



IRP RFP Questions-and-Answers

As of June 13, 2019

1. **QUESTION:** *What knowledge do you have of any similar courses of study (certifications) beginning to take root internationally?*

ANSWER: IRP was designed by Engineers Canada as a program consisting of a series of courses to provide a credential for engineer licence holders in Canada. This credential indicates that the licenced engineer has completed a set of courses that provide them with a body of knowledge around infrastructure climate resilience in Canada.

We have not studied the international landscape to determine the existence or status of similar courses of study.

2. **QUESTION:** *How often would Engineers Canada expect the course outlines/material to be reviewed and potentially updated?*

ANSWER: Engineers Canada will not impose any expectations for course updates after the IRP Program is divested. This will be at the discretion of the assuming organization.

The body of knowledge and experience in infrastructure resilience is expanding and evolving rapidly as more organizations recognize the need for this work. Regular updating of IRP courses, as often as each time a course is delivered, may be required to keep them current.

3. **QUESTION:** *Is there an ideal time of year to offer the IRP program?*

ANSWER: The IRP as a program should remain open for registration all year. The timing of courses to assure enough registration needs to be determined. Generally, it depends on the availability of engineers and instructors as well. Construction season usually starts May-June, so in our experience it seems February to April and October to early December are the best windows to plan courses. However, annual planning of course timings must also consider availability of instructors which should be established in the months ahead of the course delivery dates.

4. **QUESTION:** *Do the courses have to be delivered in a certain order or are they independent of each other?*

ANSWER: No – each course is independent of the others. There are no prerequisites for any course as these are introductory in nature. Courses can be taken when available. An important part of planning will be to think about how to space out the courses going forward.

5. **QUESTION:** *How do you think a change in government will affect the uptake of the IRP program by engineers?*

ANSWER: Achieving climate resilient infrastructure is now well-recognized by all levels of government in Canada. It is independent of political ideology. Even with a change in government, there will be a continuing need, not only at the federal level, but also other levels of government.

The private sector is recognizing the need to manage its infrastructure to consider the changing climate. There will be an increasing need for competent engineers with a recognized body of specialized knowledge to plan, design, operate, and maintain climate-resilient infrastructure that serves the public and private sectors.

6. **QUESTION:** *Is it more ideal that the assuming organization take on both the PIEVC Protocol and the IRP program?*

ANSWER: Only the RFEOI respondents are eligible to bid on the PIEVC, however they are free to form partnerships with other entities. We are equally receptive to both scenarios (e.g. one group taking both PIEVC and IRP, or separate groups taking each).

7. **QUESTION:** *Is the IRP accessed for free by public engineers?*

ANSWER: No fees have been charged for entry to the program. Once an applicant had taken an IRP course they were automatically enrolled in the program. Assuming the IRP as a program may require proponents to consider an application fee to enrol.

8. **QUESTION:** *Does Engineers Canada have a preference that the group taking over the IRP program also bid for/take over PIEVC as well, or is there no preference?*

ANSWER: No preference. Only RFEOI respondents are eligible to bid for the PIEVC, however partnerships may be formed.

9. **QUESTION:** *You said there are volunteer engineers for development. Does that mean they don't need to be paid?*

ANSWER: The courses for the IRP were developed by paid consultants under contract to Engineers Canada. We engaged engineers and other subject matter experts in volunteer committees to advise on the course development and review of course materials.

10. **QUESTION:** *Safe to assume that you will share the PPT you gave (though much of it is likely also included in the RFP...)?*

ANSWER: Yes, the PowerPoint is now available in both languages on our English and French websites.

11. **QUESTION:** *Could I get the detailed financials for the IRP program?*

- *Average cost of instructors per course*
- *Revenue per course & number of students*
- *Development costs for the 4 courses already developed (SME, instructional design etc.)*

ANSWER:

On-Line Course	Cost of Instructors/delivery	Development Costs
PIEVC On-Line Course	\$12,000 (multiple instructors)	\$25,000
Asset Management	\$6,000 (single instructor)	\$15,000
Risk Management	N/A – not yet delivered	\$20,000
Climate Law for Engineers (On-Site Delivery)	\$10,000 – \$12,000 (variable cost depending on number of students)	\$20,000
Climate Science for Engineers	N/A	TBD – estimated at \$20-25K
Policy and Procurement	N/A	TBD – estimated at \$25K

See answer to Question #20 for revenue and number of students.

12. **QUESTION:** *Can you tell me the difference between the PIEVC introductory course that is included in the PIEVC proposal vs the 15- hour course in the IRP program. Would both organizations have rights to the same material?*

ANSWER: The subject matter of both is about the PIEVC Protocol, however there is a difference in format and content design. For example, the online course is more academic, in that it was designed for credentialing, and has evaluative elements. A Certificate of Completion is issued to successful participants.

The PIEVC introductory (live) course is at a higher level and addresses the subject matter as an information piece with some short group exercises to get a sense of how the process works. There are no evaluation elements.

The online course and its materials belong exclusively to IRP, while the live course and its materials belong exclusively to PIEVC. A Certificate of Participation is issued to all attendees.

13. **QUESTION:** What physical material(s) does EC send out to the course users at the start, middle or end of the course (e.g. certificate of completion)?

ANSWER:A reading list is sent to participants before the course starts. The course materials and a certificate of completion are sent to all participants who have passed the course. These are sent as electronic files.

14. **QUESTION:** Are the consultants who were used to develop and deliver these courses still available to work with the winning proponent. If yes, could you provide us with a list of their names and contact details?

ANSWER: Yes, they are.

IRP Course Provider - Contact List

On-Line Courses	Provider	Contact
PIEVC On-Line Course	Risk Sciences International	Mr. Roger Rempel, FEC, P.Eng. IRP rrempel@risksciences.com
Asset Management	Stantec	Dr. Guy Felio, FCSCE P.Eng. IRP guy.felio@stantec.ca
Risk Management	Risk Sciences International	Dr. Greg Paoli gpaoli@risksciences.com
Climate Law for Engineers	Mantle314 (formerly Zizzo Strategy)	Ms. Laura Zizzo laura.zizzo@mantle314.com
Climate Science for Engineers	To be confirmed – not yet developed	N/A
Policy and Procurement	To be confirmed – not yet developed	N/A

15. **QUESTION:** What does "Endorsement of the program by Engineers Canada" on page 10 refer to? How/where and for how long will it be endorsed?

ANSWER: Endorsement by Engineers Canada will be a point of negotiation with the winning proponent. This would be through a mutually agreed process that would also establish the length of time the program would be endorsed.

16. **QUESTION:** EC has made it clear that they are not looking to receive money from the winning bidder to take on this program, but is it fair to expect proponents to request funds from EC as a part of their bid to integrate and promote the courses initially? For instance, the translation of the course into French can be a significant expense on its own.

ANSWER: Engineers Canada will not provide any funding support.

17. **QUESTION:** On page 10, it says the package will consist of "All course materials, syllabi and files". To estimate the cost to translate and migrate this content into our site, are we able to see/review these files somewhere?

ANSWER: The syllabi are included in the RFP. Most of the course material consists of powerpoint presentations and some exercises. We would recommend a review of each set of course materials prior to engaging in French translation as some slides may need revisions.

18. **QUESTION:** Where has the offline final exam typically been held? Can a testing centre do it or is the intention to do it under the supervision of the winning team?

ANSWER: The final exams for each course were set and marked by the consultant delivering the course. Typically the last hour of the course was allocated for the exam and students had a couple of days to complete after the exam was made available on-line.

A testing centre could do the examination, but it would be an extra cost for limited value. The winning team would assume all responsibility for testing development, maintenance and delivery.

19. **QUESTION:** Is EC able to stay involved in the IRP program by providing free newsletter/website advertising over the duration of the program (e.g. 5 years) to keep advertising costs reasonable for the winning proponent? If this is possible, can you provide us with a rough estimate of website visitors and newsletter subscribers so that we can estimate the number of potential course applicants coming from these sources? Similarly, has EC had any discussions with the engineering regulators about how they would like to stay involved or could help with free on-going promotion of this program?

ANSWER: Engineers Canada may consider posting notices of upcoming courses in our bi-weekly newsletter (about 2,000 subscribers) as well as on our website (between 60,000 – 70,000 monthly pageviews). Such notices may also be posted on our social media feeds (Twitter: 12.2K followers; Facebook: 7.3K followers; LinkedIn: 5.4K followers). This would be a topic of discussion during the negotiation of the transfer agreement

Engineers Canada has not had any discussion with our regulators about future involvement or free on-going promotion since the decision to suspend the IRP Program in June 2018.

20. **QUESTION:** Can you provide the breakdown of the IRP revenue, costs and profit (loss) to date?

ANSWER:

IRP Course Revenue and Cost Summary (not including HST)

On-Line Courses	Revenue	Expense (consultants)
PIEVC On-Line Course – April 2019	\$40,800	Risk Sciences International \$11,550
PIEVC On-Line Course – April 2018	\$10,250	Risk Sciences International \$13,583
Asset Management – June 2018	\$10,250	Stantec – G. Felio \$6,500
Asset Management- June 2017	\$10,880	Stantec - G. Felio \$7,500
Risk Management – No deliveries	N/A	Risk Sciences International N/A
On-Site Courses		Costs do not include venue or hospitality
Climate Law – CVC Toronto January 2018	\$5,705	Zizzo Strategy \$8,520

Climate Law – Halifax February 2018	\$9,732	Zizzo Strategy \$12,038
Climate Law – Vancouver June 2017	\$7,400	Zizzo Strategy \$6,950
Climate Law – Ottawa June 2016	\$14,672	Zizzo Strategy \$12,290

21. **QUESTION:** On page 5 it says " Engineers Canada and the engineering regulators organize and promote the courses ..." Can you explain how the promotion was done? What methods were most and least successful in gaining new course users?

ANSWER: Promotion of courses was done through our website, on social media (organic), and through word of mouth. We also sent links to our regulators and ask them to post on their website as well as through their communication vehicles such as newsletters and email blasts. Some regulators developed their own messages for promotion based on what we provided. The consultants delivering the courses also promoted through their websites.

Generally, word of mouth has been most successful in promoting the program and courses. However, the recent interest and increased use of the PIEVC Protocol by the federal government has stimulated demand for this type of training. The PIEVC On-Line Course in May 2019 had 71 participants – by far the most ever for an individual course. The course was not offered as an IRP course but used the same material.

No promotional brochures were ever produced for any of the courses or the program itself.

New Questions Received to June 13, 2019

22. **QUESTION:** What interest has been shown for the French program delivery? Are there any contacts that would be shared with the winning proponent?

ANSWER: Engineers Canada has not developed the French versions of the course materials nor identified instructors so it is difficult to gauge interest in French delivery. We will provide contacts but leave it to the assuming organization to initiate.

23. **QUESTION:** In Q.20 from the June 11 Q&A, what is your guess about the PIEVC On-line course revenue increase from about \$10k to \$40k?

ANSWER: The revenue increase was from a much higher enrolment (68 paying students) in the April 2019 course versus 18 for the April 2018 delivery. Between these deliveries, the federal government launched its Climate Lens requirement to demonstrate climate consideration of infrastructure to secure funding as part of their Investing In Canada Infrastructure Plan. The PIEVC Protocol is one of three accepted methods (and the only Canadian one) deemed compliant with the requirements of ISO 31000.

Federal departments such as PSPC and Transport Canada have ramped up their assessment of climate risks to their infrastructure in the past two years. They are active users of the PIEVC Protocol and are contracting out to private firms to execute the Protocol on their behalf. This trend is likely to continue at the federal level and the other levels of government. Training is needed to develop the capacity to meet this demand.

24. **QUESTION:** In Q.20 from the June 11 Q&A, could you explain why the costs to deliver the different climate law courses vary so much? The consultant looks like they are from Toronto, so I'm not sure why Vancouver would be the least expensive one to deliver. If you could provide a breakdown of one Climate Law expense, that would be great. Similarly, what is accounting for the difference in price to deliver the PIEVC and Asset Management on-line courses?

ANSWER: The costs varied in accordance with the number of students enrolled in the course and variances in venue and hospitality costs. Vancouver was less expensive because the venue and hospitality costs were lower. In addition, one of the instructors lived in Vancouver at the time so there were no travel costs.

In 2017 and early 2018, two deliveries of the Climate Law course were delivered at a loss of approximately \$2,000 per course. We were three students short of having enough registration fees to cover the costs. There were enough students enrolled that it was considered worthwhile to proceed. We were establishing a track record of course delivery to keep up the momentum and awareness of the course and IRP by showing it had been delivered. The losses were covered through an internal budget allocation.

Engineers Canada tried different pricing points for different courses and offered a non-IRP stream at a lower cost to secure enough students to break-even on costs. We did not establish consistent pricing points for courses as the program was still very young and trying to establish credibility and broaden awareness of the course availability and quality.

25. **QUESTION:** How many days does each on-line and on-site course last? Is it consecutive days?

ANSWER: On-line courses were delivered in seven, two-hour sessions spread out on alternating days over three weeks. The sessions were scheduled for mid-day to reach all time zones in Canada within normal business hours. The on-site courses are held on two consecutive days.

26. **QUESTION:** On page 7 of the RFP, it says there are 174 IRP candidates who have taken some of the programs. This amounts to an estimated \$130,500 (174 candidates x \$750/course) of course delivery expenses for the winning proponent. Should these 174 candidates wish to continue on with the program, would Engineers Canada refund those candidates and refer them to the winning proponent to sign up and pay again? If not, is Engineers Canada able to transfer the revenue from these candidates to the winning proponent?

ANSWER: The answer in both cases is no.

27. **QUESTION:** On page 10 of the RFP, it says "ownership of the intellectual property of the four courses as presently developed". Would that include the presenter's speaking notes or just the slides in the presentations?

ANSWER: Both slides and notes will be provided where these are available.

28. **QUESTION:** Has Engineers Canada developed a draft syllabus for the Climate Science course?

ANSWER: Yes. It will require verification from an advisory committee.

29. **QUESTION:** In Q.14 from the June 11 Q&A, Engineers Canada has provided a list of 4 IRP course providers. Do we have to contact these individuals to confirm that they are still interested and willing to work with the winning proponent? If not, can we refer to the 4 consultants in our proposal as if they were going to continue to consult and help us carry out our delivery strategy of the program?

ANSWER: Contacting the IRP course providers to assist in delivery in advance of the RFP deadline is recommended but the decision is up to proponents.

30. **QUESTION:** Is there a deadline for questions?

ANSWER: Monday, June 24, 2019, at 10:00 a.m. ET. The final listing of all questions and answers will be provided in both languages by 5:00 p.m. ET on Wednesday, June 26.

31. **QUESTION:** Engineers Canada (EC) has listed 6 questions and 8 items that need to be addressed in the proposal. However, there is no indication of how each item will be scored. What is ECs scoring methodology? What items have the most/least weight?

ANSWER: Engineers Canada is preparing a response to this question and it will be provided by Friday, June 21, 2019.