



RETURN BIDS TO:

**Bid Receiving Unit
Main Floor
Parks Canada
John Cabot Building,
10 Barter's Hill, 5th Floor
St. John's, NL A1C 6M1
Attn: Colleen Sheehan**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

Proposal to: Parks Canada Agency
We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred or attached hereto, the supplies and services listed herein or on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefore.

Proposition à : l'Agence Parcs Canada
Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à sa Majesté la Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes ci-jointes, les articles et les services énumérés ici et sur toute feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Title-Sujet	
National Asset Review 2018-Parks Canada	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 5P300-17-5359	Date 13.09.2017
GETS Reference No. – N° de référence de SEAG	
Client Reference No. – N° de référence du client	
Solicitation Closes L'invitation prend fin — at – à 2 :00pm on – le 19-09-2017	Time Zone Fuseau horaire - ET
Address Inquiries to: - Adresser toute demande de renseignements à : Colleen Sheehan Colleen.sheehan@pc.gc.ca	
Telephone No. - No de téléphone (709) 772-6129	Fax No. – N° de FAX: (709) 772-3651
Destination of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destinations des biens, services et construction : As outlined in the Statement of Work	
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur :	
Telephone No. - N° de telephone : Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur :	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of the Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée a signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
_____	_____
Name/Nom	Title/Titre
_____	_____
Signature	Date

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO 2

Q.1 We have worked with a number of public parks on the provincial and municipal level. All have opted to use our audit software to do their own assessments. Would Parks Canada be amenable to this option?

A1. If the proponent audit software aligns to industry standards, codes, and methodologies, and captures the required information referenced in the RFP (e.g. draft asset data assessment spreadsheet) in a manner that can be uploaded (as applicable) into Maximo 7.6, our Asset Management System, or other required National Asset Review templates, databases, or reports, Parks Canada will not preclude the use of the proponent's in-house or other third party audit software. Parks Canada is not in a position to confirm if the use of a proponent's own audit software will be acceptable prior to formal bid evaluations, and possibly only after the formal kick-off meeting upon contract award.

Q2: Mandatory requirement M2 states: "The Consultant team must have expertise in engineering, architecture and asset management (minimum 5 years)...".

- a) Can the Crown please confirm that the Consultant team refers to only the five (5) key personnel presented under rated requirement R2a)?
- b) Can the Crown please confirm if the Consultant team must show that they have minimum 5 years of cumulative experience?

**A2. A) Yes
B) Yes**

Q3: Rated Requirements R3, R5, and R6 state that the maximum points to be obtained are 15 points, however the scoring scale only reflects a maximum of 8-10 points. Can the Crown please confirm the maximum points for this requirement?

A3. This question was addressed in the Revised RFP.

Q4: Rated Requirement R4 states that the maximum points to be obtained is 20 points, however the scoring scale only reflects a maximum of 8-10 points. Can the Crown please confirm the maximum points for this requirement?

A4. This question was addressed in the Revised RFP.

Q5: Rated Requirement R1 states that the "Bid demonstrates proponent's accomplishments, achievements and experience on similar projects". In keeping with the intent of R2, "experience and performance of key personnel to be assigned this project regardless of their past association with the current proponent firm", will the Crown please accept similar projects completed by the Proponent's employees or subcontractors to demonstrate this requirement?

A.5 Yes

Q6: Under Part 3, Bid Preparation Instructions of the RFP, it indicates that Bidders must submit hard copies of their proposal. Will the Crown consider accepting email submissions as well?

A6. Hard copies with one soft copy is the only acceptable format. Emailed copies will NOT be accepted.

Q7: Would the Crown consider extending the closing date by 2 weeks (October 3rd)?

A7. No

Q8. Provide the quantity of the area of the assets to be inspected such as Bridges, Grounds, Utilities, Heritage Structures, Vessels, Marine Assets, etc. to help us determine the level of effort.

A8. For all listed assets, 100% of each asset is to be assessed.

Q9. Clarify the level of detail (categories or component level) which is expected in the Asset Assessment Report, also, if ASTM Uniformat II classification system is required and at which level.

A9. In the Asset Assessment Reports, the winning proponent will be requested to use the Parks Canada component classification system. This system is based on a blend of ASTM Uniformat II, PSPC, and the Parks Canada former component classification systems. Asset Assessment Reports are to be written at the component level (equivalent to ASTM Uniformat II Group Elements (level 2)) but will focus on those components which affect the Overall Asset Condition rating, and need not include an exhaustive review of each and every component in each asset inspected. Parks Canada will make the list of critical components for each asset category available to the winning proponent.

Q10. Clarify if the expectations regarding the Report deliverable will be similar to "annex_a_app_3_draft_asset_assessment_data_spreadsheetbil.xls" or if any significant additional details are required.

A10. Additional details will be required to provide description and context to the results entered into the Annex.

Q11. Are high-resolution digital pictures required to identify deficiencies?

A11. Yes

Q12. Provide sample deliverables for each asset category to identify expectations.

A12. Parks Canada is not able to provide sample deliverables at this time. Parks Canada will work with the winning proponent to confirm the format of the deliverables after award.

Q13. Advise if the consultant is expected to use Maximo software for collecting data, entering data or generating Reports and if any training will be provided.

A13. No, data can be provided in a MS Excel spreadsheet format, respecting the Maximo master data structure provided, for Parks Canada to then upload into Maximo.

Q14. Is a site inspection mandatory for each asset?

A14. Yes

Q15. Are alternative approaches to inspection such as satellite or drone based inspections permitted for asset types which are not buildings?

A15. No

Q16. With reference to Section II Financial Bid, please clarify if a breakdown of fee based on Park/ Site is required, or will a format for fee submission be provided?

A16. As per the Annex B – Basis of Payment, bidders are required to provide a firm all inclusive price for the services as outlined in the Statement of Work.

Q 17. Page 13 of RFP, 1.3 Objectives:

Has PCA completed any assessments of the portfolio relating to accessibility, and can the PCA provide any material that we could review during the bidding process?

A17. No, no existing data to provide.

Q18. Page 7 of RFP, 4.2 Basis of Selection

In the calculation of the 'Rating of Financial Proposal', please expand on what is meant by 'Lowest Per Diem Rate among all Technically Compliant Bidders' and 'All other Bids'.

Rating of Financial Proposal Financial Rating = <u>Lowest Per Diem Rate among all Technically Compliant Bidders</u> X 20 points All other Bids

A18. This should read "lowest total price" not "lowest per diem rate"

Q19. We have worked with a number of public parks on the provincial and municipal level. All have opted to use our audit software to do their own assessments. Would Parks Canada be amenable to this option?

A19. See answer provided to Question 1

Q20. In Annex A, Section 3.2: Recognizing that snow and ice conditions during the winter months may limit the efficacy of the "onsite visual assessments", is Parks Canada open to consider a schedule that permits this portion of the scope of work to occur in Spring 2018?

A20. No

Q21. Other than the "List of Interested Suppliers" posted on buyandsell.gc.ca, is Parks Canada willing to disclose the names of the parties that downloaded copies of the tender package (or at least the number of parties)?

A21. Parks Canada has no way of knowing how many or what firms downloaded the package. We also only have access to the list of interested suppliers.

Q22. Part 1 – General Information

1.1 Security Requirements

Enquiry :

It is stated that :

" At the date of bid closing, the following conditions must be met:

- a. the Bidder must hold a valid organization security clearance as indicated in Part 6 - Resulting Contract Clauses;
- b. the Bidder's proposed individuals requiring access to classified or protected information, assets or sensitive work sites must meet the security requirements as indicated in Part 6 - Resulting Contract Clauses; "

Can the date to meet the two conditions be changed from "the date of bid closing" to "the date of contract award"?

A22. No, the conditions must be met at bid closing.

Q23. Section 3.5, i, ii, iii, pg 21 - Based on the timelines provided, the site visits will not commence until the mid to late fall time frame. With many of the assets in the mountain park region, snow cover may or could be very likely at that time of year, preventing a proper visual review of those assets. Will Parks Canada be providing alternate locations or potentially removing those locations from the program?

A23. If local conditions prevent access or assessment of an asset, that asset will be removed from the list. It will be replaced with a similar asset in the same general geographic area.

Q24. Section 1.4 Scope, items 1-3 pg 14 - Will the appropriate Parks Canada Staff, knowledgeable in the current framework and process, be empowered to provide timely and open access to the right data if requested on this project? What advanced notification is required and what likely response time can be provided?

A24. Yes, Parks Canada staff will be empowered to provide data support to the project. No advance notification is required and response time is estimated to be 1 week.

Q25. With respect to section 6.1.2, could the Crown please confirm that the Safeguarding Measures are required for this solicitation.

A25. Yes. Please refer to PART 1 , Section 1.1 of the RFP for details.

Q26. Is the Project Milestone timeline set in stone? Or, is PCA willing to allow for an alternative schedule that is slightly less aggressive for a project of this size/scope?

A26. The Project Milestone timeline has no flexibility. The final project completion date cannot be extended.

Q27. Per section 3.5 Timelines of the RFP it is anticipated that the assessment framework will be established by September 2017 and that the onsite assessments for selected assets will occur from October – December 2017. By October Banff and Winnipeg may start receiving snow and hazardous winter conditions. Since many of the selected assets are infrastructure related and thus outside snow will have a major impact on the ability of conducting a visual condition assessment. Is there any flexibility in the schedule to allow for site visits in the Spring/Summer of 2018? Or is the final report deadline of March 2018 immovable?

A27. No, assessments cannot be done in Spring/Summer 2018 and final deadline is fixed for Spring 2018.

Q28. Per section 3.7 Payment Schedule the planned payment schedule is understandably weighted towards the middle and end of the project timeline. However, a large portion of cost will be associated with the onsite assessments in WP3. Per the payment schedule only 30% of the project value is billable at the conclusion of WP3. This will be challenging from a cash flow perspective. Is it possible to negotiate a revised payment schedule that will at least remunerate the project for the upfront costs associated with the onsite assessments during WP3?

A28: Yes, a revised payment schedule can be negotiated after contract award.

Q29. Per section 3.5 Timelines of the RFP it is anticipated that the assessment framework will be established by September 2017 and that the onsite assessments for selected assets would occur from October – December 2017. Since this is generally considered off season for many of the Parks will sufficient personnel be available to provide access as needed for the selected Park sites?

A29: Yes

Q30 Per section 3.1.3.i the consultant will be responsible for all travel to selected PCA sites. At least one of the selected sites appears to require boat access (Georges Island). Will PCA be coordinating any unique travel requirements for site access such as boats? Or will the consultant be required to charter a vessel for access?

A30: PCA will coordinate if there are unique, site specific, travel requirements to visit an asset. The consultant will have to work with Parks Canada to identify and coordinate travel prior to any site visits.