



13 May 2020

**TO ALL PROPONENTS**

**Addendum No. 3**

**RE: LRT Stage 2 Procurement Lessons Learned**

---

Please note the following questions raised by proponents, and the answers as provided by the Project Authority.

*In a cover letter please ensure that you acknowledge all addenda when submitting your firm's Proposal Submission.*

Q1: For criteria R2.1 and R2.2, can we present more than 2 relevant projects per resource. If those projects are already detailed in criteria R1.2, should we repeat them or just refer to criteria R1.2?

**A1: For criteria R2.1 and R2.2 only the first two projects presented will be evaluated. Proponents may reference other parts of their proposal in their response.**

Q2: If we are selected for this project, does this preclude us from bidding on the LRT Stage 3 Procurement?

**A2: No.**

Q3: For criteria R2.1 and R2.2, in addition to filling the appendix II for each resource, could we add in an annex a CV for each resource proposed? If so, will it be evaluated as part of this criteria?

**A3: Yes, and yes.**

Q4: For criteria R1.2, are you looking for relevant projects in Canada only or also from other countries in the world?

**A4: Projects from other countries will be evaluated to the extent that they are relevant, as outlined in the RFP.**

Q5: For greater transparency of the RFP, we request that the City provide the sub-weights of all the evaluation criteria. For example: a. R.1.2 – Relevant Project Example – as currently drafted, the RFP is unclear whether all the sub-criteria are equally

weighted (e.g. “experience developing lessons learned or similar reports ...”; public agency procurement processes; Infrastructure Ontario P3 or other similar public procurement agency contract templates; etc.)? b. R.2.1 – Lead Consultant – as currently drafted, the RFP is not clear as to whether all the sub-criteria equally weighted – are the 5 criteria contained in the bullets equally weighted?

**A5: The City will not be breaking down the scoring within R.1.2 and R.2.1 further from what is outlined in section 3.5.2 of the RFP. The criteria will be evaluated in its entirety based on the scoring grid found in section 3.5.1 of the RFP.**

Q6: In order to increase the pool of qualified proponents, and to increase openness, we request that the City please consider revising the requirement of “[L]arge scale linear infrastructure procurement projects” as contained in R.1.2 Relevant Project Examples 1, 2 and 3 and Lead Consultant Experience and Qualifications R.2.1 (related Key Team Member R.2.2.). Specifically, we would ask that the City consider amending this requirement to “large, complex infrastructure (public private partnership, if the City deems appropriate) procurement projects”. This revised requirement would allow proponents to demonstrate appropriate experience and qualifications to successfully complete and provide high quality results and deliverables to the City.

**A6: The City will not be making the requested change. The experience requested is as outlined in the council approved statement of work.**

Q7: Having reviewed the Scope of Work – Lessons Learned, as contained in Appendix III, under 1. Stage 3 Procurement Lessons Learned, we have noted that all scope items, with the exception of scope item v., relate to procurement best practices and recommendations to strengthen the principles of fairness, openness and transparency. The scope in v. relates to “ ...best practices and recommendations on the use of delegated authority by staff in other Canadian municipalities and government agencies for major light rail project procurements, including organizational reporting structures, specifically in relation to how other undertake the following ...” It is our respectful view that the potential firms qualified and interested in participating in this RFP may be able to offer expert services in all scope items, with the exception of scope item v., or vice versa. While we understand that it is critical to have scope item v. addressed, we recommend that this be a separate stream for bidding and evaluation purposes. Otherwise, it is our view that this may inadvertently result in a smaller pool of interested proponents or a successful firm who may be experts in all scope areas except for v. or experts in v. but not in the remaining scope items. To increase openness of this RFP opportunity; in order for the City obtain the highest level of expertise for the 2 streams and to allow for parallel work to be completed for the 2 streams: Please consider carving out the scope in v. as a separate stream for bidding purposes and for evaluation purposes and separate evaluation of the two streams - we specifically request that, the one stream with all scope items with the exception of stream v., please delete the requirement of “focus on demonstrating experience in decision making with municipal bylaws and governance processes” in R.1.2 Relevant Project Example 1, 2 and 3 as well as R2.1 Lead Consultant and R.2.2. , as applicable.

**A7: The City will not be making the requested change. Proponents are permitted to partner or subcontract, as appropriate, in order to assemble a team that is able to demonstrate the required experience.**

Q8: In Section 1.2 Restricted Parties you indicated that Restricted Parties are defined as those who were involved with Stage 2 City of Ottawa light rail procurement. Can the City please provide a list of those parties that were involved in Stage 2 of the light rail procurement, as this should be known information to the City, given that the Stage 2 process has ended.

**A8: Please see response in Addendum No. 2, A4.**

Q9: Can the City please confirm that affiliate companies, and partnership companies or common ownership companies of the Restricted Parties are not able to respond to this RFP or evaluate the submissions of this RFP? This is a real concern, and perhaps a likely occurrence, which is why we are asking the City to give it sufficient thought.

**A9: This City will not be amending Section 1.2 Restricted Parties of the RFP to include affiliate companies, partnership companies or common ownership companies.**

Q10: Please confirm if Restricted Parties include firms that were involved in: i) Confederation Line Stage 2; ii) Trillium Line Stage 2, or iii) Both Trillium Line Stage 2 and Confederation Line Stage 2.

**A10: Firms who worked on either Trillium Line Stage 2 or Confederation Line Stage 2 City of Ottawa light rail procurement are considered Restricted Parties.**

Q11: Please clarify if the successful proponent would be precluded from participating in any procurements related to Stage 3, including as part of a bidding team.

**A11: Please see A2.**

Q12: May we re-create the tables set out in Appendix I – Project Description Forms and Appendix II – Key Team Member Description Form within our proposals (ensuring that the information and layout is duplicated), or would the City prefer we use the Appendixes as set out in the RFP document? If the latter, could the City kindly provide a Word document version of Appendix I and II?

**A12: The tables may be re-created.**

This addendum forms part of the Request for Proposal document and will be incorporated into any resulting Agreement. In your Proposal submission, please indicate receipt thereof, **failure to do so may result in the rejection** of the Proposal submission.

For further information, please contact Mike Byrne, Procurement Officer, Supply Services at [Mike.Byrne@ottawa.ca](mailto:Mike.Byrne@ottawa.ca).

**END OF ADDENDUM**