

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### For the Review of the Partnership's Procurement Model

RFP No. RP211-2015-01 – Addendum #3

### QUESTIONS & ANSWERS # 2

Please see the answers below regarding any questions raised in relation to this RFP.

**1. Question:**

*Is there a minimum scoring requirement for the first two rating criteria (out of a total of 60%), in order to qualify to move on as 1 of the top 3 proponents for the next stage (interview stage)?*

**Answer:**

There is no minimum score for each rating criteria, however only the top scoring proposals will move on to the interview stage.

**2. Question:**

*What are the drivers for this assignment at this time (2016) given that the Partnership's procurement policies were last revised in 2009 and again in 2012?*

**Answer:**

The Partnership prides itself on continuously improving the way it operates. Reviewing the procurement model at this time will allow us to determine if any adjustments are required to the current procurement model to ensure the approach to engaging partners, sourcing vendors and selecting talent optimizes achievement of outcomes to advance Canada's cancer strategy, organizational effectiveness, and the value and impact of work undertaken with partners.

**3. Question:**

***Can you confirm that Ontario's BPS Procurement Directives have a large influence on CPAC procurement policies? Case study descriptions be included in the main body of the submission? Or as appendices?***

**Answer:**

The Partnership is a federally funded organization. Funding is received through a contribution from Health Canada. As such, the Broader Public Sector Procurement Directive is not a mandatory requirement. However, the Partnership engages with numerous vendors across Canada, including Ontario, and the BPS is considered best practice in public sector procurement.

The case study descriptions should be included in the main body of the submission. Descriptions may, for example, include an outline of the problem, solution implemented and the outcomes achieved. Case studies do not have to be related to the references provided in Schedule D Form 1. If deemed necessary, case studies may also be included as appendices.

**4. Question:**

***Does the BPS Procurement Directive apply to CPAC and if so, is it being used as procurement guidelines for Ontario only or pan-Canadian?***

**Answer:**

Please see Question # 3

**5. Question:**

***For the first two rated criteria, can CPAC share the weighting for the sub-criteria? E.g. For the first Rating Criteria, what percentage of the 30% applies to "Familiarity with grants and program development"? Similarly, for the other sub-bullets.***

**Answer:**

Each criteria is evaluated on a whole, weighting is not assigned to sub-criteria.

**6. Question:**

***Has there been (one or more) a consultancy / consultant / outside third party adviser / vendor advising the Partnership in a similar or related capacity (i.e.***

*procurement advice) over the last few years? If so, would the Partnership, acting reasonably and in an open, fair and transparent manner, consider that entity better positioned (than any other firm) to respond to this RFP?*

**Answer:**

This is the Partnership's first attempt to secure an external vendor to review its procurement model and provide feedback and recommendations.