# Questions and Answers for file no. 201602507 External Audit Services, Set 1

# **Question 2:**

Assuming all appropriate procedures would be in place (eg ethical dividers, confidentiality and access restrictions), would being the external auditor to a competitor organization to CMHC cause the CMHC not to select the proponent as the preferred provider of audit services to CMHC?

# Answer 2:

Not necessarily, but the Corporation reserves the right to understand what safeguards would be put in place and would need to be satisfied with the planned approach prior to accepting the relationship. If this situation is applicable, we would expect this to be included as part of the Corporate Alignment section of the response.

# **Question 3:**

It is noted that the preferred service provider arrangement would be for an initial 5 year period with 2 optional 2-year renewals. At the end of 9 years, is it anticipated that the preferred service provider would not be eligible to propose again as the external audit provider?

#### Answer 3:

Although we cannot comment as to what the view would be at the end of the proposed preferred service provider arrangement, there is no current expectation that the preferred service provider would not be able to propose again.

### **Question 4:**

To what extent do you require the proponent team members to be bilingual in French and English? Is it a requirement that the Lead Audit Partner and Engagement Quality Control Reviewer be bilingual?

#### Answer 4:

It would not be required, however, it would be an asset.

#### **Question 5:**

Under section 4.5 Proponent's qualifications, it requests resumes. Do you prefer those resumes be included in the body of the proposal or do you prefer they be attached as an appendix? Questions and Answers for file no. 201602507 External Audit Services

#### Answer 5:

There is no formal preference.

#### **Question 6:**

In section 4.6, it is requested that the proponent provide a response to Section 4.0 as well as to the questions. For clarification, is there a typo by referencing "4.0"?

#### Answer 6:

Yes - it is intended that the proponent respond to the question and also fulfil the mandatory requirements as outlined in Section 4 – Proposal Requirements

## **Question 7:**

To avoid duplication, we plan to provide References for the Firm and our Proposed Resources at **4 SECTION 4 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS**, **4.5 Proponent's Qualifications (c) References** only, and not repeat them at **7.3 Proposal Questions #15**. Please advise whether you approve of this approach.

### Answer 7:

This is acceptable, there was no intention for them to be repeated. However, please note that there are specific requirements in both section that need to be incorporated/met when providing the references.

#### **Question 8:**

At Page 9, 2.17 Security Clearance, please confirm that "Reliability Status" is the required level of clearance required.

#### Answer 8:

It is possible that some team members may not have secret clearance, but there are many pieces of information that would be required as part of the audit process that would require secret level of clearance. Therefore, proposing team members that are not secret cleared would not be practical. Should there be team members on the audit that do not have secret clearance, the proponent would need to ensure that appropriate safeguards are in place to prevent those team members that do not have secret clearance access from accessing it or making any decisions based on it.

#### **Question 9:**

**Page 15, 4. SECTION 4 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS, 4.1 – Overview of Section 4**, indicates that "Responses should be organized into the following Response Item sections." In the Response Items list, #4.7 Financial Information is an item. Then, **Page 17, 4.7 Financial Information** indicates that any information required here will be requested of the "lead proponent". Please confirm that nothing is required in Bidder's Responses at this time at 4.7.

#### Answer 9:

Confirmed, nothing would be required at this time.