

Question 1:

During the site visit, it was mentioned that it was a known fact that the budget constraint established in the RFP was not sufficient to cover all technical requirements. It was also mentioned that submissions needed to propose what can be done within the budget constraints. How should that be addressed when preparing proposals?

Response:

The proposals should be prepared in response to only and exactly what is requested in the RFP. The document contains all pertinent information.

Question 2:

During the site visit, there were a number of “wishes” that were expressed but that are not addressed in the RFP. Conversely, some “wishes” addressed by the RFP were characterized as “nice to have” during the site visit. For instance, it was mentioned that it was a strong desire that the performance of the Thermal Breaks be evaluated, but that the sound transmission evaluation was not as important. How should that be addressed when preparing proposals?

Response:

The proposals should be prepared in response to only and exactly what is requested in the RFP. It is the only document to be referred to. The “wishes” were expressed to show certain flexibility with priorities and it will be up to proponents to propose logically and financially viable solutions in their proposals.

Question 3:

In the RFP, it is mentioned that a number of documents and information would be transmitted to the project proponents. However, during the site visit it was mentioned that it may be possible that not many information could be made available and that some of this information may be inaccurate. Can you specify exactly what would be made available and what is the accuracy of that information?

Response:

Further documents will be made available once the lead proponent is selected. Submissions are expected to demonstrate the approach to planning (NOT the ultimate, final plan), what to analyse and how, what would be the best (and within the budget) representation of monitored units and other points of monitoring for the entire development. It will be based on the assumptions that most needed information will be provided or found. The RFP’s SOW describes such situations in Section 1.2.

Submissions will be evaluated and scored on the ability to respond to the RFP requirements and not for creation of the ultimate, final plan. The goal for submissions should be to demonstrate the proponent’s ability to plan and then implement such planning as per Section 4.7. Proponents should also refer to Appendix B, Evaluation Table, criteria 2, Response to Statement of Work.

Question 4:

Can sub-consultant's experiences count as the proponent's experiences? E.g. if a proponent subcontracts part of the project to a sub-consultant, and submits a proposal as a team, can that sub-consultant's experiences be presented and count towards the proposal's evaluation?

Response:

Yes, see RFP's 2.21 Joint Ventures Responses.

Question 5:

Is it required to provide financial statements at the proposal stage or once the consultant is selected?

Response:

Please follow the appropriate Financial Information section 4.9 in the RFP

4.9 Financial Information

Mandatory

4.9.1 Credit Check

Sole proprietorships and partnerships must provide **a statement contained within their proposal giving written permission for CMHC to perform a credit check as required.**

4.9.2 Financial Capacity

CMHC reserves the right to conduct an assessment of the Lead Proponent(s) financial capacity. **Should the proponent be selected as the lead proponent following the RFP evaluation process,** CMHC will request the necessary financial statements to confirm the financial capacity of the proponent. (...)

Question 6:

Would CMHC consider an extension to the closing date?

Response:

The closing deadline has been amended to 2:00pm, Monday, November 10, 2014.