

Request for Qualifications Evaluation Process

Recommendation:

That the August 6, 2014, Transportation Services report CR_1506, be received for information.

Report Summary

This report summarizes the Request for Qualifications evaluation process for the Valley Line LRT – Stage 1 Project.

Report

The Request for Qualifications documents were approved at the February 4, 2014, LRT Governance Board meeting. In addition, the evaluation process, including protocols and guidance for the conduct of the Request for Qualifications evaluation, was approved at the April 17, 2014, LRT Governance Board meeting.

The City issued Request for Qualifications (RFQ) No. 924536 on April 23, 2014, to identify and qualify proponents to participate in the Request for Proposal Procurement Process for the Valley Line LRT – Stage 1 Project. Five Request for Qualifications submissions were received by the closing date of June 17, 2014.

Between June 17 and July 9, 2014, the Request for Qualifications Evaluation Team engaged in a series of evaluation activities that have ultimately produced the shortlist recommendation. The Evaluation Team was composed of a number of subject matter expert sub-teams that align to the evaluation criteria sections presented in the Request for Qualifications document. Subject matter teams included Project and City experts (Attachment 1).

Request for Qualifications Evaluation Procedure

The Evaluation Team conducted the evaluation of all compliant submissions in accordance with the Request for Qualifications and the processes, protocols and guidance for the conduct of the evaluation (as approved at the April 17, 2014, LRT Governance Board meeting).

The process provided Evaluators with a common frame of reference for making their interpretation of how the submissions met the requirements of the Request for Qualifications. This improved the transparency and fairness of the evaluation process. The Evaluators assessed the submissions against the established evaluation criteria.

The evaluation was managed by Materials Management Branch who assigned a representative to act as Evaluation Manager, with the support of KPMG, the City's P3 Process Advisor.

Request for Qualifications Evaluator Training

Evaluator training sessions were held prior to the evaluation. The training sessions were designed to orient the Evaluators as to their roles and obligations over the course of the evaluation, to offer guidance on how to execute the process and procedures when

conducting the evaluation and to discuss logistic requirements associated with the evaluation performance in the evaluation office. All Evaluators attended an evaluation training session in advance of the commencement of the evaluation.

Conduct of the Evaluators

Evaluators were required to apply the following guidelines in the conduct of their work:

- Familiarity with the Request for Qualifications. Prior to commencing work on the evaluation, Evaluators were required to familiarize themselves with the Request for Qualifications document (including addenda and clarification issuance).
- Thorough and careful review of submissions. Each Evaluation Team undertook the evaluation in order to reach consensus among the members. All Evaluators were required to individually review all aspects of all submissions (pertaining to their assigned submission section and the general section) with due care and attention.
- Consensus. Each Evaluator's opinion was expressed through the consensus meeting forum and each Evaluation Team's position with respect to each evaluation criterion was unanimous.

Conduct of Evaluation Team Leads

Each Evaluation Team had a designated Team Lead, who was responsible for:

- The diligent review of the entirety of each submission (to establish an understanding of the overall consistency of the submission) with further concentration on the designated review section and the general section.
- The diligent performance of its Evaluation Team with regards to the reviewing of the designated sections of the submissions on an individual basis.
- Application to the Evaluation Manager for the scheduling of the consensus meetings once the Evaluation Team was ready to hold such a meeting.
- The diligent performance of its Evaluation Team with regards to the conduct of the consensus meetings (with assistance from the Evaluation Manager).
- The generation and compilation of potential clarification questions in response to the submission reviews.
- Attendance and participation at daily Team Leader meetings to discuss progress and potential clarification issuance with the Evaluation Manager.
- Scheduling and conducting reference checks (in conjunction with the Evaluation Manager).
- Documenting and compiling the evaluation worksheets for the Roll-Up Committee (with assistance from the Evaluation Manager).

Submission Receipt and Completeness

Request for Qualifications submissions were logged by Materials Management upon receipt. All of the submissions were received before the closing time. As such, all submissions met the mandatory requirement and were deemed to have passed.

After being received and logged, these submissions were reviewed at the Materials Management office, for compliance with the Additional Process Requirements of having the executed acknowledgement forms. Once this was confirmed the submissions were transferred to the Evaluation Office.

At the Evaluation Office the submissions were tested for the remaining Additional Process Requirements related to meeting the delivery requirements (number of copies, page limit adherence etc) and the designation of primary and secondary contacts.

All submissions met the Additional Process Requirements and were deemed to have passed without modification or any necessary clarification.

Clarification Process

In the conduct of their work, Evaluators raised clarification queries for transmittal to respondents. All Team Leads, the Evaluation Manager, Process Advisor and Fairness Monitor met to confer on the applicability of clarification queries before executing and transmittal to the respondents.

Reference Checks

As part of the diligence of the process and in accordance with the Request for Qualifications, the Team Leads, with support from the Evaluation Manager and the Process Advisor, undertook to perform reference checks for submitted project experience claimed by the respondents.

News Scans and Broker Reports

As part of the additional diligence of the process, the Process Advisor completed comprehensive news scans and broker report reviews to understand any current issues that a respondent and/or its Team Members may be facing.

The information collected did not indicate that material false or misleading information had been submitted by any respondent.

Evaluation Process Meetings

Team Leads, the Evaluation Manager, members of the Evaluation Diligence Committee, the Process Advisor and the Fairness Monitor attended daily meetings during the evaluation process, to discuss process items and considerations as they arose, such as clarification queries and responses.

Submission Scoring Process

The Evaluators were formed into respective Evaluation Teams to evaluate the following sections: General, Financing, Design, Construction, Asset Management & Preservation of Infrastructure and Operations.

The Evaluators were tasked with reviewing the submissions and then holding Evaluation Team consensus meetings to determine how the submission scored. The scoring was undertaken against the scoring scale included in Section 5.2.7 of the Request for Qualifications (included as Attachment 2).

Consensus Meetings

Once the Evaluators had communicated that they were adequately prepared, the Team Leads scheduled consensus meetings for their respective teams with the Evaluation Manager. All meetings were attended by the Fairness Monitor.

The consensus scoring did not include or involve averaging or voting to determine the scores given. It required unanimous consensus.

In total, Evaluators spent approximately 650 individual hours reviewing and scoring the submissions followed by 25.5 hours of consensus meetings to generate the consensus scoring.

Roll Up Committee

The evaluation consensus meetings generated a score for each evaluation criteria item, using the scoring scale of between zero and five (Attachment 2). The Roll-Up Committee applied these scores to the evaluation criteria weighting, as established in the Request for Qualifications, to generate the total scores.

In addition to generating the total scores, the Roll-Up Committee performed a peer-review of the consensus notes generated by their counterparts to ensure that the consensus notes supported the scoring and that all evaluation teams utilized a consistent and fair approach.

Evaluation Due Diligence Committee

The Evaluation Due Diligence Committee was tasked with the following:

- oversight of the evaluation process, ensuring that all Evaluation Teams and Evaluators diligently perform their roles
- obtaining additional resources (i.e. legal/admin support), as required, to ensure adherence to the evaluation schedule
- confirming that:
 - the pre-established evaluation process has been applied diligently and consistently by the Evaluation Teams
 - the Evaluation Teams are each unanimous in their decisions
 - the Evaluation process has been endorsed by the Fairness Monitor as fair and transparent

In the performance of its role, the Evaluation Diligence Committee members have collectively or individually completed the following:

- Attendance at the Evaluator Training Sessions.
- Attendance at the Evaluation Office, including reviews of the submissions and witness of the evaluation procedures.
- Attendance at the daily Team Lead meetings.

Request for Qualifications Evaluation Process

- Received a process update from the Evaluation Manager and Process Advisor on June 27, 2014.
- Received a full briefing of the Team Leads and the Evaluation Manager, including presentation of preliminary draft scoring on July 2, 2014.
- Received the Evaluation Report and deliberated on its mandated requirements on July 10, 2014.
- Confirmed the Shortlist Recommendation.

Fairness Monitor

The Fairness Monitor was present for the full evaluation process, including all Team Lead meetings, consensus meetings, Roll-up committee meetings, briefings of the Evaluation Diligence Committee, and other meetings. The Fairness Monitor also observed several of the reference check calls.

The Fairness Monitor was also present at the Evaluation Office to observe that evaluation procedures were being adhered to as intended.

The Fairness Monitor will issue a letter attesting to his views of the process fairness, once the full process is complete.

Corporate Outcomes

- The City of Edmonton has sustainable and accessible infrastructure.
- Edmontonians use public transit and active modes of transportation.

Attachments

1. Request for Qualifications Evaluation Team Structure
2. Request for Qualifications Scoring Scale

Others Reviewing this Report

- K. Rozmahel, General Manager, Corporate Services
- L. Rosen, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer