



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

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

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

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

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Construction Services Division/Division des services de
construction

140 O'Connor Street

140, rue O'Connor

Ontario

Ottawa

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Joint Asphalt Repair Bronson North Expansion Joint Asphalt Repair	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP168-221188/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20221188	Date 2022-03-10
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$\$FG-377-81053	
File No. - N° de dossier fg377.EP168-221188	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT on - le 2022-04-11 Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
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: Morin, Gregoire	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fg377
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (343) 552-9489 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EP168-221188

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
001

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
FG377

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
R.088005.11

File No. - N° du dossier
FG/EP168-221188

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

The following changes to the tender documents are effective immediately. This amendment will be part of the contract documents.

THE AMENDMENT NO.001 IS RAISED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON;

A- Correction to French title

B- Annex D- Evaluation scorecard for the VPM pilot

A- Correction to French title

The French title for this solicitation is as follows: **Réparation de l'asphalte du joint d'expansion Bronson Nord**

B- Annex D- Evaluation scorecard for the VPM pilot

Please find attached Annex D- Evaluation scorecard for the VPM pilot

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED

Construction Scorecard

Application Guidelines

1. It is important to ensure a common understanding of how VPM will be applied in the context of the contract. Some key performance indicators (KPIs) include qualitative language such as “minor/major”, “minimal/significant”, “frequent/infrequent”, etc. These criteria are designed to provide flexibility to the evaluator to apply them in a context that is appropriate to the particularities the contract. Where appropriate, KPIs may be linked to quantitative metrics specific to the contract. At the outset of the contract, the business owner and the contractor should review and discuss all evaluation criteria, and the frequency and timing of interim and final performance evaluations.
2. At least one interim evaluation should be completed at the mid-point of the contract, or every 6 months for multi-year contracts. More frequent interim evaluations may be appropriate, and are at the discretion of the business owner based on the nature of the contract.
3. Interim and final evaluations are to be completed by the designated evaluator representing the business owner (client) for the contract. Evaluators may wish to consult other government stakeholders involved in the contract to inform evaluations. The PSPC contracting authority is responsible for reviewing scorecards completed by the designated evaluator before finalizing.
4. The evaluator is expected keep detailed records of both positive and negative contractor performance, as well as extenuating circumstances and other considerations that should be taken into account during evaluations. This will better enable the contractor to address performance issues and provide support for final vendor performance scores.
5. Contractors are also encouraged to complete the VPM feedback form to provide constructive input on the VPM framework, evaluation processes and scorecard, and suggestions to improve contract management practices.

Quality (Workmanship)

Weighting: 10%

Evaluates the quality of the work at substantial completion, as well as the contractor's effectiveness in identifying and addressing deficiencies before and after substantial completion.

Indicators for this category include:

1. The workmanship and compliance with the quality provisions outlined in the drawings and specification as per the terms and conditions of the contract. This may include (but is not limited to) materials, grade, and measurements.
2. The effectiveness and demonstration of effort to minimize and mitigate deficiencies during the construction/development phase of the project.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• Early identification of deficiencies and effective remedial action was taken proactively before substantial completion of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• A minimal number of minor deficiencies were identified at substantial completion, and appropriate remedial action was taken in a timely manner.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• A significant deficiency or multiple deficiencies were identified at substantial completion, and appropriate remedial action was taken in a timely manner following substantial completion of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications;• A significant deficiency or multiple deficiencies were identified at substantial completion and additional follow-up was required to ensure appropriate remedial action, as some deficiencies were not initially addressed properly.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were not compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• A significant deficiency or multiple deficiencies were identified and appropriate remedial action was not taken or ineffective.

Quality (Documentation Quality)

Weighting: 10%

Document deliverables must meet any standards, guidelines or other requirements specified in the contract. If there are multiple document deliverables, they may be evaluated collectively or individually and averaged to provide a single performance category score for the contractor, at the discretion of the evaluator. At the outset of the contract it should be discussed which formal document deliverables will be evaluated and the applicable standards and criteria used.

Indicators for this category include (if applicable):

1. **Content Requirements:** The content of the document addresses all contract requirements.
2. **Level of Detail:** The level of detail provided is appropriate, without missing or extraneous information.
3. **Quality of Writing:** The quality of writing, including clarity, grammar, completeness, and consistent use of technical terms, meets or exceeds expectations.
4. **Format:** The format follows the provided templates, and guidelines as applicable.
5. **Standards:** The document meets or exceeds all applicable standards.
6. **Revisions:** Minimal or no draft versions requiring revisions. Required revisions are minor, not extensive, and addressed promptly.

The contractor's performance is rated for each indicator according to the following criteria:

Succeeds +: The contractor met or exceeded performance expectations consistently with no need for improvement noted.

Succeeds -: The contractor did not always meet performance expectations. Some minor errors or shortcomings that could be improved upon were noted.

Significant Underperformance: The contractor did not consistently meet minimum performance expectations. There were repeated deficiencies noted which had a considerable impact on overall contractual outcomes, requiring significant effort to address.

Indicator	Rating	Supporting Justification
1. Content Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Level of Detail	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Quality of Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Format	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6. Revisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Based on the ratings received for all indicators, the contractor is scored according to the table below:

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds + across all applicable indicators
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across only 1 indicator and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across only 2 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across 3 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.

Management (Communication and Coordination)

Weighting: 20%

Evaluates the contractor's effectiveness in managing and coordinating activities needed to execute the contract.

Indicators for this category include (as applicable):

1. **Communication:** The contractor is consistent and proactive in their communications, provides clear and comprehensive information, and timely progress updates.
2. **Issue Management:** The contractor is proactive and effective in responding to and resolving any issues (e.g. shipment delays, quality defects). Contracting and project authorities are informed of risks and issues and provided with corrective action plans in a timely manner. Any issues are resolved or effectively contained by the contractor.
3. **Delivery Management:** Deliveries contain the correct quantities (including for sizes and other requirements) as prescribed in the contract schedule. Invoices and packing slips are on time, accurate, and complete in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing instructions included in the contract.
4. **Relationship Management:** The contractor maintains and coordinates effective professional relationships with all contract stakeholders.
5. **Flexibility:** The contractor demonstrates agility, openness, collaboration and cooperation in coordinating activities and in responding to inquiries and requested changes to deliverables quickly.
6. **Reliability:** The contractor manages contract work independently, including following through on agreed upon action items, decisions and commitments, without excessive guidance, oversight or intervention required.
7. **Continuous Improvement:** The contractor demonstrates commitment to improving contract outcomes by acknowledging performance areas of weakness, taking corrective action, and providing valuable input for process improvement, where applicable.

The contractor's performance is rated for each indicator according to the following criteria:

Succeeds +: The contractor met or exceeded performance expectations consistently with no need for improvement noted.

Succeeds -: The contractor did not always meet performance expectations. Some minor errors or shortcomings that could be improved upon were noted.

Significant Underperformance: The contractor did not consistently meet minimum performance expectations. There were repeated deficiencies noted which had a considerable impact on overall contractual outcomes, requiring significant effort to address.

Indicator	Rating	Supporting Justification
1. Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Issue Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Delivery Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Relationship Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6. Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
7. Continuous Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Based on the ratings received, the contractor is scored according to the table below:

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds + across all applicable indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across only 1 indicator and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across only 2 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across 3 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - across 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.

Management (Health and Safety)

Weighting: 20%

Evaluates the contractor's effectiveness in managing and administering the health and safety provisions as stipulated in the contract documents, required by provincial/territorial legislation, or that would otherwise be applicable to the site of the work.

Indicators for this category include:

1. Frequency and severity of safety related compliance issues, and the timeliness and effectiveness of corrective actions.
2. Effectiveness of health and safety practices in minimizing the frequency and severity of avoidable injuries and incidents.
3. Timely provision of health and safety documentation and reports meeting contract requirements and standards, such as health and safety programs, hazardous assessment site specific safety plans, provincial/territorial notices of project, and required permits, incident reports and timely updates to health and safety documentation as needed.

Health and safety officials may include:

- Departmental representatives;
- Authorities having jurisdiction (e.g. Ministry of Labor representative, CNESST inspector, building inspector);
- Human Resources Branch-Occupational Health and Safety Directorate representatives;
- Construction and Maintenance Safety Advisor; and
- Any other health and safety officials designated in the contract.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor proactively identified and addressed hazards on site, resulting in no major hazards identified by health and safety officials, and no government imposed shutdowns for health and safety reasons (voluntary shutdowns initiated by the contractor to address self-identified hazards are permissible); • No health and safety injuries/incidents that were reasonably foreseeable and preventable; and • All health and safety documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ met or exceeded applicable requirements and standards; ○ were provided within required timeframes; ○ required minimal revisions before acceptance; and ○ were updated proactively as needed by the contractor without prompting.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimal number of hazards identified by health and safety officials, all of which were sufficiently addressed in a timely manner, and no government imposed shutdowns for health and safety reasons (voluntary shutdowns initiated by the contractor to address self-identified hazards are permissible); • No health and safety injuries/incidents that were reasonably foreseeable and preventable; and • All health and safety documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ met or exceeded applicable requirements and standards; ○ were provided within required timeframes;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ required minimal revisions before acceptance; ○ were updated promptly when requested by government representatives.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimal number of hazards identified by health and safety officials, all of which were sufficiently addressed in a timely manner, and no government imposed shutdowns for health and safety reasons (voluntary shutdowns initiated by the contractor to address self-identified hazards are permissible); ● Minimal minor health and safety injuries/incidents that were reasonably foreseeable and preventable, where timely and effective corrective action was taken in all cases; and ● All health and safety documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ met or exceeded applicable requirements and standards; ○ were provided within required timeframes; ○ required minimal revisions before acceptance; and ○ were updated promptly when requested by government representatives.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most hazards identified by health and safety officials were sufficiently addressed in a timely manner, and no government imposed shutdowns for health and safety reasons (voluntary shutdowns initiated by the contractor to address self-identified hazards are exempt); ● Minimal minor health and safety injuries/incidents that were reasonably foreseeable and preventable, where corrective action was either delayed or unacceptable; or ● Some health and safety documents were significantly late or required multiple revisions and health and safety meetings to address deficiencies.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Several hazards identified by health and safety officials that were not sufficiently addressed in a timely manner, resulting in one or more government imposed shutdowns for health and safety reasons (voluntary shutdowns initiated by the contractor to address self-identified hazards are exempt); ● Several minor health and safety injuries/incidents that were reasonably foreseeable and preventable, where corrective actions were either delayed or unacceptable; ● One or more critical health and safety injuries/incidents that were reasonably foreseeable and preventable; or ● The contractor failed to notify the departmental representatives and/or authorities having jurisdiction of a contractual/regulatory reportable incident.

Cost (Firm Price Basis of Payment)

Weighting: 20%

Cost control is an important aspect of performance, even where there is a firm price basis of payment. It is not uncommon for the need for unscheduled work to arise during the course of a contract. Particularly in complex projects, unforeseen circumstances, issues and changes in requirements can occur. Typically, the unscheduled work that was not part of the original contract must be approved through a change request/contract amendment process. This often involves proposal submissions and negotiations with the vendor and can lead to unreasonable cost escalation.

Indicators for this category include:

1. Justification of change order requests.
2. Reasonableness of price quotations for change order work.
3. Timeliness of issue identification and notification.
4. Identification and provisioning of credits (if applicable).

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient justification was provided for all change order requests. • Contractor's requests for change orders were submitted promptly and change order processes were followed before commencing work. • Cost breakdowns for change order work were always detailed and supportable. • Credits were identified and provided where applicable. • Substantial cost avoidance as a result of early identification and mitigation of issues (including prior to contact award).
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient justification was provided for all change order requests. • Contractor's requests for change orders were submitted promptly and change order processes were followed before commencing work. • Cost breakdowns for change order work were always detailed and supportable. • Credits were identified and provided where applicable.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient justification was provided for all change order requests. • Contractor's requests for change orders were submitted promptly and change order approval processes were followed before commencing work. • Cost breakdowns for change order work were usually detailed and supportable. Time and materials pricing was required occasionally for amendments where a firm price basis was preferable. • Credits were identified and provided where applicable.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated instance(s) of performance issues related to cost control, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ questionable justification for change order requests ○ late notification of change orders resulting in additional costs that could have been mitigated or avoided through early identification ○ commencement of unauthorized work ○ inadequate price support for change order work ○ failure to identify or provide credits where applicable • The contractor made a reasonable effort to address cost control issues and minimize recurrence.

<p>□ 1 Significant Improvement Needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Persistent performance issues related to cost control, such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ questionable justification for change order requests○ inadequate price support for change order work○ commencement of unauthorized work○ late notification of change orders resulting in additional costs that could have been mitigated or avoided through early identification○ failure to identify or provide credits where applicable• The contractor did not make a reasonable effort to address cost control issues or corrective measures were ineffective.
---	--

Schedule (Project Management)

Weighting: 20%

Requirements for complex contracts are commonly tied to an overall project schedule. Where the project schedule is primarily managed and controlled by the contractor, the Schedule (Project Management) performance category evaluates the contractor's effectiveness in establishing and maintaining the schedule as well as the ability to mitigate potential delays, in accordance of the contract.

In certain contract situations it may not be possible to establish firm contract timelines prior to contract award, and the initial schedule may need to be adjusted as a result of post-award activities.

The contractor is often not solely responsible for the entire project but one of multiple stakeholders that share defined roles and responsibilities. On such projects delays can occur that are outside of the contractor's responsibility and control. The tasks the contractor must perform may be dependent on tasks by other stakeholders being completed first or concurrently. Allowances should be made for excusable delays for circumstances beyond the contractor's responsibility and control, at the discretion of the evaluator.

Indicators for this category include:

1. The timeliness and effectiveness in establishing the initial schedule, including (as applicable) critical path, task orders, milestones, acceptance criteria and delivery schedule.
2. The timeliness and effectiveness of progress monitoring and notification when revisions or clarification to the schedule, including deliverables, are required.
3. The timeliness and effectiveness in addressing issues and minimizing delays within the contractor's control.
4. The contractor's ability to improve efficiency throughout the contract, even if the overall timeline is delayed due to circumstances beyond the contractor's responsibility and control.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor. • Proactive and collaborative improvements to project efficiency throughout the contract, significantly reducing completion time (>10%) of the overall project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor. • Proactive and collaborative improvements to project efficiency throughout the contract, moderately reducing completion time of the overall project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial schedule provided was not feasible and required significant revisions and administrative effort by Canada to make acceptable. • Progress monitoring and notification was inconsistent and required significant administrative effort by Canada. • The contractor made some effort to mitigate potential delays to the project schedule that was partially effective.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commencement of the project was delayed as a result of late delivery of an acceptable project schedule. • Minimal or unreliable progress monitoring and notification, resulted in operational impacts to the project. • The contractor was not responsive when addressing issues which led to significant delays to the project schedule.