



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Title:	Request for Standing Offers (RFSO) - Northern Contaminated Sites Program, Major Mine Closure Project Services
Solicitation Number:	1000227875
QUESTION 1:	Will there be an indigenous set aside component to this SO? Given the messaging on procurement regarding projects that impact indigenous communities, it would seem a perfect fit?
ANSWER 1:	The evaluation criteria for the Request for Standing Offer includes a point-rated criteria related to Indigenous Opportunities Considerations. At the time of the development of this Request for Standing Offer solicitation document, it was determined that based on the market capacity of Indigenous businesses with the required major mine closure expertise, that the inclusion of Indigenous Opportunities Considerations would be the most effective way to maximize Indigenous involvement under potential contracts. The Indigenous Opportunities Considerations provides flexibility for the potential contractor to be able to support the delivery of services, such as employment or subcontracting opportunities. Although CIRNAC has included Indigenous Opportunities Considerations for this Request for Standing Offer solicitation, CIRNAC is not precluded from implementing Procurement Set asides for Indigenous Businesses in the future.
QUESTION 2:	Section M2 on page 19 of 86 in the above-referenced RFSO refers to Table M2 "Offeror Resource Team Structure form" with instructions to "see templates provided in Attachment". I do not see that templates have been provided with the RFSO. Will CIRNAC provide the required templates for Offerors' use?
ANSWER 2:	The templates have been provided, please refer to RFSO Amendment No. 1.
QUESTION 3:	Can you please confirm that, if awarded a Standing Offer, Offerors will not be precluded from pursuing any future design or construction aspects of mine closure at the sites.
ANSWER 3:	An award through this standing offer process would not preclude a contractor from bidding on any future design or construction procurements. Any potential conflicts of interest would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis as they arise.



QUESTION 4:

Can you please provide clarification on the definition of “additional” in the context of Point-Rated Criteria for some of the Core Resources?

For example, for each of the Principal/Project Leaders, Section 1.1 a) we can achieve “up to 30 points for demonstrated experience of the Resource on additional* Work Engagements...” Here we can present a maximum of 5 WEs (5 WEs x up to 6 points = up to 30 points). These 5 WEs are “in addition to the one (1) Work Engagement required in response to the Mandatory Requirement for the Resource under each of c) and e) (respectively) (as set out in the SOW, Section 7.3.1).”

In Section 1.1.b) we can achieve “up to 18 points for demonstrated experience of the Resource on additional* Work Engagements...” Here we can present a maximum of 3 WEs (3 WEs x up to 6 points = 18 points). These 3 WEs are “in addition to the one (1) Work Engagement required in response to the Mandatory Requirement for the Resource under each of c) and e) (respectively) (as set out in the SOW, Section 7.3.1).”

Question 1: I understand that the two WEs presented to meet the Mandatory Requirements for the Principal/Project Leaders cannot also be used to meet the Point-Rated Criteria for the Principal/Project Leaders. Is this correct?

Question 2: Can the 3 WEs presented in response to the requirements in Section 1.1.b) also be presented in response to the requirements in Section 1.1.a)? In this scenario, we would present 7 distinct WEs in total (for example: WE #1 and WE #2 to meet the Mandatory Requirements; WE #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7 for Section 1.1.a); and WE #3, #4, and #6 for Section 1.1.b)). Is this correct?

Question 3: What details are required to demonstrate that the two WEs meet the Mandatory Requirements for the Principal/Project Leaders?

ANSWER 4:

Answer 1: Correct, the same work engagement used to meet a Mandatory Requirement cannot be used to meet the matching Point-Rated Criterion for the proposed resource.

Answer 2: Yes. Work engagements presented against the Point-Rated Criteria can be used to satisfy multiple Point-Rated Criteria.

Answer 3: Please refer to the Offeror submission tables (Table M3 / R1) provided in Amendment #1.

QUESTION 5:

Can you confirm that all categories will be included in the calculation of the Offeror’s Average per hour rates – including those that may not have proposed resources associated with them in the bidder’s proposal (e.g. if a junior consultant is not put forth at the time of bidding, the category’s rate would still be included in the average calculation used to determine the financial bid evaluation) ?

ANSWER 5:

Yes, as indicated on page 11, all categories will be included in the calculation of the Offeror’s Average per Hour Rates. Offerors are required to provide a rate for all categories.