

1.0 EVALUATION OF RESPONSES

1.1 Evaluation Team

The City has formulated the procedures set out in this RFSQ to ensure that it reviews and scores Responses through an open, competitive process, and that Respondents receive fair and equitable treatment in the solicitation, receipt and evaluation of their Responses. The City may reject the Response of any Respondent who fails to comply with any such procedures or are otherwise non-compliant.

The Evaluation Team will include members from City of Toronto City of Toronto Project Management Office, Corporate Real Estate Management Division. The Evaluation Team may, at its sole discretion, retain additional members or advisors as it deems appropriate.

By responding to this RFSQ, Respondents will be deemed to have agreed that the decision of the Evaluation Team will be final. The Evaluation Team will review and analyze the Response(s) of each Respondent to determine which Responses, in the Evaluation Team's determination, are most responsive to and best meet the City's requirements, as set out in this RFSQ and score the Responses accordingly.

By responding to this RFSQ, Respondents will be deemed to have agreed that the decision of the Evaluation Team will be final.

1.2 Stages of Submission Evaluation

The City will conduct the evaluation of Responses in the following four (4) stages:

1.2.1 Stage 1 - Mandatory Submission Requirements Stage

Stage I will consist of a review to determine which Responses substantially comply with all of the mandatory submission requirements. Responses failing to satisfy the mandatory submission requirements as of the Submission Deadline will be provided with an opportunity within the Rectification Period to rectify any submission deficiencies. Responses failing to satisfy the mandatory submission requirements within the Rectification Period will be excluded from further consideration. The Rectification Period will begin to run from the date and time that the City issues its rectification notice to the Respondent(s).

Please refer to Section 1.3 for more details.

1.2.2 Stage 2 - Rated Criteria Stage

Responses that are deemed compliant in Stage 1, will qualify to be evaluated further. Stage 2 will consist of a scoring by the City of each qualified Response on the basis of the rated criteria.

Responses failing to meet the minimum score requirements for a rated requirement, where applicable, will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

Only Respondents who have met the minimum threshold of 65% (or 60 out of 52 points) in Stage 2 can proceed to Stage 3 – Pricing to have their proposed costs evaluated.

If less than three (3) Respondents passed the 65% threshold for Stage 2, the City reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to cancel the Roster or reduce the minimum threshold to 60% or 48 points.

Please refer to Sections 1.4 and 2.0 for more details.

1.2.3 Stage 3 - Evaluation of Pricing

Stage 3 will consist of an evaluation and scoring of pricing submitted by the Respondent, as set out in Part 7 – Instructions to Pricing Form and Evaluation of Pricing.

Please refer to Section 1.5 for more details.

1.2.4 Stage 4 – Ranking and Tie Break of Respondents

Please refer to Section 1.6 for more details.

1.3 Stage 1 – Review of Mandatory Requirements, Submission and Rectification

1.3.1 Submission Deadline and Rectification

Responses must be submitted by the Submission Deadline. Other than inserting the information requested on the mandatory submission forms set out in this RFSQ, a Respondent may not make any changes to any of the forms. Respondents submitting Responses that do not meet the mandatory submission requirements will be provided with an opportunity to rectify deficiencies within the Rectification Period.

1.3.2 Submission Form (Part 6)

Each Response must include a Submission Form (Part 6) completed and signed by a person authorized to bind the Respondent.

1.3.3 Other Mandatory Requirements

- 1) Certificate of Practice issued by the Ontario Association of Architects (OAA); and
- 2) Certificate of Authorization issued by Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO)

1.3.4 Rectification Period

Responses satisfying the mandatory submission content requirements within the Rectification Period will proceed to Stage 2. Responses failing to satisfy the mandatory submission content requirements within the Rectification Period will be excluded from further consideration.

1.4 Stage 2 – Evaluation of Rated Criteria

1.4.1 Rated Criteria

The Responses will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in Section 2.0.

1.5 Stage 3 – Pricing

Only at completion of all rated requirements for all eligible Responses will the envelope containing Part 7 – Pricing be opened.

1.6 Stage 4 - Ranking and Tie Break of Respondents

- 1.6.1 Although it is the intention of the City to prequalify up to eight (8) highest ranking Respondents, the City may choose to invite additional Respondents if their total score is within twenty-five (25%) of the highest scoring Respondent.
- 1.6.2 For Rotational Roster Method, up to eight (8) highest ranking Respondent will be awarded with blanket contracts. The Respondent that receives the highest Total Score under Stage 2 and 3 will be ranked First (1st).
 - 1.6.2.1 In the event of a tie score, the Respondent rankings will be determined by way of highest score earned in Stage 2 of the evaluation process. If there is still a tie score, City staff are to first consider whether any of the relevant Proponents are a Diverse

Supplier as defined in the Social Procurement Policy to break a tie. If no such Supplier is a Diverse Supplier, then the tie will be broken by way of a coin toss or lottery.

- 1.6.3 For Second Stage Competitive Roster Method, there is no maximum number of prequalified suppliers. Respondents that passed the minimum threshold under Stage 2 Evaluations will be included in the Prequalified List.”

1.7 Trade Agreement and Supplier Eligibility Requirements

Point Preference Adjustment Factor: A 10% point preference will be calculated for bids submitted by Canadian Suppliers and Trade Partner Suppliers, by taking the total score for each individual bid submitted by a Canadian Supplier and Trade Partner Supplier, multiplying each individual total score by 10%, and applying the additional resulting points to the individual total score for each bid submitted by a Canadian Suppliers and Trade Partner Supplier.

Total score for Canadian Supplier or Trade Partner Supplier prior to point preference adjustment

**_____ + Additional 10% for Canadian Suppliers and Trade Partner Suppliers
= New total score for Canadian Suppliers and Trade Partner Suppliers only**

Non-American Supplier Preference: If the highest-ranked bid was submitted by a USA Based Supplier, and if the highest ranked bid from a Non-American Supplier is within 20% of the price in the bid submitted by the USA Based Supplier, the City reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, prefer the next highest-ranked Non-American Supplier and award the contract to the Non-American Supplier. The City shall be entitled to exercise or not exercise such right in its sole and absolute discretion and without liability, cost or penalty to any supplier or other person.

1.8 Conditions of Pre-Qualification

As a condition of pre-qualification, the highest-ranked Respondents being considered for the pre-qualification list shall provide a signed Supplier Attestation confirming the Respondent’s status in accordance with the definitions of suppliers set out in Part 3a Section 1.2 of the RFSQ (i.e. Canadian Supplier, Trade Partner Supplier or None of the Above). The Supplier Attestation shall be signed by an Authorized Signing Officer of the Supplier. The Respondent’s failure to provide a signed Supplier Attestation shall constitute sufficient grounds for the City to rescind inclusion on the prequalified list or terminate any resulting agreement awarded to the Respondent.

The signed Supplier Attestation must be submitted within ten (10) business days of request by the City of Toronto.

If the Attestation is not submitted within the required timeframe, the response submission will receive no further consideration.

1.9 Contract Award and Execution

The City intends to finalize the agreement with the short-listed Respondent(s). Respondents are reminded that there is a question and answer period available if they wish to ask questions or seek clarification about the terms and conditions set out in Part 4 (Master Roster Consulting Agreement). The City will consider such requests for clarification at that time, and will not make substantive changes to those terms after the Closing Deadline.

Once a Response has been accepted by the City, the Procurement Contact will notify the short-listed Respondent(s) that it has been awarded the contract, subject to the terms and conditions set out in Part 4 (Master Roster Consulting Agreement). Upon notification that the Master Roster Consulting Agreement is available for execution, the selected Supplier shall sign, date and return the completed Form of Agreement within ten (10) Working Days of its receipt, along with any required Supplier Attestation, performance security or insurance certificates. The Supplier Attestation (set out in Section 6.2.1 of the Ariba Sourcing Event) is an additional document that must be provided by the selected Supplier in addition to any other documentation required by the terms and conditions of the Form of Agreement.

If requested by the City, the selected Respondent will execute and deliver the Master Roster Consulting Agreement and any required Supplier Attestation, performance security and insurance certificates in a digital form that is legally verifiable and enforceable.

After award, the failure of the selected supplier to execute the Form of Agreement as finalized, or submit the necessary Supplier Attestation, performance security or insurance certificates, shall constitute sufficient grounds to rescind the award and may constitute grounds to suspend the Respondent from being eligible to submit bids on further procurements for such period of time as may be determined under the City's Supplier Code of Conduct in the City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 195. If a Respondent is suspended on such grounds, the City may then invite the next-best-ranked Respondent to enter into negotiations to finalize an agreement or the City may elect to suspend, modify and/or cancel this solicitation (with or without the substitution of another solicitation).

2.0 RATED EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.1 Evaluation Table

The following sections set out the categories, weightings and descriptions of the rated criteria for the RFSQ. Respondents who do not meet a minimum threshold score for a category will not proceed to the next stage of the evaluation process.

The City will not have any knowledge of any information contained in the Part 7- Pricing until evaluations for the Technical Response portion of the Bid are completed. The City uses an electronic envelope for Part 7 within the City Online Procurement System which is only opened once Respondents have passed Stage 2.

Request for Supplier Qualifications – Doc5572034849

Part 2 – Evaluation, Negotiation and Award

Rated Response		
Rated Criteria Category	Weighting (Points)	Minimum Threshold*
1. Respondent Profile	Total 8 points	n/a
a. <i>Company Profile and History (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.2.1.a)</i>	5	
b. Commitment to Diversity		
1. <i>Commitment to providing equitable access to subcontracting opportunities for diverse suppliers (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.2.2.a.1)</i>	1	
2. <i>Commitment to a pro-active employment diversity program (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.2.2.a.2)</i>	1	
3. <i>Diversity certification (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.2.2.b)</i>	1	
2. Experience and Qualifications of the Respondent (in accordance with Part 8, Sections 1.3.1 to 1.3.3)	Total 21 points	65% or 13.65 points
a. <i>Project 1: Plumbing</i>	7	
b. <i>Project 2: HVAC/Electrical</i>	7	
c. <i>Project 3: Architectural/Structural</i>	7	
3. Proposed Staff Team and Resources	Total 21 points	65% or 13.65 points
a. <i>List of Staff/Personnel (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.4.1.a)</i>	11	
b. <i>strategies and individuals (back-ups) that can fulfill the roles and responsibilities for any unforeseen events (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.4.1.b)</i>	8	
c. <i>Organizational chart (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.4.1.c.1)</i>	2	
3. Proposed Project Solution	Total 30 points	65% or 19.50 points

Rated Response		
Rated Criteria Category	Weighting (Points)	Minimum Threshold*
a. <i>Design Services (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.5.1)</i>	10	
b. <i>Client Relationship Management (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.5.2)</i>	5	
c. <i>Cost, Time and Scope Management (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.5.3)</i>	10	
d. <i>Quality and Risk Management (in accordance with Part 8, Section 1.5.4)</i>	5	
Total Rated Criteria	80 points	65% or 52 points
Pricing (See Part 7 for details)	20 points	n/a
Total Points	100 points	n/a

2.2 Scoring System

Responses will be evaluated and scored using the Scoring Criteria outlined in the table below. Responses will be reviewed, evaluated and assigned a numerical score ranging from a minimum of zero (0) to five (5):

Score	Rating	Detailed Description
5	Excellent	Fully meets the City's requirement. Submission demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirement in ways that bring benefit(s) to the City.
4	Good	Mostly meets the City's requirement. The Suppliers submission mostly meets the City's requirements with some minor deficiencies.
3	Adequate	An adequate response that demonstrates the ability to meet some of the City's criteria and requirements with major deficiencies noted.
2	Fair	Falls short of meeting the City's requirement. Submission addresses some components of the requirement; Major issues/risks identified in submission. Demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the requirement.

1	Poor	Minimal response, e.g. statement of compliance with no substantiation. Submission is unacceptable, demonstrates little or no understanding of the requirement; criterion is absent from submission.
0	Unsatisfactory	Non-responsive (e.g., a statement and/or substantiation that does not address the requirement). Does not offer an explanation or ability to answer the question and/or meet the requirement.