar to other PWGSC security projects where TRA adoption and implementation is involved?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP938-212564/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client

20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

006

File No. - N° du dossier

FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fe178

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

A37	Please refer to SC1 and appendix D of the RFP as well as the Security Classification Guide in Amendment 005 for details on the security requirements of this project.
Q38	Industrial Hygiene Specialist – This is listed under the GEICs. Please clarify what services should be carried by the Proponent.
A38	The Industrial Hygiene Specialist is required to be carried by the Proponent in order to complete the Laboratory Ventilation Assessment (LVA). PWGSC has begun the data collection process of the LVA however the successful proponent will be required to complete the LVA process and apply the results to the overall design.
Q39	<p>Appendix H - Project Brief Section 1.1 Intent of Contract refers to the following: "PWGSC will retain multiple firms through standing offers to provide geotechnical and environmental engineering services and industrial hygiene services, collectively referred to in this Project Brief as the GEICs, as well as land surveying services and design and construction services related to preconstruction works. Throughout this Contract the Consultant and all members of the Design Team are required to coordinate their Services with those by PWGSC's GEICs, other design consultants and contractors, and land surveyor."</p> <p>In addition, Appendix H Section 7.3 PWGSC's GEICs, Land Surveyor, and Other Consultants/Contractors includes the following " PWGSC will retain a geotechnical and environmental engineering firm, a land surveying firm, and other design consultants and contractors to provide the necessary services not in the Consultant's design mandate. The Consultant and the CM are required to provide all necessary coordination and integration of the findings and requirements of PWGSC's consultants at every stage of the Project."</p> <p>Both statements seem to indicate that Industrial Hygiene Services are not included in the design teams' scope of work.</p> <p>However, the Price Proposal Form in Appendix C, Additional Services Table B requests hourly rates for Industrial Hygiene Specialists.</p> <p>In addition, Appendix H - Section 6.1 Specialist Consultant Services requests the following: " t) Industrial Hygiene specialist"</p> <p>Can PWGSC confirm intent for Industrial Hygiene Specialists in the Design Team?</p>
A39	The Industrial Hygiene Specialist is required to be carried by the Proponent in order to complete the Laboratory Ventilation Assessment (LVA). PWGSC has begun the data collection process of the LVA however the successful proponent will be required to complete the LVA process and apply the results to the overall design.
Q40	<p>Appendix H Project Brief - Section 4.3.4 Architecture indicates the scope includes "j) All applicable investigations and enabling projects"</p> <p>This seems to contradict other statements other statements in Appendix H including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.4 Excluded Scope: "The following items are excluded from the scope and Cost of the Project: b) Enabling Works" • Section 4.2: "For the purposes of this project, Enabling Works are not part of this contract and will be carried out under separate contracts to facilitate the preparation of site for this contract." • Section 4.2.4: "The information in this Project Brief section is for the Design Team's information only and will be carried out in whole or part by the DR." <p>Can PWGSC confirm Appendix H section 4.3.4 bullet j)?</p>
A40	The DR will be responsible for enabling works. Please refer to the Project Brief amendments below for clarifications.
Q41	Would PWGSC consider a two week, or possible one week, extension to the current deadline of December 10th?
A41	The RFP closing date will be extended up to January 12, 2022.
Q42	We are completing the form "Appendix G Indigenous Participation Plan And Certification" for our proposal. Are we also required to submit our Draft narrative of our Indigenous Participation Plan (IPP) at this time or is our narrative for our IPP required after project award, and only Appendix G is needed at this time?
A42	<p>The draft Indigenous Participation Plan is required after contract award. Please refer to section 18 (Indigenous Participation Plan) of the Project Brief</p> <p>For a bid to be responsive and be assigned points, the Bidder must provide completed tables in Appendix G – Indigenous Participation Plan and Certification.</p>
Q43	We respectfully request a 2-week extension to the December 10, 2021 closing date (to December 24, 2021).
A43	The RFP closing date will be extended up to January 12, 2022.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EP938-212564/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client
20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
fe178
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

CHANGES TO THE RFP

The Following changes are effective immediately:

a) Refer: DEFINITIONS

"Proponent" (Prime Consultant):

The person or entity (or, in the case of a joint venture, the persons or entities) which submits a proposal. It does not include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the Proponent, or its sub-consultants.

b) Refer: SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT AND EVALUATION

At SRE 3.2.1.4

DELETE:

b) If the Proponent or a member of the Proponent team was not directly involved in the delivery of the services under the representative project, the representative project will not be evaluated

INSERT:

b) If the Proponent or a member of the Proponent team was not the prime consultant and was not directly involved in the delivery of the services under the representative project, the representative project will not be evaluated

c) Refer: SRE 3.2.6

DELETE:

Total IPP Score Calculation Example

Total IPP Score (maximum 60) = Section 3.2.6.1 Score + Section 3.2.6.2 Score + Section 3.2.6.3 Score +
Section 3.2.6.4 Score IPP Rating (maximum 10) = Total IPP Score/60 *10

INSERT:

Total IPP Score Calculation Example

Total IPP Score (maximum 75) = Section 3.2.6.1 Score + Section 3.2.6.2 Score + Section 3.2.6.3 Score +
Section 3.2.6.4 Score IPP Rating (maximum 10) + Bonus points (if applicable) = Total IPP Score/75 *10

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EP938-212564/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client
20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
fe178
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

CHANGES TO THE PROJECT BRIEF

The Following changes are effective immediately:

a) Refer: 1.1.1 Project Brief Structure

DELETE:

c) Section 4–SCOPE. This section describes the Project scope and is the basis for all Services defined in Project Brief sections 9 through 17. The scope section is broken down into four subsections: common scope elements; enabling projects; main construction; and scope exclusions; and

INSERT:

c) Section 4–SCOPE. This section describes the Project scope and is the basis for all Services defined in Project Brief sections 9 through 17. The scope section is broken down into four subsections: common scope elements; enabling projects and pre-construction work; main construction; and scope exclusions; and

b) Refer: 1.3.3.1 The First Three Years, 1st paragraph

DELETE:

To allow for the main construction work to proceed in a streamlined and efficient sequence, the Project Team will have to make fundamental design decisions and complete enabling projects, making the first three years of the Project an intensive effort for all, as depicted in the following graphic.

INSERT:

To allow for the main construction work to proceed in a streamlined and efficient sequence, the Project Team will have to make fundamental design decisions and complete enabling projects and pre-construction works, making the first three years of the Project an intensive effort for all, as depicted in the following graphic.

c) Refer: 1.4.5.3 Pre-Construction Works

DELETE:

Pre-construction works as defined in Project Brief section 4.2.4 will be carried out by the DR through other design and construction contracts.

INSERT:

Pre-construction works as defined in Project Brief sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 will be carried out by the Project Team.

d) Refer: 1.4.5 Enabling Projects and Pre-Construction Works

INSERT:

1.4.5.4 Enabling Works

Enabling works as defined in Project Brief section 4.2.4 will be carried out by the DR through other design and construction contracts.

e) Refer: 1.4.9.1 50% Design Development, 1st paragraph

DELETE:

The Design Team and the GEICs are required to sufficiently advance the overall design and complete further sustainability performance analysis by the end of the 50% DD stage. The Design Team and GEICs are required to start DPs for enabling projects after the 50% DD submission, or as prioritized by the CM, incorporating the results of the third VE workshop, if required, and the outcome of the numerous workshops focused on individual subjects.

INSERT:

The Design Team and the GEICs are required to sufficiently advance the overall design and complete further sustainability performance analysis by the end of the 50% DD stage. The Design Team and GEICs are required to start DPs for pre-construction works after the 50% DD submission, or as prioritized by the CM, incorporating the results of the third VE workshop, if required, and the outcome of the numerous workshops focused on individual subjects.

f) Refer: 1.4.11 Work Restrictions and Sequencing

DELETE:

s) Access restrictions to site and building(s) during enabling projects, construction, and post-construction;

INSERT:

s) Access restrictions to site and building(s) during enabling projects, pre-construction, construction, and post-construction;

g) Refer: 4.1.1 Investigations

DELETE:

c) A detailed examination of civil/municipal and Site and nearby mechanical, electrical, and Connectivity systems, their interconnection and dependencies on adjacent buildings and the overall Site and municipal infrastructure, or other Sites as they apply to enabling projects;

INSERT:

c) A detailed examination of civil/municipal and Site and nearby mechanical, electrical, and Connectivity systems, their interconnection and dependencies on adjacent buildings and the overall Site and municipal infrastructure, or other Sites as they apply to enabling projects and pre-construction works;

h) Refer: 4.3.3.1 Landscape Architecture

DELETE:

o) All applicable investigations and enabling projects.

INSERT:

o) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

i) Refer: 4.3.3.2 Civil/Municipal

DELETE:

Most of the work as described in this section will have been carried out as part of the Enabling Works. The scope of work to be carried out by the DR generally includes the following:

INSERT:

The scope includes:

DELETE:

m) All applicable investigations and enabling projects.

INSERT:

m) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EP938-212564/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client
20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
fe178
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

j) Refer: 4.3.4 Architecture

DELETE:

j) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

j) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

k) Refer: 4.3.4.1 Building and Site Program

DELETE:

f) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

f) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

l) Refer: 4.3.4.2 Universal Design for Accessibility

DELETE:

d) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

d) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

m) Refer: 4.3.4.3 Security

DELETE:

h) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

h) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

n) Refer: 4.3.4.4 Audio-Visual

DELETE:

e) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

e) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

o) Refer: 4.3.4.5 Information Technology

DELETE:

f) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

f) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

p) Refer: 4.3.6.3.3 Consultant's FF&E Scope and Responsibility

DELETE:

n) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

n) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

q) Refer: 4.3.6.3.5 Consultant's Connectivity Scope and Responsibilities

DELETE:

f) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

f) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

r) Refer: 4.3.4.7 Acoustic Design

DELETE:

d) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

d) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

s) Refer: 4.3.6 Building Envelope

DELETE:

h) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

h) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

t) Refer: 4.3.7 Structural and Seismic

DELETE:

h) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

h) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

u) Refer: 4.3.8 Mechanical

DELETE:

r) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

r) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

v) Refer: 4.3.9 Electrical

DELETE:

s) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

s) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP938-212564/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client

20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

006

File No. - N° du dossier

FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fe178

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

w) Refer: 4.3.11 Commissioning

DELETE:

g) All applicable investigations and enabling works.

INSERT:

g) All applicable investigations and pre-construction works.

x) Refer: 4.3.12.1 Design Team's Scope

DELETE:

b) Undertaking ongoing Cost analysis and developing elemental Cost estimates in ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II and annual cash flows for the entire Project scope at 50% and 100% SD, and 50% and 100% DD, according to the approved WBS identified in subparagraph a), including all enabling projects and incorporating estimates from the GEICs to give a holistic Cost estimate;

INSERT:

b) Undertaking ongoing Cost analysis and developing elemental Cost estimates in ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II and annual cash flows for the entire Project scope at 50% and 100% SD, and 50% and 100% DD, according to the approved WBS identified in subparagraph a), including all pre-construction works and incorporating estimates from the GEICs to give a holistic Cost estimate;

y) Refer: 4.3.12.2 CM's Scope

DELETE:

b) Undertaking ongoing Cost analysis and developing elemental Cost estimates in ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II and annual cash flows for the entire Project scope at 100% SD, and 50% and 100% DD, according to the approved WBS identified in subparagraph a), including all enabling projects;

INSERT:

b) Undertaking ongoing Cost analysis and developing elemental Cost estimates in ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II and annual cash flows for the entire Project scope at 100% SD, and 50% and 100% DD, according to the approved WBS identified in subparagraph a), including all pre-construction works;

z) Refer: 10.1.8.5.3 National Capital Commission, 2nd paragraph

DELETE:

With the DR, the Design Team, in consultation with NCC staff, must establish a strategy and timetable incorporating the sequential and incremental development of the Project design. Enabling projects may not begin until FLUDTA approval is received, typically a level 2 FLUDTA.

INSERT:

With the DR, the Design Team, in consultation with NCC staff, must establish a strategy and timetable incorporating the sequential and incremental development of the Project design. Pre-Construction works may not begin until FLUDTA approval is received, typically a level 2 FLUDTA.

aa) Refer: 10.2.1.1 Design Management Planning

DELETE:

d) A description of the processes and methods to incorporate lean design, design review, and lean construction processes for investigations and enabling projects;

INSERT:

d) A description of the processes and methods to incorporate lean design, design review, and lean construction processes for investigations and pre-construction works;

ab) Refer: 10.2.1.3 Cost Management Planning

DELETE:

h) A description of the processes and methods explaining the iterative development of 50% and 100% update of SD and DD submission Cost estimates, which incorporate estimates prepared by the GEICs, and 50%, 90% and 100% DP Cost estimates, including lean design and DP process related to investigations and enabling projects;

INSERT:

h) A description of the processes and methods explaining the iterative development of 50% and 100% update of SD and DD submission Cost estimates, which incorporate estimates prepared by the GEICs, and 50%, 90% and 100% DP Cost estimates, including lean design and DP process related to investigations and pre-construction works;

ac) Refer: 11.1 Intent, 3rd paragraph

DELETE:

The PD requirements and Services in this Project Brief section 11 apply to each of the enabling projects identified in Project Brief section 4.2, but adapted and streamlined to the maximum extent possible, as agreed by the DR.

INSERT:

The PD requirements and Services in this Project Brief section 11 apply to each of the pre-construction works identified in Project Brief section 4.2, but adapted and streamlined to the maximum extent possible, as agreed by the DR.

ad) Refer: 12.2 Enabling Projects Services

DELETE:

12.2 Enabling Project Services

INSERT:

12.2 Pre-Construction Works

ae) Refer: 12.3.12 Cost, 1st paragraph

DELETE:

The Design Team must develop iterative **ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II** class C (+/- 15%) Cost estimates per option, with the 50% and 100% SD submission, and with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each enabling project and a whole-Project sustainability budget. The SD Cost estimates and related Cost analysis includes, but is not limited to:

INSERT:

The Design Team must develop iterative **ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II** class C (+/- 15%) Cost estimates per option, with the 50% and 100% SD submission, and with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each pre-construction work and a whole-Project sustainability budget. The SD Cost estimates and related Cost analysis includes, but is not limited to:

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EP938-212564/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client
20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier
FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
fe178
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

af) Refer: 12.6 Schematic Design Deliverables

DELETE:

m) xiv. The Design Team must develop iterative [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) class C (+/- 15%) Cost estimates per option, with the 50% and 100% SD submission, and with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each enabling project and a whole-Project sustainability budget. The SD Cost estimates and related Cost analysis includes, but is not limited to:

INSERT:

m) xiv. The Design Team must develop iterative [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) class C (+/- 15%) Cost estimates per option, with the 50% and 100% SD submission, and with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each pre-construction work and a whole-Project sustainability budget. The SD Cost estimates and related Cost analysis includes, but is not limited to:

ag) Refer: 13.1 Intent, 3rd paragraph

DELETE:

All DD stage deliverables will be reviewed by the DR. DD Services do not apply for enabling and temporary works.

INSERT:

All DD stage deliverables will be reviewed by the DR. DD Services do not apply for pre-construction and temporary works.

ah) Refer: 13.2.12 Cost

DELETE:

The Design Team must develop iterative [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) class B (+/- 10%) Cost estimates for DD submissions, which includes the two DD sustainability options, with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with refined Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each enabling project. The DD Cost estimates and related Cost analysis with the 50% and 100% DD submission includes, but is not limited to:

INSERT:

The Design Team must develop iterative [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) class B (+/- 10%) Cost estimates for DD submissions, which includes the two DD sustainability options, with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with refined Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each pre-construction work. The DD Cost estimates and related Cost analysis with the 50% and 100% DD submission includes, but is not limited to:

ai) Refer: 13.5 Design Development Deliverables

DELETE:

m) xiv. [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) Cost estimates per DD submission, with an updated WBS and basis of estimate, including an updated estimate and basis of estimate per enabling project, and:

INSERT:

m) xiv. [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) Cost estimates per DD submission, with an updated WBS and basis of estimate, including an updated estimate and basis of estimate per enabling project,

aj) Refer: 14.1.1 Enabling Projects

DELETE:

14.1.1 Enabling Projects

The DP requirements and Services in this Project Brief section 14 apply to each of the enabling projects identified in Project Brief section 4.2, but adapted and streamlined to the extent possible, as agreed by the Design Team, CM, and DR.

The number of interim submissions and review periods will be reduced to optimize the schedule as agreed by the Design Team, CM, and DR.

INSERT:

14.1.1 Pre-Construction Works

The DP requirements and Services in this Project Brief section 14 apply to each of the pre-construction works identified in Project Brief section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, but adapted and streamlined to the extent possible, as agreed by the Design Team, CM, and DR.

The number of interim submissions and review periods will be reduced to optimize the schedule as agreed by the Design Team, CM, and DR.

ak) Refer: 14.3.13 Cost, 1st paragraph

DELETE:

The Design Team must develop iterative [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) class A (+/- 5%) Cost estimates for each DP, with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with refined Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each enabling project. The DP Cost estimates and related Cost analysis per DP submission includes, but is not limited to:

INSERT:

The Design Team must develop iterative [ASTM E1557, UNIFORMAT II](#) class A (+/- 5%) Cost estimates for each DP, with a detailed option-specific basis of estimate that builds on earlier versions, along with refined Cost estimates and basis of estimates for each pre-construction work. The DP Cost estimates and related Cost analysis per DP submission includes, but is not limited to:

al) Refer: APPENDIX H – DELIVERABLES SUMMARY, 39th and 40th row

DELETE:

SCHEMATIC DESIGN SERVICES	Confirm enabling projects design interferences within the Model are identified and resolved	Weekly, or as defined in the up-to-date BXP	Section 12.2
	Adapt and optimize the individual work flow of each Design Team member to meet enabling projects design production requirements and, if possible, shorten durations, as agreed by the DR	Ongoing	Section 12.2

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP938-212564/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de ref. du client

20212564

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

006

File No. - N° du dossier

FE178.EP938-212564

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fe178

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

INSERT:

SCHEMATIC DESIGN SERVICES	Confirm pre-construction and enabling projects design interferences within the Model are identified and resolved	Weekly, or as defined in the up-to-date BXP	Section 12.2
	Adapt and optimize the individual work flow of each Design Team member to meet pre-construction works design production requirements and, if possible, shorten durations, as agreed by the DR	Ongoing	Section 12.2

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.