



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.

QUESTION 6:

The following is a requirement for the “Principal / Project Leader” role, from Section 7.3.1 of the RFSO



(page 57 of 86): “d) At least three (3) work engagements in the last 10 years as a Lead, delivering services comparable to the Services as defined in Sections 5.2.1 - 5.2.8 of the Statement of Work (SOW) in support of three (3) distinct Major Mine Closure Projects in a context where the Resource actively engaged with public, industry or community stakeholders OR for a Northern Mine OR for a Remote Mine.” Could CIRNAC please confirm if, for example, we include a work engagement for a Northern Mine, then that work engagement does NOT need to include stakeholder engagement to receive full points?

ANSWER 6:

Correct, the Major Mine Closure Project needs to demonstrate one (1) of the three conditions:

- 1) in a context where the Resource actively engaged with public, industry or community stakeholders; OR
- 2) for a Northern Mine; OR
- 3) for a Remote Mine.

QUESTION 7:

Point Rated Criteria 1.1 on page 22 of 86 of the RFSO indicates that work engagements in addition to those presented in response to Mandatory Criteria M3 (page 19 of 86) must be submitted. As an example to clarify the requirements for each role, could CIRNAC please confirm how many projects should be submitted for each Principal / Project Leader? For full points, should bidders submit a minimum of 11, maximum of 17 projects for each Principal / Project Leader? These numbers are based on the following instructions:

- a. A minimum of three (3), maximum of nine (9) to demonstrate the minimum qualifications set out in RFSO Scope of Work Section 7.3.1 (page 57 of 86), addressing Mandatory Criteria M3 (page 19 of 86); AND
- b. Up to five (5) additional projects not included in in the response to M3, to meet requirements of Point Rated Criteria 1.1.a (page 22 of 86); however, if fewer than 5 work engagements are submitted in response to R1.1.a, then that bidder cannot receive full marks of 30/30 points; AND
- c. Up to three (3) additional projects not included in either M3 or R1.1.a, to meet requirements of Point Rated Criteria 1.1.b (page 22 of 86); however, if fewer than 3 work engagements are submitted in response to R1.1.b, then that bidder cannot receive full marks of 18/18 points.

ANSWER 7:

For full points for the Principal / Project Leader on R1.1, a minimum of eight (8) Work Engagements to a maximum of 17 Work Engagements may be presented that demonstrate all requirements.

- a) For the Mandatory Requirement M3, a minimum of three (3) to a maximum of nine (9) Work Engagements may be submitted against the Mandatory Requirements.
- b) For Point-Rated Criterion 1.1 a), up to five (5) additional Work Engagements that are distinct from the Work Engagement presented for M3 7.3.1 c) may be presented. Five (5) additional Work Engagements demonstrating the requirements of R1.1.a) would be required to achieve full points on R.1.1.a).
- c) For Point-Rated Criterion 1.1 b) up to three (3) additional Work Engagements that are distinct from the Work Engagement presented for M3 7.3.1 e) may be presented. Three (3) additional Work Engagements valued at \$100 Million or more in capital or liability and demonstrating the



requirements of R 1.1. b) would be required to achieve full points on R.1.1. b).

As stated in section 7.3.1 of the SOW, the same Work Engagement may be put forward against more than one (1) of 7.3.1 c)-i) where it demonstrates the requirements. Offerors can thus elect to put forward one (1) Work Engagement meeting both of M3 7.3.1 c) and e) OR two (2) distinct Work Engagements, being one (1) per M3 7.3.1 c) and e).

The same Work Engagements may be put forward against both R.1.1 a) and R.1.1.b) where they demonstrate the respective requirements.

In addition, please refer to Q&A #4.

QUESTION 8:

Section M3 (page 19 of 86) states that “Only the minimum number of Work Engagements as identified in SOW Section 7.3.1 will be evaluated for consideration of the Resource’s responsiveness to the Minimum Qualifications set out in SOW Section 7.3.1.” An example of the referenced Section 7.3.1 instruction is as follows: “At least one (1) work engagement in the last 10 years as a Lead delivering services on a Major Mining Project for a Mine located in the North or a Major Mine Closure Project for a Mine located in the North” (Section 7.3.1.A.c; page 57 of 86). If a bidder submits two (2) work engagements to address an instruction like this, and the first does not, in CIRNAC’s eyes, meet the minimum qualifications, will CIRNAC then review the second work engagement? If not, we are wondering if the “At least one” instructions should read “Exactly one”.

ANSWER 8:

As Core Team Resources are also assessed against the Point-Rated Criteria at time of RFSO, “at least [number (#)]” of Work Engagement(s) is/are required at a minimum in terms of the level of experience a Resource is to possess to meet the Mandatory Requirements.

“Only the minimum number of Work Engagements as identified in SOW Section 7.3.1 will be evaluated...” means CIRNAC will evaluate only the identified number of Work Engagement(s) in each specific requirement of 7.3.1. For example, CIRNAC will not evaluate a second Work Engagement where the identified number of Work Engagements is one (1).

As noted, Offerors are permitted to submit only up to the maximum number of Work Engagements to address the requirements.

QUESTION 9:

Could CIRNAC please confirm if we are understanding Mandatory Criteria M1.8 (page 17 of 86) correctly? As stated in the RFSO: “At least one (1) Work Engagement MUST demonstrate the Offeror’s experience working on Projects that involved Indigenous government or Indigenous community Project stakeholders, participants or input; with the Offeror demonstrating experience supporting the eliciting of feedback from Indigenous persons or incorporating feedback from engagement consultation with Indigenous persons into design/development OR developing or modifying design or costing to incorporate Traditional Knowledge.” This work engagement should either demonstrate the incorporation of feedback received through consultation and engagement with Indigenous Communities, OR the work engagement should demonstrate inclusion of Traditional Knowledge received through other means. Either way, the work engagement must have involved Indigenous government or Indigenous community project stakeholders or participants. Is that correct?

ANSWER 9:

Correct. The Project needs to have involved Indigenous government or Indigenous community Project stakeholders, participants or input, and the Offeror’s experience in the Work Engagement for the Project needs to include either:

- 1) supporting the eliciting of feedback from Indigenous persons or incorporating feedback from engagement consultation with Indigenous persons into design/development; OR



2) developing or modifying design or costing to incorporate Traditional Knowledge.

QUESTION 10:

With respect to the terms and conditions, (company name removed) requires that a provision limiting (company name removed) liability to the contract price be included in the resulting contract. Given that the submission of the bid implies acceptance of the terms and conditions, we would like to ask if this particular provision can be negotiated either before or after bid submission.

ANSWER 10:

In accordance with Appendix B of the Directive on the Management of Procurement, CIRNAC is unable to modify or limit the contractor's liability. By submitting a Bid the Offeror accepts these terms and conditions.

QUESTION 11:

With respect to the security clearance, we have the following questions:

- a. Must the IT network be a standalone network without internet access or touching other internal networks?
- b. We could not find the reference "Part 3 - Section IV Additional Information" (Section 6.1 Security Requirements, 1 (e)) in the rest of the document. We would like to confirm the locations at which the document safeguarding is to be obtained. We assume the offices of (name of company removed) unless otherwise indicated by Canada.

ANSWER 11:

- a. We don't require Protected B networks to be stand-alone (or air-gapped) networks. They can be connected to other networks, but require appropriate safeguards to protect the information while it is being processed and stored. Refer to the Security Requirements Agreement at Annex D of the RFSO.
- b. Part 3 - Section IV Additional Information has been added, please refer to RFSO Amendment No. 2. Yes, it is the office of the company.

QUESTION 12:

Would it be possible to receive an extension to January 14, 2022.

ANSWER 12:

An extension to the closing date has been granted until January 14, 2022, please refer to RFSO Amendment No. 2.