Question 4:

Would CMHC consider granting an extension to the closing date for this solicitation?

Response:

CMHC will grant a one week extension, the new closing date is May 15, 2015 at 2:00pm EST.

Question 5:

Is it possible to provide rough estimate of the technical skill your team has on staff?

Response:

CMHC has expert technical staff in web application development, ColdFusion, CommonSpot and web content management system. Without expertise in Drupal or PHP.

Question 6:

Does the organization want any major features or functions not currently covered by the existing site(s)? If so, please provide examples or directions/specs.

Response:

No.

Question 7:

Any other sites other than the main one and the 3 listed in the RFP which need to be considered to be rebuilt, or migrated?
Examples: Library Catalog, Housing Information, etc.

Response:

There were 4 microsites listed in the RFP (NOTE: only 3 urls were originally provided).

1. FlexHousing
2. Newcomers to Canada
3. Get House Smart
4. Handbook (Secure Site)

Question 8:

Is it possible to provide an overview of the roles and departments of people who would be administrating the site so we can conceptualize a layer of permissions and editing workflow?

Response:

Webmaster: Responsible for overall content and site design.
Web author: Writes and formats web content, performs page layout. Creates or updates web site navigational structure.

Question 9:

Section 3.3 - Statement of Work - the section of functional requirements (3.4) is thorough in exploring a vendors experience, but doesn't lend much in the way of functionality specs (ie: what tool and actions need to be performed on and within the website by users and administrators?) Typically, with this type of project, we'd see a listing of required functionality to build a proposed solution and associated pricing around. Examples:

- Editable calendar of events
- Multiple language functionality
- Payment gateway
- Taxes and shipping integration
- Account login and portal

While a list of this sort is not necessary, would there be an opportunity in the planning phase to work as a team to develop such a requirements resource to work from?

Response:

The proponent will describe a project plan in response to 3.7.3. During the planning phase of the project CMHC and the successful proponent will work together on specific functional details. A payment gateway, taxes and shipping integration and an account login and portal are not part of this project. One microsite of 1750 pages of content has a security interface with another site, as described in 3.3.1 "Introduction and Scope". The multiple language requirement is in 3.4.1: "The website presented to the public must be bilingual."

Question 10:

Could you please confirm if the "Shortlist Evaluation Score" referenced at Appendix B – Evaluation Table refers to a scoring scale to be applied against a vendor"s Product Demonstration? If it does, will CMHC provide more detail as to how the "20 points per section" will be evaluated/awarded?

Response:

The „Shortlist Evaluation Score" will be used to evaluate the vendor"s product demonstration. CMHC will provide further detail as to how the 20 points per section will be awarded to those shortlisted proponents.

Question 11:

The use of multiple weighting scales for technical criteria, with upset scores, **no total score**, and a vague reference to a "shortlist evaluation score" makes it difficult to deduce the methodology being applied. Could you please provide a specific evaluation example with sample scoring in order to help vendors understand how CMHC intends to evaluate their responses?

Response:

Proponents will be scored on all Section's Criteria (Section 3.4, Section 3.5, etc.) and must meet each Section's Upset Score (Column C, Evaluation Table). All section scores will be totalled for a final technical score and the top 3 final scoring proponents will be Shortlisted and invited to provide a demonstration.

Maximum Technical Points available = 3300
Minimum Upset Score applicable = 1868
Top 3 Technical Scoring proponents = shortlist
Maximum Shortlist Points available = 120
Technical Points score x 75% = Final Technical Score
Final Pricing score x 25% = Final Pricing Score
Final Technical Score + Final Pricing Score = Final Total Score

Question 12:

Alternatively, would CMHC reconsider its evaluation scoring methodology to one more in line with GoC procurement standards? Simply removing the multiple weighting calculations would provide more clarity while lessening the burden in the evaluation process.

Response:

No

Question 13:

Given the significant amount of vendor information that has requested and in the interest of providing a sufficiently detailed and compliant response, we respectfully request a two week extension to the current closing date.

Response:

Please refer to Question 4.