Question 35:

Section 2.20 Security Clearance – Can CMHC clarify why every role will need to have Secret clearance. Many of the proposed project team members would not have direct exposure to CMHC documents/ records and thus would not be in a position to pose a risk to CMHC security. In particular, the Developer, Technical Architect, Technical Analyst, Project Manager(s), and Training Developer work can easily be managed in such a way that these roles are not exposed to CMHC documents/ records. Would CMHC consider eliminating/ reducing the requirement to Secret clearance for these roles?

Response:

Developer, technical Architect, Technical Analyst will be exposed to CMHC documents through migration, testing, validation and configuration of the system. Project Manager(s) and trainer/developer may be exposed to CMHC documents/records to conduct their work, resolving issues, demos and/or involvement in discussions.

CMHC will maintain its requirement for secret clearance.

Question 36:

Section 2.20 Security Clearance – Should CMHC require Secret cleared individuals, would CMHC be able to assist in fast tracking vendor personnel who are qualified to fill roles but only have Reliability clearance as of now?

Response:

As per section 2.20, in addition to the security clearance described above, CMHC requires employees of the selected Proponent to be security cleared at a "Secret" level in order to permit them access to CMHC premises, CMHC information or have access to the CMHC network systems. All resources proposed by all Proponent(s) must confirm that they hold a valid secret clearance at the time of the bid response. A fully signed copy of the Security Screening Certificate and Briefing Form (TBS 330-47) for all resources will be required by contract award.

Question 37:

Section 2.20 Security Clearance - Some proposed activities such as solution configuration and/or configuration testing will not involve direct access to CMHC documents/ records and could be performed by individuals without Secret clearance. In fact, these roles could be provided by offshore resources which could bring down the overall project costs for CMHC. Would CMHC consider the use of offshore resources?

Response:

No. CMHC will not consider offshore resources (see answer to similar question 29)

Question 38:

Section 2.20 – can CMHC please provide a copy of the Oath of Fidelity and Secrecy so that we might review it?

Response:

See attachment

Question 39:

Section 3.1.3 – can CMHC clarify that no software is anticipated to be included as part of this vendor bid and therefore any wording related to licensing fees is not applicable?

Response:

Licensing or license maintenance costs are not part of this bid, unless they are tools included as part of the proponent's proposed solution.

Question 40:

Section 3.1.4 – can CMHC clarify what is meant by "turnkey solution" given that this RFP is seeking resources to provide services?

Response:

CMHC is seeking a team of professionals to provide an implementation solution and its supporting tools.

Question 41:

Section 3.2 – can CMHC identify if retention schedules have been developed for the entire organization or will the vendor need to provide services within this workstream to draft retention schedules (to be validated, presented to Library and Archives Canada by CMHC and approved by LAC)?

Response:

The development of retention schedules and approval from Library and Archives Canada is outside the scope of this project.

Question 42:

Section 3.2.1.1; 3.3.2. 3.4.1; – Can CMHC provide details on how the estimated number of resources and hours were arrived at? Was there another incumbent involved in developing this estimated level of effort and if so, what is the name of the incumbent firm?

Response:

The number of estimated resources and hours were based on CMHC's experience from phase 1.

Question 43:

Section 3.2.3.1 – the RFP indicates 8TB of Lotus Notes libraries and 8TB of file shares are to be migrated. Is this all active content? Has CMHC done any analysis to determine whether the content is past the specified retention period and could be purged rather than migrated?

Response:

Some of the material is still active content. Clean-up by clients of personal and transitory content has been underway for several years. Retention schedules are not yet developed for this content.

Question 44:

Section 3.2.3 – What was the success ratio for content migrated using the OTIC tool developed by CMHC (ie what percentage of content was fully migrated versus what percentage needed to be manually migrated)?

Response:

The success ratio for content migrated using the OTIC tool is 95% however this was achieved through multiple attempts.

Question 45:

Section 3.2.3.7; 3.2.2.20 – Would CMHC consider experience outside Government of Canada; i.e. experience in both private sector (financial service industry) and other public sector that would be beneficial to CMHC.

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement.

Section 3.2.2.13; 3.2.2.26 - Would CMHC again consider experience outside Government of Canada?

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement.

Question 46:

Section 3.2.3.8 – Installation, maintenance, support of technology is rarely a full time activity for Senior level data migration analysts and this capability is already covered through the Technical Analyst role. Would CMHC consider removing this requirement for the Senior Data Migration Analyst role?

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement.

Question 47:

Section 3.2.4.1 (a) (b) – Can CMHC detail what contention, performance and mis-configurations exist? Can CMHC detail the technical issues experienced during Phase 1, the estimated work effort to fix such issues and the anticipated remediation required?

Response:

During the Phase 1 deployment, CMHC experienced slow response and sometimes, SQL database locking. Some of those contentions might have been caused by mis-configuration of the environment or settings that could be adjusted to improve response time and performance.

It is expected that the Proponent will, upon completion of its analysis, identify the work effort to fix the outstanding issues and resolve them.

Question 48:

Section 3.2.4.1 – please confirm that the cost for any changes to software, hardware or network required to alleviate technical issues and enable the expansion of Infoshare enterprise wide will be borne by CMHC and are not part of the vendor's bid.

Response:

Hardware/network, licensing or license maintenance costs are not part of this bid, unless they are tools included as part of the proponent's proposed solution.

Question 49: The team

Section 3.2.4.1 – Please confirm that business requirements documents, technical design, architectural diagrams, build books, test cases/ scripts and other technical design documents exist from Phase 1 and will be available to the successful vendor?

Response:

All documentation from phase 1 will be made available to the successful vendor

Question 50:

Section 3.2.5.7 – can CMHC identify why multiple project management certifications would be of greater benefit? Is CMHC using a mixture of project management methods internally?

Response:

Multiple project management certifications are an indicator of the depth of project management knowledge and experience. CMHC has developed its own project management framework based on industry best practices.

Question 51:

Section 3.2.6 – Please confirm the roles/ resources within both business, IM and IT who will be dedicated to the project from CMHC, including the percentage of time devoted to the project.

Response:

The IM resources will provide information management services, metadata, groups and permissions standards, participating in knowledge transfer and specific CMHC knowledge. IT resources will facilitate coordination within various IT CMHC groups and ensure that methodologies and standards are followed, conducting testing and participating in knowledge transfer, while providing specific CMHC knowledge. The business will provide information regarding their specific business units.

Question 52:

Section 3.2.6 - there is reference here and elsewhere to CMHC methodology – can you please share this?

Response:

The CMHC methodology includes proprietary processes to manage projects, changes, issues, risk, and communication. It also includes development and documentation standards and protocols.

Question 53:

Section 3.3.3 - Was the Physical Objects migration leveraging Object Importer ever tested and the percentage of successfully migrated test data? What "fixes" does CMHC believe are required for this tool?

Response:

A subset of data from FRS was migrated into Physical Objects into the development environment using Object Importer was tested during Phase 1. Success rates were at 99%. Fixes may include data clean-up and programming changes to achieve 100%.

Question 54:

Section 3.3.3 – Why was FRS migration not completed during Phase 1?

Response:

Implementation and migration of FRS into the production environment was planned for Phase 2 of the project because CMHC wanted to onboard the majority of business units beforehand.

Question 55:

Section 3.4.1 – please clarify – are all training services to be contracted via Task Authorization only?

Response:

All training services will be contracted via Task Authorization.

Section 3.1.4 is modified as follows:

Replace:

A Proponent may propose resources for any one or combination of the three streams. Each stream will result in a separate contract or one contract should all streams be awarded to a single Proponent, including all the training.

With

A Proponent may propose resources for any one or combination of the three streams. Each stream will result in a separate contract.

Question 56:

Section 4.1 – This section indicates that the vendor must provide a 'fixed (firm) price" for the term of an ensuing agreement. As the RFP indicates an initial term of 2 years with an option to extend for an additional one year, is the vendor quoting a fixed price for 2 years or for 3 years? Further Appendix E requests estimated fees. Is the vendor bidding a fixed price or per diem, time and materials pricing?

Response:

The vendor is to provide a fixed price quote for the 2 years. Please use Appendix E to detail the 2 year cost estimate by resource category.

Question 57:

Section 5.4 -This section states "This should include the initial costs and any licensing (include the number of licences being offered in the price) maintenance or labour required for upgrading, along with any increase costs after the initial year or term of the Agreement" Please confirm that the vendor is NOT bidding or including any licensing or license maintenance costs as part of this bid.

Response:

Licensing or license maintenance costs are not part of this bid, unless they are tools included as part of the proponent's proposed solution.

Question 58:

Section 5.4 - This section states: "Each compliant proposal that meets all the mandatory criteria and achieves minimum scores of **6,999 out of 11,665** for Stream **1**, **2,076 out of 3,460** for Stream **2**, **2.304 out of 3,840** for Stream **3**, will be considered for short listing". However, Appendix E indicates: "Proponents are fee to add or reduce the number of resources and days required, which will form the bases of number of resource, time required to complete and costs CMHC will pay to the successful Proponent under the ensuing agreement". If the vendor choses to reduce the number of resources, we will risk not achieving the minimum score and be unable to be short listed. This would appear to penalize a vendor who chooses to bid fewer resources and hours to deliver the same outcome. Can CMHC please clarify how the scoring will be completed to accommodate for vendors who choose to submit fewer resources/ hours?

Response:

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Section 7.5, Appendix E, page 131 is amended as follows:

Replace:

Instructions: Complete information in Yellow boxes below: Proponents are fee to add or reduce the number of resources and days required, which will form the bases of number of resource, time required to complete and costs CMHC will pay to the successful Proponent under the ensuing agreement.

Instructions: Complete information in Yellow boxes below: Proponents may adjust the number of days required and/or increase the number of resources required, which will form the basis of the costs CMHC will pay to the successful Proponent under the ensuing agreement.

Question 59:

Appendix D states:" It is highly preferred that the Proponent's proposed solution operates within the overall CMHC Information Technology Environment" - please clarify what is meant by the "proposed solution" given that the vendor is only providing services and not software?

Response:

The proposed solution to implement Infoshare may include tools provided by the vendor to facilitate the implementation of InfoShare. These tools should be compatible for the CMHC technology environment. Furthermore, as the proposed solution also includes the migration of the legacy corporate file repository to InfoShare, any tools used as part of the solution should also be compatible with our existing technology environment.

Question 60:

Given the complexity of this RFP (three projects), there will be considerable effort to providing a quality response for CMHC. Would CMHC please consider an extension of two weeks?

Response:

Regretably, the closing date will not be extended at this time.

Question 61:

Re: Question 16. Does the clarification point also apply to requirement 3.3.3.8 (stream 2 project manager)

Question 16:

Regarding 3.2.5.7, it states that "The Proponent should demonstrate that the proposed resource has a Project Management Professional (PMP) designation or an industry recognized Project Management (PM) certification. No certification provided = 0; Per Project Management certification copy provided = 2 pts". However, in the "Points Available" column, it shows "1-10". How is the 10 points achieved?

Response:

CMHC recognizes that there are only 3 certifications applicable to this RFP: a. PMP b. Prince2 c. Master Certificate in Project Management from a recognized university

0 certifications = 0 points 1 certifications = 3 points 2 certifications = 7 points 3 certifications = 10 points

Response:

The reference in question 61 should be 3.3.8.8 – yes the clarification for 3.2.5.7 will apply to stream 2 3.3.8.8

Question 62:

Both Streams 2 and 3 request Physical Objects training for approximately 500 users (3.3.7 and 3.4.3). Are the estimated 100 days for Physical Objects training in Stream 2 also represented in the estimated 630 training days in 3.4.2, or should Physical Objects training only be provided in Stream 2 and not in Stream 3?

Response:

Stream 2 will address the requirements for the Physical Objects training. Stream 3 might be used as mitigation if more trainers are required during the implementation of Physical Objects, depending on the schedule that will be established.

Question 63:

Section 3.4.3 references "Boot Camp" training for end-users located at the National Office. Has CMHC identified a scope for the "Boot Camp" training (i.e. roles, topics, # of users)?

Response:

Boot Camp training will be provided to the Super Users and will be delivered at CMHC National Office. The scope for this training has been identified. Training for all end-users has also been identified as part of the overall Phase 2 training plan.

Question 64:

Page 20 notes that **"all end users receive Information Management (IM) awareness".** Is this a session that CMHC will deliver internally to all employees or is CMHC looking for the Proponent to deliver IM awareness sessions? If the latter, has the session scope and content already been defined?

Response:

The Proponent will deliver the IM awareness session (90 minutes) which is currently considered to be a portion of the overall InfoShare Training program. The session scope and content has been defined.