

Question 65:

Does CMHC have a tabulation of # of employees by office to receive InfoShare training for Stream 3 (similar to the # of users by office table for Stream 2 on page 50)?

Response:

Location	No of permanent position as of January 2015 (no are approx. and doesn't include other type of staff (consultants and contractors))
Atlantic	84
BC	118
National Office	1172
Ontario	185
Prairies & Terr	132
Quebec	199
Total	1890

Question 66:

Following the interpretation provided for the IM BA Intermediate category provided in Q&A 15, do bidders follow the same interpretation for other rated requirements that use same/similar evaluation scale for rated 3.2.2.9?

If yes, can CMHC just publish the corrected version of the evaluation scales so that Bidders are assured it has the correct set of evaluation tables? This is important as we are currently working with several resources in a very tight timeframe.

Response:

See attachment.

Question 67:

In regards to Stream 3, Section 3.4.7 General Requirements - 3.4.7.1 Requirements for Proponent (pp. 69-72), it appears that some of these requirements are more tailored to address CMHC's requirements during the Implementation Phase of this project and more directed to Streams 1 and 2.

Would CMHC consider reissuing some of the requirements, making them more relevant to Stream 3 – Training Services? Particularly, 3.4.7.2, 3.4.7.6, 3.4.7.7, 3.4.7.8, 3.4.7.9 and 3.4.7.11.

Response:

- a) Remove requirement 3.4.7.2
- b) Remove requirement 3.4.7.6
- c) Remove requirement 3.4.7.7
- d) Remove requirement 3.4.7.8
- e) Remove requirement 3.4.7.9

- f) Requirement 3.4.7.10 should read
The Proponent should provide evidence of their ability and commitment to provide ongoing service and support for comparable implementations by referencing two (2) large projects completed in the past **two five** years which have been supported by the Proponent acting in the role of prime Proponent.
- g) Requirement 3.4.7.11 – no changes are required for this requirement other than CMHC will notify the Proponents designate contract contact of a problem. CMHC would like to know how a Proponent will handle problems with the training, should it not be to CMHC satisfaction.

Please note the Evaluation table for stream 3 has changed base on the removal of the requirement listed above. Please see new table below.

	Stream 3	M/R	Weighted Points Available	Minimum Point Requirement	Weights	% of total Section points	% of total Stream 3 points
	Requirements for InfoShare Trainer & Training Developer (6 persons)						
3.4.6.5	The Proponent should demonstrate experience with creating/ maintaining/ reviewing training	R	600		10	25.00%	20.00%
3.4.6.6	The Proponent should demonstrate experience as a trainer on OpenText Livelink and/or Content Server	R	600		10	25.00%	20.00%
3.4.6.7	The Proponent should demonstrate experience as a Trainer on OpenText – Physical Object	R	600		10	25.00%	20.00%
3.4.6.8	The Proponent should demonstrate experience with creating/maintaining/reviewing training in	R	600		10	25.00%	20.00%
	Total Section:		2400	1440		100%	80.00%
	Requirements for Proponent						
3.4.7.5	The processes, methodologies and tools proposed by the Proponent to on-board the users should be	R	100		10	16.67%	3.33%
3.4.7.7	The implementation methodologies and processes that the Proponent is proposing integrates CMHC	R	90	-	10	10.71%	2.78%

3.4.7.8	The approaches proposed by the Proponent include all aspects of the project (business analysis,	R	50	-	5	5.95%	1.54%
3.4.7.9	The tools proposed by the Proponent to upload business unit's configuration during the	R	100	-	10	11.90%	3.09%
3.4.7.6	Support References - The Proponent should provide evidence of their ability and commitment to provide	R	100		10	16.67%	3.33%
3.4.7.7	Escalation Steps Please describe your escalation procedures based on CMHC's requirements below.	R	100		10	16.67%	3.33%
3.4.7.8	Travel and living expenses The Proponent should agree to be bound by the	R	300		30	50%	10.00%
	Total Section:		600	360		100%	20.00%
	Grand Total Stream 3:		3,000	1,800		100%	

4.10 Pricing Proposal - Vendors Total Price		2,000				
Grand Total of all points		5,000				

Question 68:

In regards to Stream 3, Section 3.4.6.3 (p.68), "...proposed resources have a minimum of 1 year experience using OpenText Livelink/Content Server". Would CMHC consider e-docs and RDIMS experience?

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement.

Question 69:

In regards to Stream 3, Section 3.4.6.6 (p.69), "...proposed resources have experience as a trainer on OpenText Livelink and/or Content Server". Would CMHC consider e-docs and RDIMS experience?

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement.

Question 70:

In regards to Section 2.3 Submission Format (p.8), under item b) Mandatory Compliance Checklist (M), it states:

“Proponents must include a completed Mandatory Compliance Checklist “G” , for any and all services they are responding to within this RFP”.

Please confirm that the Mandatory Compliance Checklist should be labelled Appendix C.

Response:

Correct. The Mandatory Compliance Checklist should be labelled Appendix C in section 2.3

Question 71:

In regards to Section 2.20 Security Clearance (M) (p.14), it is understood that all persons who will perform the work must apply and obtain a CMHC security clearance. We require clarification with respect to the 2nd paragraph which states:

“...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 (and will be required to provide a fully signed copy to CMHC at the time of contract award to the Security Screening Certificate and Briefing Form (TBS 330-47)) at the time of the bid response...”

Would providing the File Number and Expiry Date from the *Security Screening Certificate and Briefing Form (TBS 330-47)* be acceptable demonstration of compliancy at the time of bid response for all proposed resources?

Response:

It is acceptable to show compliance at the time of the bid. However, to be granted access to CMHC premises and information at time of contract award, all resources are required to provide a hard copy of the TBS 330-47 Security Screening Certificate and Briefing Form, which indicates that they hold a valid secret clearance and duly signed by all parties. Should a proponent's resource not have a copy of the fully signed TBS 330-47 form this may result in a material breach of the contract and be cause for contract termination.

Please note that all resources will meet with meet with CMHC Human Resources on their first day to sign an Oath of Fidelity and Secrecy.

Also, the security clearance performed by CMHC will be for reliability status through the RCMP.

Question 72:

In regards to Section 7.3 Mandatory Compliance Checklist (p.122-125), the numbering seems to be off for some of the sections. Please confirm that the following changes apply:

- All Costs – Section 3.1.1 Section 3.1.3
- Statement of Requirements – Section 3.1.3 Section 3.1.1
- 5 years experience for the Project Manager, IM/IT industry – Section 3.2.3.3 Section 3.2.5.3
- 10 years experience for the Project Manager, managing projects, valued at \$5Million or more – Section 3.2.3.4 Section 3.2.5.4
- 5 years experience for the Project Manager, using project management tools – Section 3.2.3.5 Section 3.2.5.5
- Response to Statement of Requirements – Section 4.8 Section 4.6
- Financial Information – Section 4.10 Section 4.8
- Pricing Proposal – Section 4.11 Section 4.10
- 7.5 Financial Cost Sheet Table – Appendix E (should be added)

Response:

Please find the revised Mandatory Check List

1.1 Mandatory Compliance Checklist

APPENDIX C

<input type="checkbox"/>	Certificate of Submission	Section 2.2 & 2.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	Submission Deadline	Section 2.3 & 2.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Detailed Item by Item Responses	Section 2.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	Compliance Checklist	Section 2.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	Complete Financial Cost Sheet Tables	Section 2.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	Offering Period	Section 2.8
<input type="checkbox"/>	Security Clearance	Section 2.20
<input type="checkbox"/>	Statement of Requirements	Section 3.1.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	All Costs	Section 3.1.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 years experience for the Business Analyst	Section 3.2.2.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 years experience analyzing business requests	Section 3.2.2.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience gathering requirements	Section 3.2.2.6
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience with EDRM or RDIMS	Section 3.2.2.7

- ❑ 10 years experience for the senior Business Analyst Section 3.2.2.17
- ❑ 10 years experience for the senior Business Analyst, analyzing business requests Section 3.2.2.18
- ❑ 5 years experience for the senior Business Analyst, gathering requirements Section 3.2.2.19
- ❑ 5 years experience for the senior Business Analyst, with EDRM or RDIMS Section 3.2.2.20
- ❑ 10 years experience for the senior Data Migration Analyst, system analysis, design, Section 3.2.3.6
- ❑ 5 years experience for the senior Data Migration Analyst, implementation data migration Section 3.2.3.7
- ❑ 3 years experience for the senior Data Migration Analyst, OpenText-Livelink/Content Server. Section 3.2.3.8
- ❑ 5 years experience for the Data Migration Analyst, system analysis, design, Section 3.2.3.18
- ❑ 5 years experience for the Data Migration Analyst, system analysis, Quality Assurance activities Section 3.2.3.19
- ❑ 5 years experience for the Migration Specialist, system analysis, design, Section 3.2.3.27
- ❑ 5 years experience for the Migration Specialist, system analysis, Quality Assurance activities Section 3.2.3.28
- ❑ 5 years experience for the Migration Specialist, writing SQL scripts Section 3.2.3.29
- ❑ 2 years experience for the Migration Specialist, data migrations using OpenText Section 3.2.3.30
- ❑ 10 years experience for the Senior Technical Architect in the IT industry Section 3.2.4.4
- ❑ 10 years experience for the Senior Technical Architect, defining requirements ... Section 3.2.4.5
- ❑ Senior Technical Architect two similar projects, implementation of OpenText Livelink Section 3.2.4.6
- ❑ 2 years experience for the Technical Analyst, OpenText installations,... Section 3.2.4.14
- ❑ 3 years experience for the Technical Analyst,

	Web servers and HTML (MS IIS, Tomcat)	Section 3.2.4.15
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience for the Technical Analyst, Windows Operating System	Section 3.2.4.16
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience for the Technical Analyst, with SQL Server 2008 or higher	Section 3.2.4.17
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 years experience for the Project Manager, IM/IT industry	Section 3.2.5.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	10 years experience for the Project Manager, managing projects, valued at \$5Million or more	Section 3.2.5.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 years experience for the Project Manager, using project management tools	Section 3.2.5.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Proponent must describe strategies, approaches,	Section 3.2.6.2
<input type="checkbox"/>	Escalation Procedures	Section 3.2.6.3
<input type="checkbox"/>	Invoicing	Section 3.2.6.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Payment Disputes	Section 3.2.6.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 year experience for the Physical Object Specialist, records & document management	Section 3.3.5.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 years experience for the Physical Object Specialist, developing IM business procedures	Section 3.3.5.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 years experience for the Physical Object Specialist, working as a business analyst	Section 3.3.5.6
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 years experience for the Physical Object Specialist, developing test cases,	Section 3.3.5.7
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience for the Physical Object Specialist, electronic document management apps	Section 3.3.5.8
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 years experience for the Developer, as a Systems Integrator	Section 3.3.6.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience for the Developer, in Systems Analysis, Design,...	Section 3.3.6.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 year experience for the Trainer, in Information Management System	Section 3.3.7.4
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 years experience for the Trainer, classroom training for IM/IT systems	Section 3.3.7.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trainer must be fluent in both official languages (English and French)	Section 3.3.7.6

- 5 years experience for the Project Manager, IT industry Section 3.3.8.4
- 10 years experience for the Project Manager, managing projects, valued at \$1Million or more Section 3.3.8.5
- 5 years experience for the Project Manager, using project management tools Section 3.3.8.6
- Proponent must describe strategies, approaches, Section 3.3.9.2
- Escalation Procedures Section 3.3.9.3
- Invoicing Section 3.3.9.4
- Payment Disputes Section 3.3.9.5
- 2 years experience for the InfoShare Trainer, in Information Management System Section 3.4.6.1
- 3 years experience for the Trainer, classroom training for IM/IT systems Section 3.4.6.2
- Proponent must demonstrate 50% of the proposed resources are fluent in both official languages, Section 3.4.6.4
- Proponent must describe strategies, approaches, Section 3.4.7.2
- Escalation Procedures Section 3.4.7.3
- Invoicing Section 3.4.7.4
- Payment Disputes Section 3.4.7.5
- Response to Statement of Requirements Section 4.6
- Financial Information Section 4.8
- Pricing Proposal Section 4.10
- Mandatorys' in Terms and Conditions Section 6.2
- 7.1 Certificate of Submission Appendix A
- 7.5 Financial cost Sheet Table Appendix E

Question 73:

The RFP seems to be missing pages 102 – 112 between Section 7.1 Certificate of Submission – Appendix A (p.101) and Section 7.2 Evaluation Table – Appendix B (p.113). Please confirm that there are no additional requirements missing.

Response:

This is a pagination error – there are no missing pages. The page numbers are sequential up to 101 then jump to 113 and run sequentially from there.

Question 74:

Who was/were the service provider(s) responsible for the development, management, implementation, or proof-of-concept for the Phase 1 of the InfoShare solution?

Response:

This is not relevant to this RFP.

Question 75:

Who was/were the service provider(s) that participated in the development of the on-boarding process used for the Phase 1 of the InfoShare solution?

Response:

This is not relevant to this RFP.

Question 76:

Was the Phase 1 of the InfoShare solution developed by the service provider(s) as a time & material (T&M) or fixed priced contract? What was the contracted dollar amount of the engagement for Phase 1 of the InfoShare solution?

Response:

This is not relevant to this RFP.

Question 77:

RFP section 3.2.1.3 On-Boarding Process used at CMHC outlines the 5 repeatable stages that the InfoShare project team will follow in order to successfully prepare and implement the InfoShare solution with a business group. Could CHMC provide a more detailed description of this process? Can the CMHC share the detailed project plan schedule that outlines the work effort, duration and resources required to implement this approach? If some bidders have this information already, for example, vendors that provided services during Phase 1, then the bidders that do not have this information are at a competitive disadvantage.

Response:

The 5 repeatable stages are described in the section 3.2.1.3. The detailed project plan schedule is not available.

Question 78:

We ask that CMHC recognize Livelink certifications equivalent to the Content Server certifications listed in 3.2.4.20 (for example ECM-Enterprise Server Administrator Certification (OTLSA)).

There are Technical Analysts certified in Livelink 9.7.1 who have direct and relevant experience installing, configuring, supporting and maintaining OpenText Livelink and/or Content Server that will meet CMHC's requirements. We ask that CMHC recognize these resources' experience and their equivalent certifications.

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement

Question 79:

In the majority of OpenText implementations, Oscript experience is typical for a Developer resource but not for a Technical Analyst. Further, within Stream 1, the Oscript experience is already addressed with the Senior Data Migration Analyst and Data Migration Specialist categories. In these categories Oscript experience is evaluated at: "1 to 2 years = 5 pts, 2 or more year = 10 pts".

As Oscript experience is more common for developers rather than analysts and also addressed within the data migration analyst categories (where resources total 4-3), we ask that this requirement be removed as it is not reflective of experienced OpenText technical analysts in the IT industry.

Response:

No, CMHC will maintain its requirement.