



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Public Works and Government Services Canada

See herein for bid submission

instructions

Voir la présente pour les
instructions sur la présentation
d'une soumission

NA

Manitoba

NA

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle du département(OCID)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless
otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of
the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf
indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent
les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Public Works and Government Services Canada
Northern Contaminated Site Program
Canada Place/Place du Canada
10th Floor/10e étage
9700 Jasper Ave/9700 ave Jasper
Edmonton
Alberta
T5J 4C3

Title - Sujet Multidisciplinary Environmental Ser Services environnementaux multidisciplinaires	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EW699-220414/B	Date 2022-02-17
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client PWGSC EW699-220414	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
File No. - N° de dossier NCS-1-44066 (013)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$NCS-013-12213	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2022-01-24	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Central Daylight Saving Time CDT on - le 2022-04-19 Heure Avancée du Centre HAC	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Wiebe, Amanda	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur ncs013
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (431) 335-3523 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (418) 566-6167
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

This amendment 004 is raised to:

1. Modify Solicitation EW699-220414/B as follows:

Extend the Solicitation Closing date:

REVISED CLOSING DATE: 02:00 PM CDT on 2022-04-19

Refer to GI1

DELETE:

"Price Rating":

A rating assigned to the price component of an offer and subsequently used to establish a Price Score for inclusion as a percentage of the total score to be established following the evaluation and rating of technical offers.

INSERT:

"Price Rating":

A rating assigned to the price component of an offer and subsequently used to establish a Price Score for inclusion as a percentage of the total score to be established following the evaluation and rating of technical **and Indigenous/ Inuit** offers.

Refer to 9.1.5 (2018-03-13) Phase III: Final Evaluation of the Offer

DELETE:

a) In Phase III, Canada will complete the evaluation of all Offers found responsive to the requirements reviewed at Phase II. Offers will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the Offer solicitation including the technical and financial evaluation criteria.

INSERT:

a) In Phase III, Canada will complete the evaluation of all Offers found responsive to the requirements reviewed at Phase II. Offers will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the Offer solicitation including the technical, **Indigenous/Inuit** and financial evaluation criteria.

Refer to SP 5 Call-up Procedure 6 c) Category of Personnel:

INSERT:

It is expected that either the Senior or Intermediate Professional will be identified on each call-up.

Refer to SRE 3.1.2 Licensing, Certification or Authorization

DELETE:

You must indicate current license or how you intend to meet the provincial licensing requirements.

INSERT:

You must indicate current license or how you intend to meet the provincial **or territorial** licensing requirements.

Refer to SRE 3.2 Rated Requirements:

DELETE:

Remote: Remote experience is experience gained on projects where the work site is isolated from essential services (medical, communication, food, accommodation and fuel) and the environment is challenging in regard to terrain, wildlife and weather.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

INSERT:

Remote: Remote experience is experience gained on projects where the work site is isolated from essential services (medical, communication, food, accommodation and fuel) and the environment is challenging in regard to terrain, wildlife and weather. ***This includes fly-in only communities/sites, any sites with limited accessibility where camp needs to be set up, or sites and communities north of 60 excluding Yellowknife, Whitehorse and Iqaluit.***

DELETE:

Detailed Project Description Requirements

Project descriptions must be for work completed within the last seven (7) years by the firm or ***subcontractor.

INSERT:

Detailed Project Description Requirements

Project descriptions must be for **projects that have been actively worked on** within the last seven (7) years by the firm or ***subcontractor.

Refer to Resource Resume Requirements

INSERT:

Project descriptions must be for **projects that have been actively worked on** within the last seven (7) years.

DELETE:

2. Project Client Reference: including name, title and contact information (either email address and/or phone number) of client contact at working level.

INSERT:

2. Project Client: Provide client name (e.g., company or government agency). If requested, Offerors should be prepared to provide client contact information.

Refer to Part E Indigenous / Inuit Benefits Criteria (IBC)

DELETE:

For a plan to be assigned points for representations made in respect of any IBC, the Offeror must provide proof with their plan to demonstrate how they will meet the objective of each criterion. The proposed IBP under 3.0 will be applicable to the overall Standing Offer. Successful Standing Offer holders, will be responsible for explaining how they will apply their overall IBP plan to each specific call-up, if applicable, prior to authorization of a call-up as per Appendix C.

Proof of efforts and/or plans made by Offerors should include, but not be limited to, the names of persons or companies contacted and the nature of the undertakings at the time of the submission as applicable. Offerors must ensure their IBP documentation demonstrates sufficient evidence to assess the compliance of their plan against the criteria listed herein. It is the Offerors' responsibility to provide sufficient information in its plan to enable the Evaluation Committee to complete its evaluation. Offerors must include all reference material to be considered, material and/or documents outside the offer will not be considered. URL links to website will not be considered. No prior knowledge or experience will be taken into consideration.

INSERT:

For a plan to be assigned points for representations made in respect of any IBC, the Offeror must fully demonstrate how they will meet the objective of each criterion. In this section Offerors must explain how they will apply their IBP to each specific call-up. It is the Offerors' responsibility to provide sufficient information in their plan to enable the Evaluation Committee to complete its evaluation and assess the viability of a plan. This may include, but is not limited to, practices, procedures or resources already in place or how they will be developed, and the steps a consultant will take once a request for call-up proposal is received i.e. who they will

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

contact or how they will go about determining who to contact within the community. Offerors must include all reference material to be considered, material and/or documents outside the offer will not be considered. URL links to websites will not be considered. No prior knowledge or experience of the Evaluation Committee will be taken into consideration.

The proposed IBP under 3.0 will be applicable to the overall Standing Offer. If requested, successful Standing Offer holders will be required to complete Appendix C prior to authorization of a call-up.

Refer to SRE 4

DELETE:

All price offers corresponding to responsive offers which have achieved the identified pass marks will be considered upon completion of the technical evaluation.

INSERT:

All price offers corresponding to responsive offers which have achieved the identified pass marks will be considered upon completion of the technical **and Indigenous/Inuit Plan** evaluations.

Refer to SRE 5

DELETE:

The offers will be ranked in order from the highest to the lowest using the total score (technical plus price).

INSERT:

The offers will be ranked in order from the highest to the lowest using the total score (technical **plus Indigenous / Inuit plan**, plus price).

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

2. Address questions from Industry:

	Question	Answer
1	Please indicate if there are any requirements in regards to certifications/credentials/ designations/ education for proposed Senior and Intermediate Professionals?	It should be demonstrated that the Senior and Intermediate Professionals have the education, experience and appropriate professional designations to complete projects under the applicable project categories. Senior Professionals must have 10 years of relevant experience and Intermediate Professionals must have 5 years of relevant experience.
2	SRE 3.1.2 The RFP specifies Offerors shall be licensed or eligible to be licensed to practice in the locations listed under the stream for which they are offering services. Please advise what type of licenses are required – for example, do we require Permits to Practice from Engineers Yukon and NAPEG for Stream 2 submissions? If so, do we provide copies of the permits with our submission in an Appendix?	Offerors must provide documentation that confirms the firm is authorized to provide engineering services in the province or territorial under the applicable streams. In addition, a listing must be provided of those in the firm available to work on projects and who are provincially or territorially authorized to provide engineering and any other professionals services.
3	Regarding work for Streams 2/3 - In the North we often have to provide a deposit to book sub-contractors for work and are out-of-pocket for this amount until we are paid by PSPC. Would there be any consideration to allowing a mark-up on disbursements and or travel?	No
4	The Cost Estimating (for streams 2 and 3) falls under Design, Specifications and Cost Estimates (6.1.2) in the Statement of Work, but falls as Item 4.3 under the Technical Evaluation. Can you confirm that resources for the Cost Estimating do not have to be joint venture or in house.	That is correct, the Cost Estimating role does not have to be in-house.
5	For Streams #2 and #3, Cost Estimating work discipline is required. However, there is no description or outline of that discipline (except from what can be interpreted from Section 6.1.2.(4)). Could Canada please provide a more robust outline for that specific discipline (similar to the other outlines for the other work disciplines) that more clearly defines what is expected and required in order to obtain full point scoring?	Canada does not have any further information to add related to cost estimating services. An outline of what is requested for cost estimating services is provided in Section 6.1.2.4 as well as 6.1.2.5 and 6.1.2.6
6	With respect to the seven year timeline for project experience, can you confirm if this applies to the start of a project, the completion date or both? As we have just entered into 2022, does the seven year timeline include projects from 2015 and onward or would projects from 2014 also be valid?	The project should have been actively worked on within the last 7 years. See solicitation modifications above.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

7	There are references in the RFSO that indicate three separate submissions per Stream, including Technical, IBP and Financial; however, there is also a reference to just submitting a technical and financial bid. Can you confirm if the IBP is to be submitted as a standalone submission or included as a component of the Technical Bid (ie: as Part C)?	The IBP is to be submitted as a standalone section. See solicitation modifications
8	The epost submission is a new process compared to previous hard copy/PDF file submissions that have been used or the process of uploading submissions via MERX, which has been around for awhile. The RFSO indicates that the Offeror will be notified of the submission receipt by epost; however, if there is a glitch with any of the files, it also states that this falls to the Offeror. As this is a new process for submitting the documents, it would be helpful to have some form of confirmation that the files are received, can be downloaded and are readable. The alternative would be to include a hard copy/PDF submission as back-up to the epost submissions.	Bid submission options, other than epost, are not being considered at this time.
9	SRE 2.4 The RFP specifies minimum margins of 12 mm left, right, top, and bottom. Can we insert a footer with the page number and name of RFP within the 12 mm margin?	Yes, that is acceptable.
10	SRE 3.1.3 Do we provide our response to Integrity Provisions with our Technical Offer? If so, is it part of the maximum 180 page count?	The Integrity Provisions may be included with your Technical Offer, but are not included in the 180 page limit as detailed in SRE 2.5.
11	SRE 6; GI 10 In SRE 6, Offerors are instructed to provide one electronic document and a separate electronic document with the Price Offer Form for each stream. In GI 10, Offerors are instructed to submit separate sections for the technical, Indigenous/Inuit Benefit Plans, and price components. Please clarify if the one electronic document specified in SRE 6 comprises both the Technical Offer and the Indigenous/Inuit Benefit Plan, or if we are to submit separate electronic documents for these two items, for a total of three separate electronic files for each Stream.	The technical, Indigenous/Inuit Benefits Plans, and price components of the offer must be submitted in separate sections. See solicitation modifications
12	SRE 6 Do we submit separate epost messages for each Stream?	Separate epost messages for each stream are not required.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
 Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
 File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
 CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

13	<p>Page 88 The maximum page limit for the combined total of project descriptions is 30 pages for Stream 1 and 32 pages for Stream 2. Please clarify if we have to split this equally among the 15 (Stream 1) or 16 (Stream 2) project categories (that is, maximum two pages each per project category), or if we can, for instance, devote one page to one project category and three pages to a different project category, as long as the total doesn't exceed the specified limit. For example, in Environmental Management of Federal Facilities category, the maximum points available for 2.1 Environmental Management and Compliance is 10; whereas the maximum points available for 2.2 Designated Substance and Hazardous Materials Surveys, Audits and Abatement is 30. Therefore, should we devote 3 times more space to 2.2 than 2.1, or is PWGSC scoring projects on relevance (quality) over quantity?</p>	<p>It is up to the Offeror to determine how to present the information in their proposals, there is no page limit per example, only the overall page limit of 30/32.</p>
14	<p>In Amendment 2, PWGSC clarified that projects do not have to be located within the same Stream as the one the Offeror is applying to. Can projects be located in other areas of Canada other than the three Streams? For example, would projects in British Columbia be considered for Stream 2 if they demonstrate relevant experience for a specific project category and demonstrate proof of relevant federal regulations?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
15	<p>The RFP requires that proposed Indigenous Benefits Criteria be supported by proof of efforts made by the Offeror which are interpreted to be very specific under this contract in terms of names of people and companies engaged and specific measures taken, or agreements reached. Given the lack of scope definition and wide range of locations for potential projects to be contracted under the Standing Offer, combined with the multitude of potential Indigenous and Inuit communities and businesses across these geographies, it is felt that this interpreted degree of specificity is not reasonable at this stage. Can PWGSC please clarify what are the expectations for proof of efforts required within the IBP submitted as part of the proposal?</p>	<p>At this stage Offerors are required to respond to Part E - Indigenous/Inuit Benefits Criteria. This is an Offers plan to maximize Indigenous/Inuit participation. Plans are required to be supported in order for Canada to assess their viability, this will differ for each Offeror and will typically include any consultations the Offer undertook in order to develop their plan or any in-house resources already in place. Canada understands that it is not feasible for Offerors to provide firm commitments with regards to Indigenous or Inuit Participation, this will be done at the time of Call-up through the forms included in Appendix C. Appendix C is provided as information only at this stage.</p> <p>See solicitation modifications above.</p>

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

16	Should Offerors include the checklist in the Technical Offer and, if so, is it part of the 180 maximum page count?	Offers may include the checklist, however, it is not required and will not be counted as part of the 180 page limit.
17	With respect to detailed project description requirements, detailed descriptions of each project, many of our clients are Fortune 500 companies and, as such, do not wish to be identified as our client. In these cases, if we use projects examples which include these clients, will these examples be discounted in any way during your evaluation of our proposal if we cite our client and client contact information as "Confidential" (and not cite the requested names in our proposal)?	<p>Yes, you can identify clients as "confidential". However, if Canada determines that reference checks are required to assist in the evaluation and there is no contact information available it could affect scoring. Alternatively, Offerors may state that contact information will be available upon request.</p> <p>From the RFSO:</p> <p><i>Reference checks may be completed at the sole discretion of Canada to assist in the evaluation of performance based on past projects with respect to budget, schedule and quality of work. The information obtained through client reference validation will be used to assist in determining the compliancy of the referenced project to the technical evaluation criteria. The client reference checks will result in either confirmation that Detailed Project Description information is accurate or in the Government of Canada determining that the Detailed Project Description does not meet requirements.</i></p>
18	With respect to detailed project description requirements, we understand that project management methodologies applied and health and safety are to be described. However, as these aspects will be described in detail under Part B of our response, do we need to restate these aspects in project examples? Especially considering the 30 to 32 page limit?	Yes, project examples need to provide information on the project management methodologies applied and health and safety aspects specific to the project.
19	TABLE 1: Technical Evaluation Maximum Points and Minimum Technical Pass Scores for Detailed Project Descriptions and Resource Resumes shows PART ONE points available for i) Detailed Project Descriptions (32 pages max.) and ii) Resource Resumes (96 pages max.) TABLE 2: Management and Corporate Evaluation Total Points Available and Criteria for Part B, The evaluation criteria is unclear to us and seems to suggest that Part B should be 52 pages and 10% of the total technical points. There seems to be no appropriate place to show our understanding of	Page 82 of the RFSO states " <i>The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is 180 pages per offer.</i> " Firms do not have to submit this many pages, it is just the maximum that will be accepted. Offerors are encouraged to use the column labelled "Cross Reference to Proposal" in Table 1 under Part A: Technical Evaluation and Table 2 under Part B: Management and Corporate Evaluation in their proposals to indicate where evaluators

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
 EW699-220414/B
 Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
 PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
 004
 File No. - N° du dossier
 NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
 NCS013
 CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

	the Scope of Services or Project Categories in either Part A or Part B.	should look in their proposals for items to evaluate.
20	We ask that the crown reconsider the requirement for 2 references/client information in the resource resumes. Clients are often not familiar with many of the project team individual resources, aside from seeing their names on invoices. They are therefore not typically in a position to comment on the performance of individual resources. In addition, currently we are required to provide 64 resource resume client references in addition to the detailed project description client references.	See solicitation modifications above.
21	Please can you further clarify remote experience? In particular, what level of medical or communication provision is considered "essential service". For example, would an active mine site with a medic station, satellite phone and Wi-Fi communication throughout qualify as remote by the definition provided in Amendment 002? Or would a small, fly-in only northern community with a nursing station qualify as essential medical service? Would Iqaluit or Inuvik, both of which have hospitals but where any serious injury would still require a medevac flight to a southern provincial hospital, qualify as having essential medical service? There is considerable ambiguity in what might be considered essential services with respect to medical and communication services.	See solicitation modifications above.
22	Page 88 - The RFSO specifies the number of years of recent and relevant experience required for each position. Please confirm that the number of years of experience is demonstrated through listing work history.	Yes, that is correct, it is to be demonstrated through the detailed project examples provided.
23	Page 89 - Is there a specific timeframe for the two required project experiences for each Senior Professional and Intermediate Resource?	The project should have actively worked on within the last 7 years. See solicitation modifications above.
24	Given the detailed response required for each stream of this RFP (>180 pp per stream) , the fact that you can't simply replicate the information should you choose to bid multiple streams and the heavy push on reporting for the year end related to the existing SO's, would Canada consider granting a three week extension?	RFSO have been extended to April 19, 2022

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EW699-220414/B
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
PWGSC EW699-220414

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
NCS-1-44066

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
NCS013
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

25	Why was there the change to take away the markup on disbursements?	This change was to create consistent across the country. From the management side, each firm had different markups, which was more difficult to manage. By requesting all-inclusive hourly rates Canada is able to evaluate the financial proposals more fairly.
26	Yukon territory has typically been under PSPC Pacific region. What will be the difference, will it be the difference in clients or are projects going to be a new split between Pacific and Western Region?	It's specifically intended for our work with our Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs (CIRNA) client because in some cases there is a little bit of overlap. In general Yukon Territory is Pacific region, it is not with Western Region but there are a couple of cases where it makes sense for us to be able to provide those services specifically to CIRNA. It won't be a very significant proportion, but we need to have that flexibility.
27	Can PWGSC indicate a page count breakdown for Part 8 Management Corporate Evaluation section.	There is no specific page limit for that section, the Management section will fall within the overall 180 each page limit.
28	Would resources employed by a limited partnership are considered in house?	For the purposes of this RFSO joint-venture and partnerships are used interchangeably so yes, resources employed by a joint-venture or partnership are considered in-house.

3. Distribute the presentation presented at the Offerors' Conference on Feb. 10

Offerors Conference

EW699-220414/B Multidisciplinary Environmental Services
Feb. 10, 2022



Public Services and
Procurement Canada

Services publics et
Approvisionnement Canada

Canada

Agenda

- PSPC Western Region representatives
- Registered firms / roll call
- Technical disciplines & requirements
- Solicitation Requirements
- Questions and answers

Please submit questions in writing in the Microsoft Teams chat window



PSPC Western Region Representatives

- ◆ Amanda Wiebe— Procurement Specialist & Standing Offer Authority

amanda.wiebe@pwgsc-tpsgc.gc.ca

- ◆ Any communication concerning this procurement should be sent to me as the Standing Offer Authority.

3

I am Amanda Wiebe, a Procurement Specialist with PSPC's Western Region Procurement Branch. Any communication concerning this procurement should be sent to me as the Standing Offer Authority.

On the information session today, we also have:

- Mario Giguere, Procurement Team Leader within the Procurement Branch
- Chris Doupe, who is a manager in our Environmental Services team in Edmonton,
- Matthew Irvine, who is also a manager in our Environmental Services team in Winnipeg
- Giselle Cotta, who is a manager in our Northern Environmental Services team in Edmonton,
- Kristina Farmer, who is the Regional Manager of our Environmental Services team

Registered Firms / Roll Call

Advisian	Hemmera	SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd.
AECOM	Kavik-Stantec	SNC-Lavalin
Arcadis	KEL Environmental	Solstice Environmental Management
Associated Environmental	KGS Group	Stantec
BluMetric Environmental	Nunatta Environmental	Tetra Tech
Dillon Consulting Ltd.	Outcome Consultants Inc.	TREK Geotechnical Inc.
EGE Engineering Ltd.	Parsons	Wood PLC
GHD	Scout Environmental Management	WSP Golder

Technical Requirements

- Matt Irvine
Manager of Environmental Services, Winnipeg



Who We Are

- Environmental Services, Western Region is a group of approximately 20 project managers plus support staff
- Our region extends across the Prairies, NWT and Nunavut, with some support work in Yukon
- We operate out of offices in Yellowknife, Edmonton, Calgary and Winnipeg, although mostly out of home for now
- Giselle Cotta manages a group dedicated to CIRNAC working on their large northern projects
- Chris Doupe and I manage the other two groups, separating work out by client department with some fluidity

Who We Are (2)

- ◆ We operate somewhat independently from other regions (Pacific, Ontario, Quebec, NCA and Atlantic) and we develop our own contracting tools
- ◆ Our tools are only appropriate for use in Western Region
- ◆ To the extent possible, our tools are similar across Canada but there are some regional differences

Who We Work For

● Our largest clients in recent years are:

- Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)
- Environment and Climate Change Canada
- Department of National Defense
- Transport Canada
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- RCMP
- Public Services and Procurement Canada
- Parks Canada

● Other smaller clients include:

- Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Correctional Services Canada, Canadian Border Services, Natural Resources Canada and others

How We Deliver Our Services

- While we have approximately 20 project managers, only a small amount of work is delivered directly by our PM's, therefore, most work is done through contracting with private contractors
- Most work tendered through our Procurement group, either as standing offer type tools or specific contracts
- This group of tools is meant to cover almost all services we expect to deliver in the next few years
- Examples of projects not managed in this manner:
 - Where there is very specific objective not covered by our contracting tools;
 - Too large to fit well within tool definition;
 - Construction type contracts not typically bid by consulting companies (ie remediation)

What We Do

- PSPC is a service provider for all federal departments
- Environmental Services are an optional service—client departments are free to do work themselves or go out directly to contractors/consultants
- Our work theoretically could include a wide variety of “environmental” projects
- Typically clients will come to us annually with similar requirements
- Most of our work is in contaminated sites
- Other aspects that are NOT contaminated sites work per se are often also associated with these projects (ie archaeological and biological studies, regulatory permitting)

Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (FCSAP)

- ◆ FCSAP is a large federal initiative to identify and address contaminated sites within the federal government portfolio
- ◆ Many, if not most, of the environmental aspects in this tool are aligned with this program (ie historical review, testing program, etc)
- ◆ FCSAP projects and other similar contaminated sites work typically make up >90% of our workload

A Couple Important Factors to Consider

- Remote/northern nature of (much of) our work
 - Consideration of logistics, including weather and a short summer are key to project success
 - Combining work steps and tasks into fewer site visits to minimize travel
- Indigenous involvement: many projects are located within CLCA's or on Reserve lands
 - Opportunities for hiring local labour, services and contractors need to be considered
 - Often need to engage with local communities prior to site work and/or apply for permits or license
 - Indigenous / Inuit Benefit Plan must be submitted with offers

Breakdown of Environmental Aspects

● Request for proposal identifies 16 environmental project categories within four groups as follows:

1. Environmental Impact Assessment, Permitting and Related Studies
2. Environmental Management of Federal Facilities
3. Contaminated Sites Consulting Services
4. Construction Planning, Design, Supervision

1. Environmental Impact Assessment, Permitting and Related Studies

1.1 Environmental Impact Assessment

1.2 Permitting and Regulatory Support

1.3 Biological Studies and Investigations

1.4 Archaeological Assessment

2. Environmental Management of Federal Facilities

2.1 Environmental Management and Compliance

2.2 Designated Substances and Hazardous Materials Surveys
Audits and Abatement

2.3 Air Quality

2.4 Storage Tank System Audits, Design and Site Supervision

2.5 Demolition Assessment and Waste Survey

3. Contaminated Sites Consulting Services

3.1 PH I/II/III Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)

3.2 Geotechnical Assessment

3.3 Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment

3.4 Remedial Options Analysis and Remedial Action Plans /
Risk Management Action Plans

4. Construction Planning, Design, Supervision

4.1 Design and Specifications Including Tendering Assistance

4.2 Site Supervision and Contract Administration Services

4.3 Cost Estimating (Streams 2 & 3 only)

Summary

Expectation is that all firms submitting a proposal will be able to complete all of the expected work, whether this is through in-house services, joint ventures or subcontracting portions of the work.



Solicitation Requirements

- New objectives for the RFSO
 - Improve call-up procedures for
 - value,
 - flexibility and
 - Performance
- New standing offers with geographic streams
 - Stream 1: Alberta, Saskatchewan & Manitoba
 - Stream 2: Northwest Territories & Yukon
 - Stream 3: Nunavut
- Nunavut Directive – register with the Inuit Firm Registry (IFR)
 - <https://www.inuitfirm.tunngavik.com>



Just to review some key points, this RFSO is posted on Buy and Sell, interested offerors should refer to Buy and Sell for the most up to date documents, other sites like MERX may pick up the original posting, but not necessarily all the amendments.

We have made some changes from the previous tools in order to achieve more value with call-ups, notably in terms of travel costs or Indigenous and Inuit Benefit Plan commitments, to allow Project Managers more flexibility in choosing the most appropriate offeror for their specific projects and to prevent and correct issues surrounding the previous vendor performance procedures.

The new RFSO will feature three “streams” that will separate projects according to geography. The first stream encompasses work in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The second stream is meant for work in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, while the third stream is reserved for work in Nunavut.

Please note that consultants may choose to submit offers for one stream, two streams or all three streams. The RFSO will include a basis of selection for evaluators that will determine five successful offerors for each stream. This means that PSPC will issue 15 standing offers in total.

As such, registration on the IFR will be a mandatory criteria for a standing offer in the Nunavut stream. This is a key point of the presentation—if your firm is interested in the Nunavut stream, I strongly recommend that you register now for the IFR, or that you approach Inuit businesses to form joint ventures that will meet the IFR’s definitions and registration requirements. Take a look at the IFR documents and forms at <https://www.inuitfirm.tunngavik.com>

Solicitation Requirements (2)

Business volumes and percentage distribution of call-ups

Rank	Percentage Distribution	Estimated Value AB, SK & MB	Estimated Value NT & YT	Estimated Value NU
1	30%	\$3,825,000	\$3,465,000	\$2,385,000
2	25%	\$3,187,500	\$2,887,500	\$1,987,500
3	20%	\$2,550,000	\$2,310,000	\$1,590,000
4	15%	\$1,912,500	\$1,732,500	\$1,192,500
5	10%	\$1,275,000	\$1,155,000	\$795,000
Total	100%	\$12,750,000	\$11,550,000	\$7,950,000

20

This is our estimated business volume per stream for the initial almost 3 year period. Keep in mind that unlike contracts, the standing offers themselves do not guarantee the work. The standing offers simply set the conditions and pricing for its call-up process over a specific period of time. It's actually the call-up against the standing offer that forms a guaranteed contract.

PSPC will distribute call-ups according to the procedures stated in the upcoming RFSO, which will include the percentage distribution for each of the five ranked standing offers in each stream. The top ranked standing offer holder should receive 30% of the total value of the call-ups, while the fifth ranked standing offer should receive 10% of the call-ups. For purposes of illustration, this table breaks down the cumulative value of call-ups according to the percentage distributions of each standing offer.

Solicitation Requirements (3)

● New call-up procedures

● Tier 1: <\$100,000

- Choose an offeror - May be Selective or Rotational
- Compete call-up on the basis of level of effort, work plan or Indigenous/Inuit Benefits Plan (IBP) commitments, fees will be based on RFSO rates

● Tier 2: ≥\$100,000

- Rotation
- Direct call-up with “best fit” justification
- Compete call-up on the basis of level of effort, work plan or IBP commitments, fees will be based on RFSO rates

21

For call-ups estimated to be worth less than \$100,000.00, PSPC Project Managers may either 1) select the offeror of their choice or 2) compete the call-up on the basis of a work plan, Indigenous Benefit Plan commitments, or level of effort using the pre-established unit rates specified in the standing offer. This tier is remarkable because it doesn't use a rotation to distribute work, however each call-up will affect the ideal percentage distribution that is a key metric for respecting the pre-determined standing offer percentages.

For call-ups worth \$100,000.00 and greater, PSPC has three options: 1) issue the call-up to the next firm on the rotation, 2) direct the call-up to a particular offeror with a “best fit” justification, or 3) compete the call-up in the same way as the first tier. Indeed, the rotation ensures more equitable and consistent distribution of call-ups for larger projects, while the “best fit” justification cannot be used arbitrarily—it must explain how one particular offeror is necessary to achieve the technical solution, cost savings or scheduling efficiencies.

Solicitation Requirements (4)

- Vendor performance procedure
 - Consultants will be evaluated on a per call-up basis
 - A score in any one category will result in a Corrective Measure action to be taken against the Consultant
 - Adjust percentages of distribution to avoid compounding call-ups in the rotation
 - This could result in a reduction of up to 3% of the firms Ideal Work Distribution
 - This work will be re-allocated among the other firms

22

With regards to the Vendor Performance, for consultants will receive project evaluations on a periodic basis, one at a mid-way point and one at the end, there may be more depending on the length of the project, of course if there are issues in-between reviews those will be discussed with the consultants at the time of occurrence to ensure there are no surprises at the end of the project.

For assessment where a firm has failed any one category, firms will have the opportunity to respond to the PM's assessment, a team comprised of Environmental Services and Procurement will then form a committee to ensure that failing scores are supported and justified. If the failing score is determined to be the appropriate score, a firm may lose up to 3% of their ideal distribution depending on where they rank. This work will be redistributed among the other 4 firms PSPC will also have the option to bypass this firm in the rotation for up to 6 months after the corrective measure is applied for similar work. The only opportunity for firms to regain this distribution of work would be for another firm to receive a corrective measure.

This will help mitigate the issue of firms being suspended and then overloaded when they are reintroduced into the rotation, and not tie up funds PSPC needs for other projects.

Solicitation Requirements (5)

- ◆ Modern treaties and Indigenous procurement
- ◆ Evaluation criteria
- ◆ Pricing
 - ◆ Hourly rates and rate adjustments
 - ◆ No allowance for a mark-up on Fees, Disbursements or Travel
- ◆ Security
 - ◆ <https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/organisation-organization/securite-security-eng.html>



Since the standing offers cover a large geographic area, notably in the arctic territories, they are applicable to modern treaties (also known as Comprehensive Land Claim Agreements) that have specific procurement obligations aimed at enhancing the economic opportunities of Indigenous groups. This RFSO will contain socio-economic evaluation criteria in each stream requiring a strategy for maximizing the use of local Indigenous employment, subcontracting and skills development.

Firm commitments for labour, subcontracting and training will not be required for the RFSO, however they may be required at the time of each individual call-up. Some individual call-ups, almost all in the northern streams, and some in the South will include a request for IB commitments that is tailored to the applicable modern treaty and project requirements. Later on in the call-up, those commitments are assessed against their actual percentages during the performance of the work.

The price proposal form in the RFSO require an hourly rate for each listed resource category in the RFSO. Each hourly rate will be multiplied by the weighting provided. Disbursements and Travel will be paid at actuals without allowance for mark-up. Rate adjustments for the standing offer periods or option years will be based upon the previous years' hourly rates according to the average weekly earnings for Canada as published by Statistics Canada.

I wish to highlight that the RFSO will not have an industrial security requirement, yet we encourage offerors to obtain security clearance as soon as possible to be eligible for individual call-up requirements that include a Security Requirement Checklist (SRCL). Note that it can take up to 12 months to obtain security clearance, so it's worth taking a look at the web site listed here to get started.

Solicitation Requirements (6)

- A separate proposal must be submitted for each stream that the firm is applying
- Firms must submit a Technical, Indigenous/Inuit Benefits, and Financial Proposal to be considered
- The Phased Bid Compliance Policy will NOT apply to sections that are missing in their entirety
- The Phased Bid policy will NOT apply to the overall pass mark included for the Technical Proposal.

24

Note: Even if the overall pass mark is not met, Canada will still go back to bidders for items where a the PBCP was applied, if the offer provides additional information to meet the requirements, their offers will still be deemed non-responsive.

This is a chance for Offerors to learn from their mistakes. Only in the case where the Offerors failed a section, but still met the overall pass mark will they still be eligible to receive a SOA.

It is also important to note that a consultants score will not change as a result of submitting new information under the policy, the information is provided and evaluated only to assess if a firm can move forward to the next phase.

Solicitation Requirements (7)

- Anticipated tender and award timeframes

- Current Closing date is March 8, 2022. This will be amended
- It is anticipated that Canada will have completed their evaluation by the end of May 2022.
- Award standing offers in June of 2022

25

The important thing to note is that each call-up will be assessed for performance and—in instances of non-performance—PSPC will be permitted to adjust the offeror's percentage distribution of call-ups.

PSPC will evaluate the offers during the early spring months with the intent of awarding the new standing offers in the June of 2022.

Questions

- Questions submitted by e-mail
- Questions written in the Microsoft Teams chat window



Now I would like to answer your questions!

[Mario] will begin by reading out and answering the questions that were submitted by e-mail, then I will read out and answer the questions that you've submitted through the Microsoft Team chat window over the course of the presentation.

Thank you!

Amanda Wiebe

431-335-3523

Amanda.wiebe@pwgsc-tps.gc.ca



This concludes our information session. Once more,

- If your firm cannot offer all of the services required for this RFSO, look at forming joint ventures or finding subconsultants
- register in the Inuit Firm Register should you be interested in complying with the requirements of the Nunavut Stream
- get a head-start on obtaining industrial security
- remember to look on buyandsell.gc.ca/tenders this fall for the RFSO

Thank you!