

Q&A Set #3

REOI 2015-01- Managed IT Hosting, Application Development, Maintenance and Support Services

1. If a vendor is proposing to bid both Streams, could CMHC please confirm that two separate responses to REOs for Streams 1 and 2 are required and that they will be evaluated separately?

In the case that a vendor is bidding both streams, CMHC is seeking one (1) response. Form #1 must indicate the streams for which the vendor is bidding and the appropriate Mandatory requirements must be met. Rated requirements must reflect the stream of services against which the vendor is responding and will be evaluated based on the vendor meeting the mandatory requirements for that stream(s).

2. If two responses to REOs are not required but rather only one integrated response to REOI for both Streams is required, could CMHC, please, confirm the following:

a) Does the integrated response to REOI have to address the M1 to M9 and R1 separately per Stream?

CMHC confirms that an integrated response is expected. Responses to Mandatory and Rated requirements must reflect the stream of services against which the vendor is responding and will be evaluated based on the vendor meeting the mandatory requirements for that stream(s).

b) Will the integrated response to REOI be evaluated separately per Stream?

The integrated response will be evaluated against the stream of services for which the vendor is responding. Bidders must meet the mandatory requirements for a stream in order to be considered for that stream. In the case that a bidder has responded to both streams, but meets the mandatory requirements for only one stream, the rated evaluation will be based on the stream for which mandatory requirements have been met. Rated requirements must reflect the stream of services against which the vendor is responding and will be evaluated based on the vendor meeting the mandatory requirements for that stream(s).

3. With regard to Section 4 – REOI Structure Requirements, subsection 4.1 shows the outline bidders are to follow in an indexed binder. The Compliance Matrix is listed as Section 4.4 and the Executive Summary as Section 4.5; however on the next page, the description per section shows the Executive Summary placement at Section 4.4, before the Compliance Matrix at Section 4.5. Could the client please confirm in which order the sections should be placed within the response binder?

The bidder is asked to include the Compliance Matrix as Section 4.4 and the Executive Summary as Section 4.5.

4. We request that CMHC either remove the mandatory requirements for full ISO 20000 and SOC 2 compliance or change it to a rated requirement. In addition, we suggest that CMHC add a mandatory requirement for Protected B status to better align with the Government of Canada's general approach to security. By enacting these measures you would get a more focused set of responses from organizations qualified and experienced in providing services to the Government of Canada.

M5 currently reads:

M5. If the bidder has declared the "Managed IT Infrastructure Hosting services" proposed workstream, then the bidder must describe the data centre security policies and certifications.

M5 has been amended to read as follows:

M5. If the bidder has declared the "Managed IT Infrastructure Hosting services" proposed workstream, then the bidder must describe the data centre security policies and certifications. In particular, the bidder must confirm that it currently holds or is willing to obtain a recognized security controls certification (e.g. ISO27000, ITSG33, CIISD, or equivalent 3rd party report).

Given this change, M7 has been removed.

5. Within the current requirements for M3 and M4, CMHC has requested contact information for the corporate references. In order to respond to the requirements within the short timeframe provided we believe it would be reasonable for CMHC to allow (a) client organization names to be masked (e.g. "National Canadian Grocer" instead of IGA), and (b) to provide a lead vendor contact to respond to the requirement for a contact information. In our experience, the procurement authority would not normally contact the client for a reference without notifying the supplier, so it should be suitable for vendors to provide the name of the lead vendor contact who would engage the client on behalf of CMHC to fulfill a reference request.

CMHC will not change the requirement to provide the client reference information as part of the response. CMHC does confirm that it will notify the vendor prior to contacting the reference client. As part of this process, CMHC will contact the primary contact person with respect to this REOI – as listed on the cover page of the vendor's response.

6. Requirements M8 and M9 speak to the need for the vendor to demonstrate an onshore delivery model. M9 is specific to experience in Canada. If the vendor has a client in the United States that has a similar onshore requirement (i.e. within the continental US), the credential would not meet requirement M9. We believe that this type of experience within the United States would be sufficient to demonstrate the vendor's corporate capability and experience in delivering a similar onshore service. Allowing this experience would not alleviate the requirement in M8 for the vendor to demonstrate an on shore (in Canada) delivery capability. Would CMHC please amend the requirement in M9 to allow similar experience for a US Client where services are delivered onshore within the continental US?

CMHC wishes to engage a partner that has experience delivering the proposed services within Canada. CMHC will not amend this requirement.

7. Given the need to coordinate with our various references (up to 8 per stream) regarding the use of those projects in support of the response to CMHC's requirement, as well as the outstanding answers to questions already submitted regarding project references, we respectfully request an extension to the closing date of the REOI from June 9, 2015 to June 16, 2016.

Given the tight timelines, no extension will be granted at this time.