

RFSO- 201801194

Risk Management Oversight Services

Solicitation Closes: 02:00 pm EDT July 17, 2018

Addendum No. 1

(Question & Answer)

Question & Answers

1. CMHC RFSO for Risk Management Oversight Services No. 201801194 lists three (3) streams. Are all streams to be submitted on with a separate technical submission for each (3 distinct proposals), or a single proposal covering all three (3) streams?

Answer: **In case not every proponent submits a proposal for all streams, we recommend to submit a proposal per stream. Each stream is evaluated independently and the ranking of proponents per stream may be different.**

2. Would you kindly confirm that this solicitation is open to all vendors?

Answer: **Yes, it is a new procurement initiative and publicly posted on buyandsell.gc.ca**

3. The amount of insurance coverage requested (\$2M in General Liability and \$5M in Errors and Omissions) is disproportionate with the potential revenue to be realized by any successful vendor who is awarded a SO. With a total collective SO value of \$3M over 3 years, or \$1M per year. With up to 15 potential vendors (up to 5 per stream), this amounts to a distributed revenue of up to \$200,000 annually per vendor, assuming a best-case scenario of equal distribution, which is not likely to be the case.

The RFP makes reference to CMHC utilizing PSPC's Supplier Information Database. For large value contracts (\$2M+), PSPC typically requests between \$2-5M in General Liability and \$1-2M in Errors and Omissions Insurance.

We respectfully request that CMHC adjust the insurance requirement to align more proportionately with PSPC standards and/or the potential revenue to be realized by successful vendors.

Answer: **Insurance requirements are established in consultation with its insurance brokers to ensure effective risk management at CMHC. Insurance requirements in this RFSO will not be adjusted at this time.**

4. Could CMHC please clarify how many SOs will be awarded per Stream?

Section 1.4 Purpose of the RFSO states “retain a source list of three (3) qualified vendors per stream,” however section 4.4 Offeror Selection states “an award up to fifteen (15) SOs (top five (5) ranked Offerors per stream).

Answer: Please delete the first paragraph of section 1.4 and replace with the following:

CMHC will use this RFSO to retain a source list of up to five (5) qualified vendors per stream, hereinafter referred to as the “SO Holder(s)”, of work to provide services outlined herein on an “as-and-when requested” basis.

5. How is CMHC determining the “Average hourly rate” for the purposes of evaluation? Will the rates be equally weighted across all categories and years? If not, could CMHC please provide the method?

Answer: Correct, rates will be averaged across all categories and years to reach one overall average rate.

6. Could CMHC please clarify the Level for the Project Manager/Leader?

- Level 1 <5 years of experience;
- Level 2 5-10 years of experience;
- Level 3 10+ years of experience.

The Level will influence the rate.

Answer: Please disregard level numbers and provide rates for Junior, Intermediate, Senior and Project Manager/Leader positions based on the number of years of experience defined for each.

7. Could CMHC please confirm that Offerors must follow the following:

- Level 2 rates must be equal to or higher than Level 1 rates
- Level 3 rates must be equal to or higher than Level 2 rates
- Rates in Year 2 must be equal to or higher than Year 1
- Rates in Year 3 must be equal to or higher than Year 2

Answer: Rates set by the Offeror are at the sole discretion of the Offeror and are not required to follow the above model.

8. How will “other positions” rates be treated for the purposes of evaluation? Will they be included in the “average hourly rate”? If so, how will CMHC ensure that Offerors who include a number of “other positions” are treated fairly compared to Offerors who include no “other position” rates?

Answer: Only level 1, 2, 3 and the project lead rates will be used for evaluation purposes for each stream. Other positions and their rates are for the Offerors to suggest, if applicable, and may be added to the Offeror’s proposal.

9. Will SO holders be able to add resources during the contract? If so, how many resources per stream, per level is CMHC expecting in the RFSO response in order to show bench strength?

Answer: Offerors are not expected at this time to name any specific resources or number or resources, as work has not been completely identified. Offerors will be required to do this when they are awarded work under a call-up.

10. Can successful Offerors use subcontractors to deliver the services identified in Section 3 of the RFP?

Answer: Please refer to section 4.18 in the RFSO.

11. RFP page 18 of 39, item 4.3(d) requests "...the Offeror's specific experience with the proposed goods and/or services. This information seems like it is answered by the stream specific replies to 4.3(b), 4.3(c), and 4.4 Response to Statement of Services. 4.3(b) speaks to our team member's specific experience, 4.3(c) speaks to our firm's specific experience, and 4.4 Response to the Statement of Services speaks to the approach and methodologies we use to deliver our services. May we simply refer to that detail, or is CMHC seeking something different? Please clarify.

Answer: Please refer to Section 4.3. Each item (a through d) is requesting different information about either the firm or individual consultant(s) who may be engaged under a call-up. An Offeror's response to Section 4.4 is specific to the ability of that firm (and its consultants) to perform the work in the scope of this RFSO.

12. For the stress scenarios, please could you clarify whether the results of the stress scenarios would require development of a model, or leverage an existing model that you may already have?

Answer: Work related to the stress scenarios could entail either one.

13. We see references to OSFI and ORSA in the RFSO. Which is CMHC's primary regulator?

Answer: CMHC is not formally regulated, however, we do adhere to applicable OSFI requirements.

14. Does more than one regulator regulate CMHC? If so, which ones?

Answer: See answer above under question 13.

[End of document]