

# Research Briefs to Accelerate Market Transformation in Green Buildings

## Request for Proposal (RFP) - Addendum

Addendum Details	Details
Edition	#1
Posting Date	2025-08-28
Reference	<b>25-034</b>

Where no notice is given, the Canada Green Building Council (CAGBC) copyrights all information contained herein.

## 1. Overview

This addendum forms part of the Research Briefs to Accelerate Market Transformation in Green Buildings RFP for the Canada Green Building Council (CAGBC), including all related documents, and amends the RFP as noted below:

## 2. Additions/Adjustments

There are no fundamental changes to the RFP at this time.

## 3. Questions & Responses

In its sole discretion, CAGBC may choose to consolidate responses or not address submitted questions for any reason whatsoever.

#	Question/Response
1	<p>Would CAGBC consider sharing draft terms of the Master Service Agreement?</p> <p><i>As stated in the RFP, we do not wish to distribute copies of our standard service contract at the onset of the procurement process.</i></p> <p><i>It would not be fair to distribute it to some proponents but not others... and unfortunately, if it is shared with <u>all</u> proponents, that often opens the door to proponents focusing on our terms &amp; conditions, rather than their proposal submissions.</i></p> <p><i>As CAGBC's time, resources, and legal assistance is limited, we can only engage in such negotiations with the successful proponent.</i></p>

	<i>We would like to remind proponents that our RFP process is non-binding. A successful proponent does not have to accept our MSA if the T&amp;Cs are in significant conflict with their requirements.</i>
2	<p>Is CAGBC able to grant an extension on the submission deadline?</p> <p><i>This RFP is associated with a funded project that CAGBC is working on, and we need to meet our own project deadlines and deliverables. Unfortunately, we are unable to grant any extensions in this procurement activity.</i></p>
3	<p>Availability of Financial &amp; Performance Data: Can you please clarify whether CAGBC currently maintains structured and accessible data for its LEED and Zero Carbon Building (ZCB) certified projects, particularly in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital cost premiums and financing structures</li> <li>• Operational cost savings</li> <li>• ROI metrics, asset valuation, or cap rate impacts</li> <li>• Qualitative owner insights related to business case development or co-benefits</li> </ul> <p>Understanding the extent of available data (versus what would need to be obtained directly from owners) will help us accurately scope the required level of outreach and primary data collection.</p> <p><i>CAGBC maintains structured technical and performance data for LEED and Zero Carbon Building (ZCB) certified projects. However, detailed financial data (e.g., capital cost premiums, ROI, valuations, etc.) is not held in a standardized dataset and will primarily come from structured interviews/surveys with owners.</i></p> <p><i>CAGBC will provide project-level data it holds and is able to release and will collaborate with the successful proponent in accessing owners/developers; however, proponents should plan to collect financial information directly.</i></p>
4	<p>Project Timeline Feasibility: We are concerned about the feasibility of the proposed project schedule. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The October 2025 deadline for completing data collection and analysis for the residential briefs may be <b>challenging</b>, given the time needed to secure interviews and collect sensitive financial data from owners.</li> <li>• The overall timeline—from initial outreach to drafting and finalizing five detailed Research Briefs and a cross-cutting compendium by March–May 2026—appears <b>compressed</b>, especially when factoring in the required stakeholder engagement, validation, and production of designed, AODA-compliant outputs.</li> </ul> <p>Could you clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether there is flexibility in these deadlines, or</li> <li>• If CAGBC will play a supporting role in facilitating owner engagement or already has early commitments for participation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Internal milestone adjustments may be possible, leading up to 90% final drafts of all briefs by March 2026, with publication adjusted if needed. CAGBC will support owner engagement by sharing its certified project database and facilitating introductions and then expects the proponent to lead the outreach. Proponents should outline timeline considerations in their approach.</i></p>
5	<i>"While engineering and building science expertise may be subcontracted, financial analysis and valuation expertise must be core to the proponent's service portfolio".</i>

	<p>I want to confirm if this means there is a requirement for a team member to have a financial qualification, or if previous experience completing financial analysis and valuations will be sufficient?</p> <p><i>The RFP requires financial analysis and valuation expertise as a core service of the proponent's team. This does not mandate a formal financial designation. But the team must show strong, demonstrated experience in financial analysis, valuation techniques, and deep understanding of real estate finance.</i></p>
6	<p>Can proponents include a skills matrix (1–2 pages) in Appendix B in addition to the CVs?</p> <p><i>Yes, proponents may include a 1–2 page skills matrix in Appendix B in addition to CVs, as long as CVs remain consolidated to one PDF.</i></p>
7	<p>If additional funding becomes available (up to \$200K), does CAGBC have preferred areas for its allocation or expansion?</p> <p><i>Per Section 2.3, additional funding could allow scaling by,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Expanding asset class coverage</i></li> <li><i>Increase the number of buildings sampled</i></li> <li><i>Engaging more owners in interviews/ surveys/ focus group discussions</i></li> </ul> <p><i>However, proponents should clearly state what factors can be scaled up or down in a short budget narrative.</i></p>
8	<p>Regarding the industry roundtable/briefing, what level of involvement is expected from the proponent? For example, is it a single 2-hour session, multiple sessions, or a broader facilitation role?</p> <p><i>At least one roundtable/briefing is required (Refer Stage 4: Engagement). It is envisioned as a single 90-minute session organized by CAGBC where the proponent participates and presents findings. Broader facilitation or multiple sessions are not required but may be included if a proponent wishes to include this in their approach.</i></p>
9	<p>Beyond AODA compliance, are there any additional accessibility or bilingual (English/French) requirements for the deliverables?</p> <p><i>Deliverables must comply with AODA standards for digital assets while complying with the CAGBC's Brand Guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>No additional bilingual requirement is expected from the proponent, though CAGBC may choose to translate materials later in to French.</i></p>
10	<p>May proponents embed hyperlinks to external company reports within their proposals to further demonstrate their expertise and relevant experience.</p> <p><i>Yes. Hyperlinks to external reports may be included to illustrate expertise, provided the proposal otherwise meets format requirements stated in the RFP (PDF for Technical Proposal, Excel for Financial Proposal).</i></p>
11	<p>The RFP notes an interest in the qualitative factors/co-benefits that contribute to the business case for green buildings (pg. 2). Where feasible, does CAGBC see value in having those factors/co-benefits quantified and/or monetized?</p> <p><i>Yes. Where feasible, proponents are encouraged to quantify or monetize co-benefits, as this strengthens the business case (Section 1.2, Purpose, and 2.1.2, Business Case Definition and Framing). The proponent may detail the approach they believe is most relevant.</i></p>
12	<p>The RFP notes the project requires a multi-disciplinary team (pg. 6). May CAGBC clarify the expected role(s) that Architects, Engineers, and/or Building Scientists would have on the project?</p>

	<i>These roles are expected to provide technical insights that complements the financial analysis. Key inputs include but not limited to identify and analyze key technical and building performance data from the database, contextualize performance metrics, design decisions, and technical factors in relation to financial outcomes.</i>
13	<p>Criteria B1(c) of the Technical Proposal evaluation (pg. 10) notes that all examples should be Canadian based projects. If we provide examples from outside of Canada, in addition to the 2 required Canadian project examples, will those international examples be included in the evaluation?</p> <p><i>Evaluation criteria (Section B1.c) require two Canadian-based examples. Additional international examples may be included for context but will not substitute for Canadian examples. Their consideration in evaluation is at CAGBC's discretion.</i></p>
14	<p>Is the additional budget (for the total of \$175,000 - \$200,000) expected to be procured via CAGBC or the project team?</p> <p><i>Any additional budget (up to \$200K) will be procured by CAGBC. Proponents should structure their proposal to demonstrate how scope augments within the stated funding envelop (Minimum \$100K and Maximum \$200K)</i></p>
15	<p>Within the RFP, it seems that the focus of the briefs is on both new construction and retrofits (with emphasis on NC for MURBs and emphasis on retrofits for Office). From our understanding and experience, the business case and financial investment implications for these two types of investments (1 - New Construction / Major Renovation and 2 - Retrofits) are significantly different. Can you confirm that the briefs and the associated financial analysis is to be developed from both perspectives for each property type?</p> <p><i>Yes. The briefs are expected to address both perspectives of new construction and retrofits, depending on the data availability.</i></p>
16	<p>The implication of the RFP is that 50-75 certified buildings exist that will allow for a representative sample suitable for the quantitative analysis requested in the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the CaGBC confirm that there are sufficient certified projects in the past 5-15 years that will allow for a representative sample of what is defined as "Green Building" (i.e. per 2.1.1) today? We ask this question, recognizing that the definition of Green Building will be clarified as part of the work. However, we trust that the CaGBC recognizing that even 5-10 years ago many facilities which were LEED Gold certified did not include fuel-switching sufficient to achieve more contemporary goals of decarbonization.</li> </ul> <p>If, after trying to engage with 50-75 selected sites, a representative sample is not present (for one reason or another) will the consultant team be held accountable to expand the search to make the sample representative across all asset types?</p> <p><i>Yes. CAGBC expects the proponent to draw from 50-75 LEED Gold/Platinum or ZCB-certified buildings from the last 5–15 years. If a fully representative sample is not feasible, CAGBC will work collaboratively with the proponent on determining next steps. Consultants will not be penalized for factors outside their control.</i></p>
17	<p>Please confirm that the expected source of all quantitative information for the study - including incremental capital costs and estimated operational cost savings- is to be from the developers/owners/operators of the sample buildings, or from their CaGBC submission applications. To be clear, this statement means that there will not be additional study data</p>

	prepared by the consultant team of the facilities in question or from other/outside archetypal material (for example, through the work of energy modelers or cost consultants).
	<p><i>Quantitative information (capital costs, operational savings) should primarily come from owners/developers/operators through interviews/surveys/focus groups and from CAGBC's database.</i></p> <p><i>Consultants are not expected to collect or generate (model) additional study data.</i></p>

---

## 4. Terms & Conditions

1. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.
  2. Proponents are required to acknowledge all Addenda in their Proposal submission. See Appendix A – Submission Form.
- 

Best Regards,

CAGBC Procurement Team  
[corporateservices@cagbc.org](mailto:corporateservices@cagbc.org)