

**Question 3:**

Would CMHC please clarify or amend Evaluation Criteria 4 as this criteria does not seem to make sense and unfairly penalizes most risk assessors in the Ontario. A QPra is often a scientist (toxicologist) and as such does not qualify as a P.Eng. or P.Geo. which are the requirements for a QPesa. This criteria excludes, or at least penalizes, most risk assessors, thereby penalizing those that would be best suited to complete the Risk Assessment component of this project. It is acknowledged that a QPesa is required to complete the ESAs and file the RSC; however, this rarely the same person as the QPra who has the responsibility of signing off on the RA component.

**Response:**

CMHC does not feel that evaluation criteria 4 “unfairly penalizes” any proponent. It should be noted that this is not a mandatory criterion, it is a rated item. Therefore, it excludes no one from providing a bid and does not preclude a team where QP-RA and QP-ESA are different individuals. CMHC feels that there is a strong connection between the risk assessment and the risk management plan and that a disconnect between these disciplines is not to CMHC’s advantage in the successful completion of the risk assessment.

**Question 4:**

The RFP notes the requirement for a bid and contract security/bond. This is an unusual request for engineering work (as opposed to construction work). Can you confirm that this is necessary?

**Response:**

The requirement for a bid and contract security/bond as required by Section 2.20 has been removed.