



**Request for Qualification #289-4:
Audit, Special Examination and Related Services
Annual Refresh of Permanent Suppliers List
Resulting from Request for Standing Offers #256 and #264**

Question & Answer # 1

This Question & Answer #1, including any appendices attached hereto (the “Addendum”), amends and clarifies Request for Qualification No. 289-4, as previously amended and clarified. The Request for Qualification otherwise remains unchanged and any capitalized words not defined herein have the meaning ascribed thereto in the Request for Qualification.

1. “Given that this is an evergreen procurement, would the client be willing to release past Question & Answers provided to vendors to assist with streamlining the procurement process? It is highly likely the same questions will come up again with this refresh therefore, releasing the same would lower costs to the crown by putting the onus on vendors to conduct a thorough review of past teachings.”

Answer: Past Questions & Answers for RFSO 256 and 264, as well as for Request for Qualification 289-1, 289-2 and 289-3 are available on Buy and Sell.

2. “There is a 40 page limit to this procurement (or 20 double sided pages). Given that some of the Personnel Category criteria require vendors to illustrate upwards of 10 years of experience, does the page limit also apply to Consultant CV's? As well, does the page limit apply to the entire procurement, or to each Stream individually? And are the Rated Requirements - Bidder also included in the page limits? Would the Table of Contents, Commercial Statement, etc. also be included in the page limits?”

Answer: The page limit described in section 4.1 (Organization of Proposal) applies to the Technical Offer only. Any pages containing content that the Bidder intends to be evaluated in response to the rated requirements should be limited to 40 single-sided pages (or 20 double-sided pages), preferably numbered and excluding the cover page and table of contents. Any resumes should be included within the 40 single-sided pages (or 20 double-sided pages) if the Bidder intends the content contained therein to be evaluated. We expect Bidders to optimize the content and format of their submission while respecting the page limit in section 4.1 (Organization of Proposal) of the Request for Qualification. Any information contained in pages exceeding the stipulated maximum may not be evaluated, in the OAG's sole and absolute discretion. Without limitation to section 3 (Basis and Method of Evaluation), the stipulated page limit applies for each Stream, such that a Bidder may submit up to four (4) Technical Offers totalling 160 single-sided pages (or 80 double-sided pages), provided that Bidders may not submit more than one Technical Offer for the same Stream.



For greater certainty, the Technical Offers should include separate sections for each Stream in which the proposal is submitted for evaluation, such that each section is limited to 40 single-sided pages (or 20 double-sided pages) and contains the response to all the requirements for independent evaluation of that Stream without reference to or consideration of any Technical Offer submitted for the other Streams.

3. "With respect to M-1, the requirement states "... *Bidders may respond with the following number of personnel for the Partner/Principal resource category if one (1) individual does not meet all minimum education and designation qualifications set out for each sub-category in the applicable Stream...*" which then goes on to list 1-3 Partners depending on the Stream. We interpret this to mean that IF the Partner does meet the category requirements, that we are not required to submit more than one (1) Consultant on each of the Streams (except for Stream 5 where that is N/a). Further, vendors can submit more than one Consultant in Streams 3 and 4 IF the original one (1) Partner does not meet all the requirements. Therefore, IF a vendor proposed one (1) Partner on each Stream that DID meet all the requirements, they would be found compliant in that Stream and are not required to submit more than one (1) consultant against M-1. Is this interpretation correct?"

Answer: This is correct. With respect to Mandatory Requirement M-1, Bidders are only required to respond with one (1) individual for the Partner/Principal resource category and none of the other resource categories will be evaluated for the purpose of section 4.2 (Mandatory Requirements) of the RFSO. Bidders may respond with more than one (1) individual for Stream 3 and 4 only if one (1) individual does not meet all minimum education and designation qualifications set out in section 2 (Statement of Work).

4. "Regarding Stream 3 -Financial Instruments Audit and Related Consulting Services, there are four categories listed including Financial Instruments Valuation, Private Markets Valuation, Financial Instrument/Derivative Accounting and Risk Management. With respect to the qualification criteria for the role positions and related Consultants being proposed in relation to the M-1, are each of these categories evaluated separately, or does line item 2. Minimum Experience apply to the role position as a whole? For clarity sake, are we required to propose four (4) individual Partner/Principal Consultants (each possessing the 10+ years required in 2. Minimum Experience), or are we required to propose one (1) Partner/Principal with 40 years of experience total across each category? This same question applies to Stream 4 and Stream 5."

Answer:

In relation to Mandatory Requirement M-1 (personnel proposed for the Partner/Principal resource category), for Stream 3 (Financial Instruments and Related Consulting Services), if one individual does not meet all minimum education, designation, and experience qualifications for each service sub-category, and multiple individuals are therefore being proposed, one of the individuals must meet all minimum education, designation, and experience qualifications set out for the Financial Instrument/Derivative Accounting sub-category AND any two (2) other



service sub-categories. Up to two (2) additional individuals may be proposed for the Partner/Principal personnel category to cover the remaining service sub-categories for a total of up to three (3) individuals to be evaluated in respect of that personnel category.

In relation to Mandatory Requirement M-1 (personnel proposed for the Partner/Principal resource category), for Stream 4 (Actuarial Services), Bidders may propose a maximum of two (2) individuals in the event that one (1) individual does not meet all minimum education, designation, and experience qualifications set out for each service sub-category in section 2 (Statement of Work).

For example, if the individual proposed for the Partner/Principal personnel category does not meet all minimum education, designation, and experience qualifications set out for both the Insurance sub-category and the Employee Benefits sub-category, then up to one (1) additional individual may be proposed for the Partner/Principal personnel category for a total of two (2) individuals to be evaluated in respect of that personnel category.

Where Bidders respond with more than one (1) individual per resource category, as permitted for Stream 3 and 4 only, the maximum point allocation will be divided equally among the individuals proposed.

For Stream 5 (Special Examination Auditing Services), Mandatory Requirement M-1 does not apply.

5. “What is the preferred method of demonstration of ability to provide Consultants for this bid? How shall vendors illustrate that the Consultants meet the requirements? Typically, grids would be submitted to substantiate qualifications, however, due to the page limits, we do not see how the application of this best practice would be feasible. Would the client be able to share an example, so that vendors are not disqualified on the grounds that they are not illustrating experience according to the standards already set via the original procurement?”

Answer: With respect to section Rated Requirements – Bidder Personnel of section 4.3 (Rated Requirements), Bidders should provide a profile with project summaries for each proposed personnel in the form of a customized résumé or curriculum vitae to demonstrate the individual satisfies the minimum education and designations, and experience qualifications for the applicable categories of Contractor Personnel as described in Section 2 (Statement of Work) of this qualification solicitation.



The OAG will evaluate the breadth and depth of experience (including projects), the relevance and suitability of education, designations and other capabilities or qualifications of the personnel proposed by the Bidder in each of the service sub-categories.

Points will be awarded based on the qualifications, experience, skills and abilities of the Bidder's proposed personnel as relevant to the OAG's requirements.

6. "Regarding Rated Requirements - Bidder, A-2; please confirm the three (3) projects required are for the bidder and not for the Consultants being proposed. Further, to effectively produce a proposal, and illustrate how vendors are compliant, we are unclear how we are to demonstrate compliance with this, while remaining within the page limits."

Answer: Correct. The three (3) projects summaries required are for the bidder. For greater certainty, the Bidder is the supplier, who is the person or entity submitting a proposal responding to the requirements of the qualification solicitation and having legal capacity to contract.

Bidders are expected to provide project summaries that will best demonstrate how they can satisfy various requirements described in section 2 (Statement of Work). We expect that project summaries will be provided where Bidder's involvement was substantive. For clarity, Bidders should add a description to demonstrate their level of involvement.

7. "Please reference Rated Requirements - Bidder Personnel, page 33/65, our team has reviewed the requirement and each of us have a different interpretation varying from one (1) Consultant total up to five (5) Consultants total. Obviously this is a very wide interpretation. Therefore, please clarify that IF we propose one (1) Partner that fits ALL of the qualifications of the Manager, Senior Auditor, Auditor, etc., then we only need to submit that one (1) Partner Consultant to gain full points, as by virtue of their fitting the Partner role, they automatically qualify (as substantiating) the other roles within that Stream and gain full points. Kindly confirm whether or not this interpretation is correct, and if it is not correct, how shall we respond in a way that achieves full points?"

Answer: No, this interpretation is not correct. Bidders should propose at least one (1) individual resource for each personnel category, as described on page 34/65. Please also refer to Answer #5.

8. "Are vendors required to sign and execute the Master Agreement on submission of our Proposal?"

Answer: Bidders are not required to sign and execute the Master Agreement on submission of their proposal(s).