Addendum Number: 1

Request for Proposal: **ISI Accessibility Audit RFP 2021-001**

Date Issued: February 11, 2021

Issued by: Li Lei

Addendum #1 is issued in response to submitted questions and to provide further clarity.

Note: More information will be provided in Addendum #2.

Question 1 – Under Section 5.3.2, it asks if the proponent can provide bilingual services. Can you please clarify the services? Does this mean the report needs to be delivered in both languages? Will this influence the rated criteria scores?

Answer 1 – No, the audit report does not need to be delivered in both languages. Please outline your bilingual capabilities, it is not a mandatory requirement and it will not influence the rated criteria scores. The awarded supplier should discuss the language requirement with the French speaking member(s) to meet their needs effectively.

Question 2 – Will all buildings listed in Appendix H be needing audits?

Answer 2 – All buildings listed in Appendix H are the buildings from members who initially indicated their interest in participating in this agreement. We anticipate that all these buildings will need audits, which will be started at staggered dates throughout this agreement.

Question 3 – Will participating universities supply supplemental documents such as plans, drawings, and photos of the building's interior and exterior to facilitate the audit process?

Answer 3 – It is our intention. Although some buildings are older; thus, it can be difficult to retrieve this information. The awarded supplier should discuss their needs with each member before starting the audit process.

Question 4 – Are the participating universities listed in Appendix D Section 5.5.2 in order of priority? i.e., is it expected that we audit Acadia first, then CBU, then Mount St. Vincent, and so on?

Answer 4 – No. They are not listed based on priority. ISI participating members will contact the awarded supplier, pending on their schedule and operational needs. Individual members will set up meetings with the awarded supplier to discuss and agree upon the specific project timelines.

Question 5 – Our typical audit reports include site photos, observations, short and long-term recommendations, and illustrations; would such a level of comprehensiveness be expected in the audit report deliverables for this RFP? Or would the expected audit report be in a more simplified checklist format (such as the ones used in the NS interim guidelines and the Rick Hansen Foundation)?

Answer 5 – ISI requires the proponents to provide their typical audit report as the sample audit report. Please ensure your audit report will include the requirements noted in the NS Interim Guidelines.

Question 6 – Under Rated Criteria, it indicates "Key Local Personnel and Experience in the field" – is ISI only looking to hiring consultants from Atlantic Canada? Please clarify.

Answer 6 – No. We are open for proponents outside Atlantic Canada if the proponent can travel to participating members' campuses and complete the audit project based on the agreement set up with members. However, the public health travel restriction and the self-isolation timeline should be carefully assessed when the proponents assess this RFP opportunity and prepare for their proposal.

Question 7 – How much preference will be given to those that are RHFAC professionals? 5%, 25%?

Answer 7 – There will not be a percentage assigned to this certification. ISI will assess the proponent's overall qualification, and the certification is only one factor being considered.

Question 8 - Please confirm regarding the pricing – The proposal pricing appears to be by the university. Are all the buildings listed in the provided excel document to be considered in the costing? Thus, costing would be by each university only and not by individual buildings.

Answer 8 – Yes, that is correct. All the buildings listed in Appendix H should be considered when the proponent prepares for their fee submission, particularly for the number of business days to complete the audit and deliver the audit report. The daily rate should be proposed by each university, not by individual buildings.

End of this Addendum.