

## **1.0 EVALUATION OF RESPONSES**

### **1.1 Responses**

Respondents should respond to this RFSQ in accordance with the instructions and terms set out in this RFSQ.

### **1.2 Stages of Submission Evaluation**

The City will conduct the evaluation of Responses in the following three (3) stages:

#### **1.2.1 Stage 1 - Mandatory Submission Requirements Stage**

Stage 1 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).

#### **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 set out in Section 2.0. Responses failing to meet the minimum score requirements for a rated requirement, where applicable, will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

It is the City's intention to prequalify, through this RFSQ, a minimum of three [3] Respondents for each scope. The City may choose to prequalify additional Respondents, for each scope if their total score is within (5%) of the highest scoring Respondent.

#### **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 – Pricing Form and Evaluation of Pricing.

#### **1.2.4 Stage 4 – Tie Break and Ranking of Respondents.**

## **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

Request for Supplier Qualifications – Doc5421410915  
Part 2 – Evaluation, Negotiation and Award

---

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 Reference Form (Part 6)**

Each Respondent must complete a Reference Form (Part 6) and include it with its Response.

**1.3.4 Rectification Period**

Responses satisfying the mandatory submission requirements within the Rectification Period will proceed to Stage 2. Responses failing to satisfy the mandatory submission 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 below.

**1.5 Stage 3 – Pricing**

The evaluation of price will be undertaken after the evaluation of all rated requirements.

**1.5.1 Rate Bid Form – Part 7**

Respondents must complete and submit the Pricing Form included in Part 7 (Pricing Form and Evaluation of Pricing).

**1.6 Stage 4 - Tie Break and Ranking of Respondents**

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.

### **1.7 Conditions of Pre-Qualification**

As a condition of pre-qualification, the highest-ranked Respondents being considered for the Roster List shall provide a signed Supplier Attestation confirming the Respondent's status in accordance with the definitions set out in Part 3, Section 1.1 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 Respondent. 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 two (2) 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.

### **1.8 Contract Award and Execution**

The City intends to finalize an Agreement with the top-ranked Respondents, a minimum of three (3) for each Scope A and/or Scope B, selected in accordance with the terms of this RFSQ, with each Agreement commencing from the date the City notifies Respondents that they are prequalified.

The terms and conditions found in Part 4 (Form of Agreement) are to form the basis for finalizing the Agreement between the City and the Prequalified Suppliers. Upon notification that the Form of Agreement is available for execution, the selected Respondents shall execute the completed Form of Agreement within 10 business days of its receipt, along with any required Supplier Attestation, performance security and/or insurance certificates. The Supplier Attestation (set out in Section 6.2 of the Ariba event) is an additional document that must be provided by the selected Respondents 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 Form of 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 Respondents 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 the City may then invite the next-best-ranked Respondent to finalize an Agreement.

## 2.0 STAGE 2 - RATED EVALUATION CRITERIA

### TECHNICAL RESPONSE AND QUALIFICATIONS

#### 2.1 General

The following sections set out the weightings of the criteria for the RFSQ. Respondents who do not meet a minimum threshold score for a section below will not proceed to the next stage of the evaluation process.

The City will not have any knowledge of any information contained in the Cost of Services, Part 7- Pricing Form and Evaluation of Pricing until evaluations for the Technical Response portion of the response are complete and Respondents have been short-listed. The City uses an electronic envelope for Part 7 within the City Online Procurement System which is only opened once Respondents have been short-listed.

#### 2.2 Table 2-1: Rated Evaluation Table

STAGE 1 - MANDATORY SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS	
STAGE 2 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - 80 Points	
Rated Criteria Category	Weighting (Points)
<b>Subsection 1 – Executive Summary</b>	N/A
<b>Subsection 2 – Respondent Profile</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Profile of the Company [2 points]</li> <li>Company's commitment and related policies to supplier diversity and employee diversity and evidence of being a certified diverse supplier [3 points]</li> </ul>	5 points
<b>Subsection 3 – Experience and Qualifications of the Respondent</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide three (3) examples of comparable peer reviews successfully completed in the last five (5) years. (i.e. if you are responding for the RSRM Roster category, please provide RSRM-related examples and if you are responding for the Nuisance Roster category, please provide nuisance-related examples) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project 1 [5 points]</li> <li>Project 2 [5 points]</li> <li>Project 3 [5 points]</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	15 points

Request for Supplier Qualifications – Doc5421410915  
Part 2 – Evaluation, Negotiation and Award

<b>Subsection 4 – Proposed Staff Team and Resources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated experience of assigned staff for this work including their professional qualifications, experience on projects of a similar nature and scope, and the appropriateness of their duties and responsibilities. [10 points] Individual Experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Manager - minimum 10 years experience. [5 points]</li> <li>• Peer Reviewer(s) - minimum 5 years experience. [10 points]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Resume (max 2pgs) for each Team Member: Demonstrate technical expertise for all disciplines required on a peer review including the resources required to undertake a peer review as specified in Part 5. [10 points]</li> <li>• Strategies and individuals that can fulfill the roles and responsibilities for any unforeseen events requiring replacement of team members. [2 point]</li> </ul>	<p>37 points</p>
<b>Subsection 5 – Proposal Approach</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondent's understanding of the goals and objectives of potential roster work assignments. [ 5 points]</li> <li>• Proposed approach for achieving the goals and requirements of potential roster work assignments. [5 points]</li> </ul>	<p>10 points</p>
<b>Subsection 6 – Work plan and Deliverables</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed work plan indicating the project method, schedule, Gantt chart, tasks, and deliverables within the specified peer review period of 28 days. [8 points]</li> <li>• Peer Review Team Organization Chart provided showing overall peer review team structure. [5 points]</li> </ul>	<p>13 points</p>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<p><b>80</b></p>
<p><b>Proponents must score a minimum threshold of 70% or 56 out of 80 points in total from Stage 2 in order to be considered for qualification.</b></p>	
<p><b>STAGE 3 - COST OF SERVICES</b></p>	



Request for Supplier Qualifications – Doc5421410915  
Part 2 – Evaluation, Negotiation and Award

---

Supplier's fees calculated as follows: Formula: $[(\text{lowest cost Proposal} \div \text{Supplier's Proposal Cost}) \times 20]$	20 points
<b>Total Points</b>	100 points

### 3.1 **Table 2-2: Scoring Criteria Table**

Responses will be evaluated and scored using the Scoring Scale outlined in the table below. Responses will be reviewed, evaluated and assigned a numerical score ranging from a minimum of zero (0) to a maximum of ten (10), for each of the subsections outlined in Stage 2 of Table 1.

Score	Rating	Description
10	Excellent	Fully exceeds all of the requirements of the criterion and is sure to deliver the required output / outcome exceeding the expectations in a way that provides benefit to the City.
9	Very Good	Fully meets all of the requirements of the criterion and exceeds some of the requirements of the criterion in a way that may provide or has potential to provide benefit to the City.
8	Good	Fully meets all requirements of the criterion.
7	Above Average	Satisfies the requirements of the criterion but may be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
6	Average	Meets most of the requirements of the criterion but fails in some areas.
5	Below Average	Barely meets most of the requirements of the criterion but inadequate detail provided.
4	Weak	Meets some (half/partial) of the requirements of the criterion.
3	Very Weak	Barely meets some of minimum requirements of the criterion.
2	Poor	Fails to meet minimum requirements of the criterion.
1	Very Poor	Significantly fails to meet minimum requirement of the criterion.
0	No Value	Fails to address the component. Response significantly deficient, no response provided.