



# Ottawa LRT Stage-2 Trillium Line Extension

## Executive Steering Committee Presentation

October 26, 2018



# Evaluation Process to date



- In July 2017 the City qualified 3 proponent teams to bid on the Trillium Line Extension Project and the RFP was released in July 2017
- Technical Submissions were received on August 10, 2018 and the Financial Submissions on September 21, 2018.
- The evaluation process is guided by the Request for Proposal. The City has also developed an Evaluation Framework to describe and outline the evaluation process that will be used to select the Preferred Proponent .
- As per the RFP and the Evaluation Framework these submissions are reviewed separately with the Technical Evaluation to be completed before the Financial evaluation are completed so there can be no influence on the Technical Evaluation from the financial results.
- As outlined in the Evaluation Framework, the Technical Evaluation Team reports to the Bid Evaluation Steering Committee who in turn reports to this group: the Executive Steering Committee

# ESC Role in Procurement



- As per the Evaluation Framework the ESC's role is the following:

(1) OLRT Executive Steering Committee

The OLRT Executive Steering Committee is comprised of the individual Participants designated in Appendix 9 to this Evaluation Framework and is responsible for the following:

- (a) receive reports, presentations and makes decisions on matters of substance related to the RFP evaluation raised by the OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee;
- (b) rule on any material non-conformance issues, taking advice from the OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee;
- (c) rule on any material non-conformance issues, taking advice from the OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee;
- (d) endorse the recommendation of the Preferred Proponent at the completion of the Evaluation Process for approval by the City of Ottawa Council; and

- The Bid Evaluation Steering Committee is seeking ESC direction as per (a) in above relating to the results of the Technical Evaluation.

# Technical Submissions



- The purpose of the Technical Submission in a procurement is to ensure that the output specifications are understood and that the proponents demonstrate that they are capable of designing, constructing and maintaining the project.
- The IO template, upon which the procurement documents are based, sets a threshold of 70 percent on each of the four components of the Technical Submission as a “Minimum Score”. A failure to meet the minimum score on any one or more of the components on the Technical Submission, as per the RFP, could mean that proponents submission is no longer evaluated.

# Technical Evaluation Results



- Technical Evaluation includes a Conformance Review in which the technical leads review the Technical Submissions to ensure that the submissions conform to the output specifications.
- The Conformance Team did not identify any material non-conformances in any of the bids.
- The technical evaluation team is comprised of (5) representatives from OC Transpo and the O-Train Construction Team
- The Evaluation Team Lead presented the results of the consensus evaluation to BESC on October 3 for diligence as per the Evaluation Framework.
- One of the proponents had components of the Technical Score which were below the 70 percent Minimum Score threshold.

# Technical Evaluation Results



- The BESC had concerns about the evaluation exercise specifically:
  - Not all negative attributes they identified could be linked to the RFP's Technical Submission Requirements
  - Over reliance on broad RFP language without direct tie in to output specifications or technical submission requirements
- Consequently BESC gave written direction to the Technical Evaluation Team to re-convene, review, and to the extent necessary, re-evaluate the Technical Submissions and respond to some direct questions regarding certain of the identified negative attributes while applying a more rigorous scoring methodology.

# Technical Evaluation - Updated Results



- On October 23 the Evaluation Team Lead presented to the BESC the updated results of the Technical Team's review following the written direction. One of the proponents has two separate components of their Technical Score which are below the 70 percent Minimum Score threshold:

Requirement	Proponent C
1.0 General Technical Requirements	70.71%
2.0 Design Submission	63.58%
3.0 Construction Submission	71.86%
4.0 Maintenance and Rehabilitation	65.40%
<b>Total</b>	<b>67.27%</b>

# BESC Recommendation



- The RFP, specifically provides that if a Proponent fails to achieve any of the minimum scores, the City may, in its sole discretion, determine whether that Proponent's Proposal will continue to be considered in the evaluation process.
- BESC is recommending the continued evaluation of this Proponent's Proposal and asks ESC to confirm this recommendation and direct the continued consideration of this proposal.
- The reasons for this recommendation include:
  - Given the fact that the discretion to continue to consider the submission is preserved in the RFP, all Proponents will expect the City in good faith to consider whether or not to exercise that discretion and the facts and circumstances set out below lead to the good faith conclusion that this technical submission should continue to be considered in the evaluation process.



# BESC Recommendation



- Reasons (Continued):
  - The two individual components where the proponent failed are within 6.42 and 4.60 points of the passing mark, respectively. Severity of the of the failure to achieve the applicable minimum score should inherently be considered in good faith by the City in interpreting the discretion afforded by the RFP.
  - The increase of each of the component scores following the written direction from BESC to the Technical Evaluation Team.
  - All three proponents were selected through a rigorous RFQ process involving five (5) respondent teams on the basis on their past project experience and financial strength.
  - The absence in the Proponent's technical submission of any material non-conformances, as confirmed by the Conformance Report presented to BESC.
  - The recommendation will not modify the technical score of this Proponent but will allow the proposal to be ranked based on its overall score, including the financial score and technical score, as per the RFP.

# Conclusion and Next Steps



- If ESC confirms BESC's recommendation and directs the continued evaluation, the financial evaluation for all three proponents is anticipated to be complete next week and a full presentation on the results to ESC on November 7.
- If ESC gives direction to continue to evaluate there is no opportunity to revisit this decision once the total score has dictated the highest scored proponent team.



# For ESC Consideration



- Confirm BESC's recommendation and directs that this Proponent's Proposal continue to be considered in accordance with the Evaluation Process in the RFP and the Evaluation Framework.





- Questions?

