



QUESTIONS & ANSWERS (“Q&A”)

ISSUED TO ALL PROPONENTS

Q&A No.:	1
RFP #:	15160010
RFP Title:	Internal Audit Services
Issue Date:	August 17, 2015
Issue by:	Brenda Cardinal
No. of Pages:	2

DETAILS OF Q&A DOCUMENT

This Q&A document is being issued to respond to questions submitted by Proponents seeking further clarification.

QUESTION 1:

Global Bidders have resources around the globe that may be of value to IDRC in delivering internal audit services. Please confirm that we are able to utilize such resources on internal audit projects (it was noted that mandatory requirement M7 requires Reliability level clearance, so we want to confirm that global resources can be used to support delivery of the internal audit services, recognizing that non-Canadian residents cannot obtain Reliability security clearance).

ANSWER:

Reliability clearance is not required for non-Canadian resources performing internal audit work outside of Canada.

QUESTION 2:

The RFP asks for 2 resource scenarios for each of the 4 audits noted in mandatory requirement M6. Can IDRC clarify the purpose of submitting 2 distinct resource scenarios? Is the expectation for different levels of effort by level, or are there other differences IDRC is expecting in the 2 different scenarios for each audit? And in that same context, can IDRC please clarify how each of the scenarios will be used in proposal evaluation?

ANSWER:

Given that proponents have limited information about IDRC and the specific engagements for which scenarios are requested, providing 2 resource scenarios gives proponents more flexibility in their proposal by incorporating different assumptions. Scenarios will be rated as described in 4.6.2 c. and R6.

QUESTION 3:

Our experience with similar RFPs is that some Bidders may attempt to play games with their financial bids in order to maximize financial scoring. Would IDRC clarify how the financial evaluation method proposed will prevent

unfair financial bidding practices by Bidders? Also, please clarify whether IDRC is evaluating the total dollar values being proposed for the 4 projects, or if per diem rates are somehow part of the financial assessment process?

ANSWER:

The financial bid is worth 20%. Scenarios will specifically be rated in R6 which is worth 10%, other rated requirements are worth 70%. Resource levels are described in M4. As per 3.2.3, the financial proposal is scored based on total price.

QUESTION 4:

Would IDRC consider changing its evaluation approach to “Highest Technical Score within the established budget of \$215,000 inclusive of HST”, for evaluation purposes.

ANSWER:

No, please refer to 3.3 for the evaluation table.

QUESTION 5:

With respect to RFP sections 4.1 and 4.3, can IDRC please confirm that the required cover letter and financial proposal are NOT included within the 30 page proposal length limitation?

ANSWER:

Yes that is correct.

QUESTION 6:

Given that proposals should be no longer than 30 pages, can IDRC please confirm that the bidding firms are NOT required to reproduce all the mandatory and rated requirements wording as described in the RFP and that a table that lists the mandatory/rated requirement number (e.g. M1, R1) along with providing a reference or response to each requirement is sufficient?

ANSWER:

Correct, as long as the matching reference (e.g. M1, R1) is noted beside each response to each requirement.

QUESTION 7:

Given that audit requirements will differ over the course of the contract, would it be acceptable for the bidding firms to provide specific proposed resources at the Partner and Project Manager/Leader levels only and not provide specific named resources for the Senior Auditor and Auditor levels, since, depending on audit scope, a variety of staff could potentially be utilized?

ANSWER:

No, details for core proposed staff at all levels must be provided. Other “specialists” may also be proposed.

END OF Q&A # 1
