

Q1. On page 33, Scored Criteria item 1(c) states: "demonstrated three core competencies..." Is there a list of these?

A1. Please replace the wording of Scored Criteria item 1(c) as follows: ~~demonstrated three core competencies supported through relevant/appropriate project examples worked on by key personnel.~~

Q2. Will you accept the graduate certificate in program evaluation as relevant graduate work experience for the junior resource?

A2. Yes, as long as the graduate certificate is through a recognized university or college.

Q3. Will you accept experience with other quantitative software or does it have to be SPSS or SAS?

A3. SPSS and SAS would be preferred but other relevant data management and analytical software will be considered.

Q4. Under section 4.4 Offeror's Qualifications, (c) References, CMHC asks for "A list of three (3) contracts of a similar size and scope which the offeror currently holds or has held over the past 24 months." Please clarify if reference projects should be **standing offer contracts** or completed **evaluation projects** with similar organizations to CMHC? If evaluation projects, please define of a similar size and scope.

A4. The references are in respect to evaluation projects completed whether or not under a standing offer. Similar size and scope would refer to projects with organizations comparable to CMHC, preferably government institutions (federal, provincial or municipal), non-profit or private sector companies.

Q5. If the Offeror has completed a recent evaluation project for CMHC, would you accept an internal **reference from CMHC**?

A5. Yes, we would accept any references that would reflect the work outlined within the reference.

Q6. On page 10 under Required Education and Experience for the Project Manager/Team Leaders, CMHC requests "Experience managing at least five (5) large projects/assignments related to evaluation." Please clarify what CMHC considers **large projects**.

A6. There is no exact definition of a "large project". However, examples **could** include: projects over CAD \$50,000.00; projects with multiple phases (evaluability assessment and evaluation); horizontal evaluations; projects with large scopes; or projects with more complex methodologies.

Q7. Under section 3.2 Statement of Goods and/or Services, Minimum Mandatory Qualifications and Experience, would CMHC like each personnel's project experience samples to cover all "**required services**" bullets listed on page 10?

A7. Yes, each resource must possess the required education listed (bullets) under the title "Required Education/Experience" In addition, the specific personnel must have the experience listed under section title: " In addition to the above requirement, the specific personnel require the following education/experience:"

Q8. On Page 33, in the Evaluation Matrix, can CMHC provide further detail in what is required under section 4.4 Response to Statement of Goods and Services? Specifically, what are CMHC's expectations of the bidders to **clearly demonstrate** meeting the scored criteria in requirements b –e.

**A8. The proponents are to clearly outline and demonstrate their qualifications/competencies/knowledge relative to the specifications listed in response to Section 3, The Statement of Goods and/or Services to be covered under this Standing Offer (SO).**

Q9. Page 13 of the RFP states: "*References: A list of three (3) contracts of a similar size and scope which the offeror currently holds or has held over the past 24 months.*" Will CMHC accept references from projects completed during the last five years?

**A9. No, CMHC is requesting current references from work performed over the past 24 months whether completed or ongoing during those last 24 months from issuance of this RFSO.**

Q10. A number of past CMHC evaluations and research projects have been about their Indigenous housing programs. Will CMHC consider also issuing a PSAB Indigenous set-aside?

**A10. This RFSO is for Evaluation Services to support policy and program improvements, expenditures management and accountability reporting. Evaluation projects are undertaken periodically for a variety of CMHC programs, initiatives and activities designed and delivered to meet a public objective, therefore, not solely for Indigenous housing programs.**

Q11. Will CMHC consider qualifying only the five top rated proposals so that the selected firms have more possibility of receiving evaluation work?

**A11. The source list of professional services will be determined by the number of qualified proponents meeting i. the stated mandatory criteria ; and ii. the upset scores (the minimum score required to proceed in each scored criteria).**

Q12. Will CMHC be issuing the call-ups based upon the ranking of the successful firms?

**A12. Please refer to Section 1.10 of the RFSO.**

Q13. The RFP states "You must provide a complete set of signed, detailed, audited financial statements for each of the last three (3) years of your firm." What is required for smaller firms?

**A13.**

**RFSO Section 4.7.1 – All proponents must provide the information required in this section.**

**RFSO Section 4.7.2 - Only shortlisted proponents will need to comply with Section 4.7.2 prior to a SO award upon request by CMHC. For all types of entities, CMHC reserves the right to conduct an assessment of any potential Standing Offer Holders' financial capacity. Three years of financial statements are required for Partnerships, Corporations, Joint Ventures and consortiums.**

Q14. Do projects used for references have to be completed? The language "currently holds" in the RFP (p. 13) would appear to indicate that the projects can be ongoing.

**A14. The projects may be ongoing or completed.**

Q15. Is there any flexibility on the requirement of at least three years' evaluation experience? I.e: a staff member who has 2.5 years of experience and well over three evaluation assignments (e.g., 15+).

A15. We would consider less than 3 years of experience if combined with significant evaluation work.

Q16. Should the years' of experience be calculated based on the time of the proposal submission (January) or the time of decision (March)?

A16. Time of issuance.

Q17. Can individuals be proposed for more than one category?

A17. Yes.

Q18. Is there a typo in the Evaluation Table as the numbers in brackets don't correspond to the sections in the body?

A18. Yes. The titles are correct, however the numbers should read as follows:

| EVALUATION CRITERIA   | FAIL in any section will not proceed any further in the evaluation |                  |                | Result       |
|---|--|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>1. Offeror Qualifications (Section 4.34)</b><br>a) Minimum Requirements are met  | PASS/FAIL  |                  |                |              |
| <b>2. Project Management (Section 4.56)</b><br>a) Lines of authority are clearly identified<br>b) Quality control measures identified<br>c) Project interface with CMHC is described  | PASS/FAIL  |                  |                |              |
| <b>3. Pricing (Section 4.68)</b><br>a) Per diem rates, hourly rates and any other pre-determined rates for each of the Project Manager/Team Leader, Senior Evaluator and Evaluator positions are provided.<br>b) Above rates conform to industry standard rates for similar services. | PASS/FAIL  |                  |                |              |
| SCORED CRITERIA   | WEIGHT<br>100 Total  | POINTS<br>1 to 5 | UPSET<br>SCORE | SCORE<br>WxP |
| <b>1. Response to Statement of Goods and Services (Section 4.45)</b>  |  |                  |                |              |

AMENDMENT #2  
 CMHC RFSO for Evaluation Services  
 RFX000062  
 Submission Deadline: 2:00 PM EST, January 3, 2019

|   |     |  |     |  |
|---|-----|--|-----|--|
| a) Application is well organized and well written.  | 10  |  | 30  |  |
| b) Demonstrates necessary qualifications and experience   | 75  |  | 225 |  |
| c) Demonstrated <del>three core</del> competencies supported through relevant/appropriate project examples worked on by key personnel |     |  |     |  |
| d) Demonstrated specialized knowledge that is supported through relevant/appropriate project examples worked on by key personnel      |     |  |     |  |
| e) Demonstrated ability to communicate clearly (technical, plain language, briefing, presentation)                                    | 15  |  | 45  |  |
| <b>TOTALS</b>   | 100 |  | 300 |  |