

Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
406	Individual	<p>Does the Ministry really support a reluctance to provide full-time inspection? and what potential implications could that mean to the provision of safety to the public in general especially as this is dealing with structural components and we have seem catastrophic failures in other provinces?</p> <p>"Since there is a reluctance to provide full-time inspection services for products that have been certified by engineers, only representative samples of the materials and components are required to be visually inspected. With this greatly reduced level of visual inspection, the inspector cannot be expected to witness the Contractor's non-destructive testing of the welding."</p>	<p><b>Text has been updated (Pg. 5).</b></p> <p>It should be noted that these guidelines are for QA not QC. There is no reluctance in ensuring the required 100% inspection is complete. This is done by the Contractor. Our QA oversight helps to ensure this is being done as required by the code.</p>
407	Individual	<p>On page 5 the document says that monotube fabricators are "pre-approved". Are the fabricators pre-approved or pre-qualified?</p>	<p><b>Text has been updated (Pg. 5).</b></p>
409	Individual	<p>Regarding the requirements for structural coating, would the Ministry consider allowing a Professional Engineer who has experience with structural coating and who is registered in RAQS under the Structural Coating Specialty work in place of a Level 3 coating inspector? Further, the CAIS identifies a Structural Engineering Specialist under numerous inspection activities within CAIS 911.</p>	<p>Requirements in the guidelines with respect to inspection personnel qualifications remain unchanged.</p>

## Comments received by Email

Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
C1-1	Individual	Section 1.0 - It is the MTO Contract Service Administrator in Construction who does the procurement for CA services and not the MTO Project Manager. I would recommend taking this guideline to the Contract Services Administrator (CSA) team for review and consultation.	<b>Text has been updated (Pg. 3)</b>
C1-2	Individual	Section 2.1 - Any required inspection or administration activities should be in the CAIS and not in this document as this is a guideline for MTO staff on how to procure CA services.	These guidelines are used to create the TOR, so typical tasks done by the specialty inspectors will be included. There is overlap between the CAIS and this document. Final TOR should be project specific.
C1-3	Individual	Section 2.2 and 3.2 – Are these qualifications not in RAQS? Are these additional qualifications? Engineering Contract Policy Section is the custodian of RAQS and the generic TOR for RFP and RFQ of CA services. Were they consulted as this documents is a guideline regarding procurement for CA services?	No, inspection firms are not in RAQS.  Firms certified under CSA W178.1 that have done work for us in the past were notified of the changes to this document.
C1-4	Individual	Section 2.3 and 3.3 – Are these documents not provided to the CA as part of the Design Package Handover meeting?	These sections do not form part of the TOR (see sample). However, documents should be provided to the CA as well as the inspection firm.
C1-5	Individual	Section 2.4 and 3.4 – Is this required as the Contract Documents will identify the specifications to be used? Also are the qualifications of the inspection firm not in RAQS?	No, inspection firms are not in RAQS.
C1-6	Individual	Section 2.5 and 3.5 – Are these inspection tasks and scope of inspection not already included in the CAIS? If not, the CAIS should be updated.	Yes, there is overlap between the CAIS and this document.