## Questions and Answers for RFP 20190562

| Question # | Questions Received from Bidders | Responses to Bidders |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Are you able to provide additional details and some understanding as to the Physical Security Services (define or list) that will be supplied under the RFP? | Please refer to section *3.2 Tasks and/or Activities* in the Statement of Work (at page 54) for further details on what type of services may be required. |
| 2 | Could you confirm if there has been a company doing this or similar work in the last 24 months? | Physical security services are currently delivered by internal OFSI resources (permanent/casual/term), there is no incumbent supplier. |
| 3 | As most Physical Security projects are short term and often "as needed" would you consider lowering the min value of the reference projects to $25000? | OSFI requires a supplier with demonstrated ability to provide Physical Security Services, including multiple resources, similar to those required by OSFI. Mandatory criteria *#M-1 Corporate Experience* is intended to confirm the Bidder's demonstrated ability to provide such. As outlined in the RFP, OSFI has an initial requirement for two resources, plus an additional resource to support investigations as they arise. Please note; the total billed amount under any contract used as a Corporate Reference Contract includes all Task Authorizations (if applicable) issued and billed under the contract. The request has been reviewed and the requirement remains unchanged. |
| 4 | Would the government accept resources who have 10 years or more of experience conducting physical security on government sites, instead of certifications? | It should be noted that each point-rated criteria evaluation criteria (table) contained in Attachment 2 to the RFP includes criteria to assess experience in the Government of Canada environment. Certification is a differentiator representing 10-20% of the maximum points (as applicable to resource category) and there is no minimum pass mark associated with individual resources. The request has been reviewed and the requirement remains unchanged. |
| 5 | Ref: M-2 & R-2 proposed resources. M2 and R2 describes the required resources as "senior physical security specialists (#1, #2, #3) with multiple scoring tables (from pages 1 to 30 of the RFP). But table 1 Maximum points assigned (RFP page 31), table 2 – Maximum points assigned (RFP page 34) , attachment 4.2 Financial Evaluation Criteria (RFP page 36) and the SOW (RFP page 56) all refer to Junior, Intermediate and Senior Physical security specialists with two additional tables (T1) for Mandatory assessments of the Intermediate and senior positions<br><br>Please clarify:<br>a) The level of expertise required for each position? | To clarify, as described in Annex A, Statement of Work, the resulting contract will be for the provision of resources "as and when requested" in three categories:<br>1. Junior Physical Security Personnel<br>2. Intermediate Physical Security Specialist<br>3. Senior Physical Security Specialist<br>Therefore, the Bidder must propose Per Diem Rates for each of the three categories as specified in Attachment 4.2: Financial Evaluation Criteria (page 36).<br><br>At time of RFP, the Bidder must propose three (3) Senior Physical Security Specialist resources as specified in M-2 Proposed Resources (page 11) as follows:<br>• Using the Mandatory Resource Evaluation Criteria: Senior Physical Security Specialist table contained on pages 16 – 17; and<br>• Using the Point-Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria Table that is applicable to each proposed resource:<br>   o Resource #1 - Senior Physical Security Specialist (TRA Specialist), pages 18-21 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | b) Whether there is a table missing (T1) for a junior physical security specialist<br>c) Which table is required to assess the resources? It is unclear whether the tables referring to senior physical security specialists or the two distinct tables for junior, intermediate and senior positions apply | | o Resource #2 - Senior Physical Security Specialist (Security Assessment Specialist), pages 22-23<br>o Resource #3 - Senior Physical Security Specialist (Investigator), pages 24-26<br><br>To further clarify, the Bidder is not required to propose a Junior or Intermediate resource at time of RFP. If additional resources are required (in any category) they will be assessed at time of Task Authorization using the Criteria contained in Tables T1-1, T1-2 and T1-3 of the SOW. Table T1-3, assessment criteria for the Junior category, is missing from the RFP and has been added. Refer to RFP Changes #1 and 2 that follow. |
| 6 | Ref: Attachment 2 to Part 4 – Mandatory Technical Criteria. Is the capability of conducting a maturity analysis a mandatory requirement? On page 9 proponents must be in a position to offer 4 out of the 6 service but on page 11 it becomes a mandatory requirement (resource #2). Also, none of the templates in attachment 1, 2 refer to Maturity analysis experience. | | To clarify; the criteria on page 9 relates to the four mandatory Corporate Reference Projects and not the experience of individual resources. The mandatory Physical Security Experience stipulated in Attachment 1 (pages 1617) relates to the proposed resources. |
| 7 | Ref: Attachment 3 - R3. Please confirm that the two Additional Resources must be at the "senior" level. | | Yes. To further clarify, for R-3 the Bidder must complete the table contained as Attachment 3 (pages 27-29). |
| 8 | We are respectfully requesting a two-week extension for the above-referenced RFP – and proposing an October 8th closing date. | | The RFP closing date has been extended to October 2, 2019, and is reflected in RFP amendment #2. |
| 9 | We acknowledge receipt of your email including two attachments: Amendment 003 extending the submission date to October 9th for RFP 20190562, and a Questions and Answers (QAs) document. However, the attached QAs document references "RFP 20182044" which does not match the RFP 20190562 for this bid, so the QAs don't seem to belong to this RFP.<br>Can you please advise, and also confirm the submission date of RFP 20190562? | | The Q&A 20182044 was posted in error. I confirm that the RFP submission date is now October 9th. |