

## Questions as related to the Statement of Work (Annex A) of Bid Solicitation No. 5000053495

1. The CARB-sponsored survey that serves as a template for the proposed Canadian project was designed to capture equipment types that fall under the “lawn & garden” and “light commercial” categories of off-road SSI engines. Table 1 of the Statement of Work lists out 18 explicit equipment types – with the stated qualification that these are the “main pieces of equipment”. Are these the only 18 equipment types of interest to the study or is the intent of the survey to cover all SSI off-road engines (as well as the electric-powered equivalents) or a targeted subset?

Answer: The intent is to capture all equipment with Small Spark Ignition (SSI) engines (as well as their electric powered equivalents). However, the 18 equipment types listed in Table 1 would be brought up to survey respondents with specific questions. The other types would have to be mentioned by survey respondents while responding to a more general question such as: Do you have any other type of equipment?

2. Leaving the electric-powered applications aside, is the remainder of the scope only related to spark-ignition internal combustion engines that are specifically gasoline powered? Or are other spark-ignition engine fuel types of interest (LPG and CNG) which are less common fuel types?

Answer: The scope of the work only includes gasoline powered equipment and electric powered equipment (battery or corded).

3. Is it the intent of the proposed effort to exclude recreational marine applications?

Answer: The scope of the work does not include recreational marine applications.

4. Is it the intent of the proposed effort to exclude recreational vehicles and equipment (i.e., off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, and off-road utility vehicles)?

Answer: The scope of the work does not include recreational vehicles and equipment (i.e., off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, and off-road utility vehicles), except for golf-carts and go-carts.

5. Is it the intent of the proposed effort that equipment rental companies are inherently part of the Task 2 general business survey?

Answer: Equipment rental companies are part of Task 2, general business survey, as potential caretakers maintaining the landscaped yard at their store site. The equipment that these companies rent to customers would only be captured from the user perspective (when respondents to the survey under Tasks 1, 2 and 3 have rented equipment themselves and used it).

6. Is it the intent of the proposed effort that equipment used at agricultural facilities are inherently part of the Task 2 general business survey?

Answer: Yes

7. Is it the intent of the proposed effort that equipment used in commercial timber harvesting (e.g., commercial chainsaws) are inherently part of the Task 2 general business survey?

Answer: Yes

8. The CARB-sponsored study that provides the template questionnaire modified for the RFP (Appendix 1) did not consider government or institutional sources as part of that agency's general business survey effort. The proposed Canadian effort does include government sources as part of the Task 2 general business survey – with the implicit assumption that the same questionnaire can address both general business and government ownership. It is the intent for the proposed effort to cover the draft list of government entities listed below?
- 204 federal agencies
  - 48 national parks
  - 13 provinces and territories. For example, Ontario has over 170 provincial agencies and over 360 community organizations and boards
  - >1,000 provincial and territorial parks
  - 550 ports, 17 port authorities
  - 500 airports (27 are federally owned)
  - 5,162 municipalities according to the Canadian Census. Of these, there are 3,573 municipalities that have local governing responsibilities.
  - 850 hospitals owned and operated by non-profit organizations (might overlap with Task 2 general business survey)
  - 679 school districts covering 15,500 primary and secondary schools
  - 98 universities (1.8 million enrolled)
  - 3,672 fire departments
  - Libraries, museums

**Answer: Based on the question, we have reconsidered the need to include all government entities in this survey and have decided to include only municipalities. An amended RFP has been posted reflecting that change.**

9. Are branches of the military included or excluded from the government equipment survey?

**Answer: Branches of the military are excluded from the survey.**

10. Is it the intent of the survey information to be collected exclusively by telephone? Instances of ownership of a larger equipment inventories may be more accurately handled by form filling and electronic file transfer.

**Answer: No, the survey information does not need to be collected exclusively by telephone.**

11. The proposal states that bid valued in excess of \$180,000 will be considered “non-responsive”. Can a bid be divided into a “base effort” that falls under the \$180,000 threshold and an “optional effort” of additional improvements – or would this bid also be considered non-responsive?

**Answer: Any bid in excess of \$180,000 will not be accepted and deemed non-compliant. There are no other alternatives when submitting a bid.**

12. The RFP requests that “the results from the surveys are to be statistically significant (aiming as much as possible at 95% confidence level with a margin of error of  $\pm 8.0$  points) throughout Canada and in every province and territory.” The accuracy of the survey-based results will be specific to each equipment type – not uniform across all equipment types; certain equipment types with lower ownership rates (e.g., generator set or compressor) may have greater uncertainty. Will it be acceptable for a geographic resolution that groups the Atlantic provinces and/or the territories for

certain survey coverage elements within the methodology (while still reporting results at the province and territorial level)?

Answer: Yes

13. The participation rate and accuracy of the project could depend upon flexibility in the schedule – primarily as it relates to the Task 2 (general business) and Task 3 (landscaping vendors) surveys. Given that Deliverables 4.5 and 4.6 precede the commencement of surveys, there is a maximum of 5 and 6 weeks available for data collection and processing for Task 2 and 3 surveys, respectively. Whereas the CARB-sponsored survey effort allowed for (1) a round of initial survey sampling followed by survey improvement and (2) review and input from industry stakeholders on questionnaire preparation. Those efforts would be useful to the proposed Canadian project as well but may not fit into the proposed schedule. Moreover it should be noted that (1) not all of the technical issues were resolved in the CARB-sponsored effort and (2) the government survey of the proposed Canadian effort is effectively a separate survey (as the communication route, stratification scheme and data request will likely be distinct from those items of the general business survey). Is there any flexibility in the scheduling?

Answer: There is flexibility to rearrange tasks within the 21 weeks allotment in the RFP (e.g. doing tasks in parallel instead of sequentially). Also, clarifications to the scope of the survey mentioned in the answer to question 8 as well as other answers should, at least partially, address this concern. In the methodology proposed by the bidder, municipalities could be surveyed in a separate effort from the more general business survey, if the bidder prefers a separate approach to achieve the results. If you still perceive a risk with the timelines, we would invite you to mention it in your proposal.

14. In Annex A (page 31) it states that the margin of error should be  $\pm 8.0\%$  in each province and territory. Is the error rate that is applied based on the total completed surveys by type by province, regardless if they own or use the products being assessed? For example, if 400 households are surveyed in a province, and 200 use/have the products identified, is the error rate based on the 400 or the 200?

Answer: The error rate would be based on the total of completed surveys by type by province. In your example, it would be based on 400 completed surveys whether or not they use/have a type of product. From the results of the survey, we need to be able to infer the number of a type of equipment in the population.

15. In Annex A (page 31), is the  $\pm 8.0\%$  error rate also applied for each individual territory (NU, YT, NT) or the 3 territories together?

Answer: It is possible to regroup the territories to meet the error margin. Results still need to be reported for each territory.

16. Deliverables and Schedule (page 31) #4.2 and 4.3 – Deliverables for item 4.2 indicates that changes to draft questionnaire should be submitted by 3 weeks, but item 4.3 says provide draft questions at 7 weeks. Can the difference between these two tasks be clarified (as well as deliverable of draft surveys under 4.5 for business and 4.6 for landscaping companies)?

Answer: Thank you for pointing out the problem with the table that is included in the Deliverables and Schedule section of Annex A. An amended RFP has been published. Note that there is flexibility to rearrange tasks within the 21 weeks allotment in the RFP (e.g. doing tasks in parallel instead of sequentially).

17. Given that EC has already developed the surveys, how much feedback is EC looking for on changes to the survey?

Answer: At a minimum, the survey questionnaires are to be reviewed to ensure quality, consistency and that the wording is appropriate for the Canadian context. Also, the questionnaires would need to be adapted to the methodology/approach proposed. For example, some questions may be irrelevant for one approach while additional questions are needed under a different approach.

18. Who will be responsible for translating the surveys into French – the vendor or EC?

Answer: The draft survey questionnaires included in the RFP are already translated (see versions of the RFP in both languages). The Contractor will be responsible for translating any revised or added text.

19. For the survey of households, is EC open to conducting the survey via a panel or is the touchpoint expected to be a random-digit survey?

Answer: The methodology proposed by the bidder needs to achieve the objectives and requirements of the RFP. It should be based on sound/recognised surveying principals, but the intent of the RFP is not to be restrictive. In the bidder's proposal, the methodology needs to be clearly described, logical and coherent.