

# ANNEX C

## MANDATORY & TECHNICAL CRITERIA EVALUATION

### Technical Bid Format

The technical bid must address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. In order to facilitate the evaluation of the bid, **Canada strongly requests that bidders address and present topics in the order of the evaluation criteria under the same headings.**

To avoid duplication, bidders may refer to different sections of their bids by identifying the specific paragraph and page number where the subject topic has already been addressed.

All information required for evaluation purposes must be included directly in the Bidder's Technical Bid. The Evaluation team cannot consider information not provided directly in the Technical Bid (e.g. links to additional website content, references checks, etc.)

**Bidders are advised to pay careful attention to the wording used throughout this Request for Proposal (RFP). Failure to satisfy any term or condition of this RFP may result in an unacceptable bid.**

### Mandatory Criteria

Bids will be evaluated against the Mandatory Technical Criteria below.

**For a bid to be declared responsive to the solicitation requirements it must demonstrate and meet ALL Mandatory Technical Criteria. Bids declared non-responsive to the Mandatory Technical Criteria will be given no further evaluation.**

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria
<b>M1.</b>	The Bidder must provide information on three (3) custom furniture and/or amenity projects for which the Bidder completed the successful concept design, detailed design, construction plans and/or specifications for fabrication and/or manufacture, assembly and installation of the final items. Bidders may provide examples of projects that are not specifically furniture or amenities so long as they clearly describe and depict how these projects are similar or comparable to the requirements in the RFP.
<b>M2.</b>	The Bidder's project examples must be from within the last ten (10) years and be similar in scope, nature and complexity to the requirements described at <i>Annex A – Requirement</i> . Project examples that are currently underway may be included provided that the project has progressed beyond the detailed design stage.
<b>M3.</b>	At least two (2) of the examples must be completed projects in which the Bidder was the main contractor for the industrial and concept design.
<b>M4.</b>	The Bidder must specify which of the proposed team members for the Parks Canada Outdoor Furniture project worked on each example provided. Key design personnel must have performed key design roles in a minimum of two (2) of the examples of previous work.
<b>M5.</b>	Bidders must provide a client reference, including name, title, and contact information, for each of the project examples provided. Acceptable references may include the Project Authority and/or designated client lead and/or owner/manager of the previous client company/organisation. Parks Canada may choose two (2) of the three (3) references to contact. Parks Canada's questions to the references will be provided below in the rated criteria. Reference letters are not required.

<b>M6.</b>	At least one member of the Bidder's proposed design team must be a qualified industrial designer that is a professional member in good standing of a recognized professional organization. Proof must be provided. Professional organizations may include: <a href="http://www.bcid.com/">http://www.bcid.com/</a> (BC) <a href="https://adiq.qc.ca">https://adiq.qc.ca</a> (Qc) <a href="http://acido.info">http://acido.info</a> (Ont) Membership in another professional organization other than those listed above will be considered, provided that the organization requires educational and work experience in the field of industrial design that is similar to the requirements of the listed organizations.
<b>M7.</b>	The person described in Mandatory Requirement #6 above must also have participated in a minimum of two (2) of the examples of previous work provided.
<b>M8.</b>	As the language of work for the contract will be English, the lead designer and/or project manager for the Bidder must be able to communicate at a professional and technical level in English.
<b>M9.</b>	Bidder must provide bilingual French and English capacity at a professional and technical level for professional level graphic design and text editing of all project documentation in both official languages. This capacity may be provided by an employee or subcontractor.

### Rated Technical Criteria

Bids will be evaluated against the Point Rated Technical Criteria below.

Each point rated technical evaluation criterion has weight that reflects its importance in proposal submissions. The degree to which the proposal satisfies the requirement of each criterion will be assessed and a score will be assigned ranging from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning the proposal completely fails to satisfy the requirements, and 10 meaning the proposal fully meets the outlined criterion. This score will then be multiplied by the weight indicated for that point rated evaluation criterion.

Proposals that fail to achieve the Overall Minimum Weighted Points Required will be deemed non-responsive and will be given no further evaluation.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Weighted Points</b>
<b>R1.</b>	<b>Qualifications and Experience</b>	<b>230</b>
<b>1A.</b>	<p><b>Proposed Project Team</b></p> <p>The design team proposed for this project must clearly be identified. If there is a joint-venture between more than one (1) firm, all firms should be identified, with the individuals that will do the work, their qualifications, relationship to the Bidder and their role in the project. The primary contact for each firm should be outlined.</p> <p>All members of the proposed team should be clearly defined. At minimum, the proposed team should outline the Bidder's employees or sub-contractors who have the qualifications and experience to perform the following functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Primary Contact/Project Manager;</li> <li>2. Lead Industrial Designer (can be the same as Primary contact/Project Manager);</li> <li>3. Bilingual capacity for graphic design and copy editing for project documentation both English and French; and</li> </ol>	<b>70</b>

	<p>4. Any other staff that will work on the project.</p> <p>The Bidder should provide a summary of the experience or a résumé for each project team member as it relates to their role in this project.</p> <p>The following information should be included in this summary and/or résumé of each individual assigned to the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name;</li> <li>2. Position or role and responsibilities on project;</li> <li>3. Identification as subcontractor or employee of the Bidder’s company. If they are a subcontractor, the company they work for should be identified;</li> <li>4. Experience with industrial design and concept development and/ or client/ stakeholder collaboration and communication, particularly as it relates to their proposed role with this project;</li> <li>5. Role in provided examples of previous work;</li> <li>6. Language qualifications/proficiency if identified as a bilingual resource; and</li> <li>7. Education and training.</li> </ol> <p><i>Each summary of experience or résumé should be limited to two (2) pages maximum per team member.</i></p> <p>The Bidder must provide a two (2) paragraph description outlining the experience the proposed project team has working together.</p>	
--	--	--

**The Proposed Project Team will be evaluated on the following Point Rated Technical Criteria.**

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Point Criteria	Maximum points	Weight	Maximum Weighted Points
	Previous experience (depth and diversity) of key team members in <u>industrial design</u> for projects of similar size, scope and complexity.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Incomplete details provided and/or key team members have limited experience (depth and diversity) in industrial design for projects of similar size, scope and complexity.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Mostly complete details provided and/or most key team members have good experience (depth and diversity) in industrial design for projects of similar size, scope and complexity.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Complete details provided and/or all key team members have good to very good experience (depth and diversity) in industrial design for projects of similar size, scope and complexity.</p>	10	4.0	<b>40</b>

		<b>10 points:</b> Complete details provided and/or all key team members have extensive experience (depth and diversity) in industrial design for projects of similar size, scope and complexity.			
<b>R1A.2</b>	Education, certifications and other relevant qualifications of project team members in their respective roles for this project.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Limited education and/or certifications, limited qualifications of team members in their respective roles.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Some education and/ or certifications and sufficient qualifications of team members in their respective roles.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Appropriate level of education and certifications and good qualifications of team members in their respective roles.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Extensive education and certifications and excellent qualifications of team members in their respective roles.</p>	10	1.0	<b>10</b>
<b>R1A.3</b>	Experience working collaboratively with clients, stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades to achieve successful completion of industrial designs.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Incomplete details provided and/or limited to no experience working collaboratively with clients and stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Mostly complete details are provided and/or team has some experience working in collaboration with clients and stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> complete details are provided and/or team has good experience working in collaboration with clients and stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Complete details are provided, and team has extensive and well described experience working in collaboration with clients and stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades.</p>	10	2.0	<b>20</b>

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Weighted Points
1B.	<p><b>Examples of Previous Work</b></p> <p>The Bidder must provide information on three (3) custom furniture and/or amenity projects for which the Bidder completed the successful concept design, detailed design, construction plans and/or specifications for fabrication and/or manufacture, assembly and installation of the final items.</p> <p>Bidders may provide examples of projects that are not specifically furniture or amenities so long as they clearly describe and depict how these projects are similar or comparable to the requirements in the RFP.</p> <p>The examples must be of work done during the last ten (10) years and be similar in scope, nature and complexity to the requirements described at <i>Annex A – Requirement</i>. Project examples that are currently underway may be included provided that the project has progressed beyond the detailed design stage.</p> <p>At least two (2) of the examples must be completed projects in which the Bidder was the main contractor for the design.</p> <p>The Bidder must specify which of the proposed team members for the Parks Canada Outdoor Furniture project worked on each example provided.</p> <p>Key personnel must have participated in a minimum of two (2) of the examples of previous work.</p> <p><i>The Evaluation Team will only evaluate a maximum of three (3) projects in order of appearance in the Bidder’s proposal.</i></p> <p>Bidders should provide the following for each project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project title, description, and location venue;</li> <li>2. Start date of work (month and year) and completion date (month and year);</li> <li>3. Bidder’s role;</li> <li>4. Overall approach for the project, including details about how the Bidder worked collaboratively with clients, stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades to achieve successful completion of industrial designs;</li> <li>5. Relevant and detailed renderings, or complete construction drawings (if feasible), from the designs that the Bidder is using as examples of previous work.</li> <li>6. Photo examples (minimum of three (3) and maximum ten (10) per project) of fabricated items completed from the detailed concept designs;</li> <li>7. Names of the team members involved in the example projects that are in the proposed Bidder’s team, and a brief explanation of their involvement and responsibilities pertaining to each project.</li> </ol>	160

The Examples of Previous Work will be evaluated on the following Point Rated Technical Criteria.

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Point Criteria	Maximum points	Weight	Maximum Weighted Points
<b>R1B. 1.</b>	Examples of previous work are similar in nature, scope, and complexity to this project.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Not similar in nature, scope, complexity, etc.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Somewhat similar in nature, scope, and complexity, etc.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Similar in nature, scope, and complexity, etc.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Very similar in nature, scope, and complexity, etc.</p>	10	2.0	<b>20</b>
<b>R1B. 2.</b>	Previous work examples demonstrate creativity, innovation, technical skills and quality of work.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Demonstrates lack of creativity and innovation. Technically insufficient.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Demonstrates some creativity and innovation. Technically sufficient.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Demonstrates very good creativity and innovation. Technically well done.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Demonstrates very unique, bold, and creative approach. Highly innovative. Technically excellent.</p>	10	4.0	<b>40</b>
<b>R1B. 3.</b>	Previous work examples demonstrate comparable or similar products or amenities that are highly durable, easily maintained, with low technological expertise and time required for maintenance.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Demonstrates a high level of maintenance, time and/ or technological expertise to maintain. Insufficient.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Demonstrates some level of maintenance-free, low time commitment and/ or low technological expertise required to maintain. Sufficient.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Demonstrates low level of maintenance, time and/ or technological expertise to maintain. Well done.</p>	10	4.0	<b>40</b>

		<b>10 points:</b> Demonstrates very low level of maintenance, time and/ or technological expertise to maintain. High ability for client to self-maintain with low capacity. Excellent.			
<b>R1B. 4</b>	Previous work examples use creative techniques to effectively communicate brand identity.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> The examples do not effectively communicate brand identity. Brands are unclear or overly emphasized. Poor example of creative thinking.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Examples adequately communicate brand identity. Brands are clear for audience. Adequate example of creative thinking.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> The examples effectively communicate brand identity. Brands are clear and engaging to the audience. Very good example of creative thinking.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> The examples excellently communicate brand identity. Brands are very clear. Excellent example of creative thinking.</p>	10	3.0	<b>30</b>
<b>R1B. 5</b>	The previous work examples provided are visually appealing. Concepts are attention-grabbing, welcoming, beautiful, and clearly depict function, form and appropriate material use.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Not visually appealing. Function, form and appropriate material use are not clearly depicted.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Somewhat visually appealing. The look insufficiently relates to function, form and material use.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Visually appealing. The look relates to the function, form and material use.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Very visually appealing. The look is tied in very well to the function, form and material use.</p>	10	3.0	<b>30</b>

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Weighted Points
R2.	<b>Proposed Approach, Methodology, and Project Schedule</b>	100
A.	<p>The Bidder must provide a detailed approach and methodology that outlines how the Bidder's proposal will meet all the objectives and deliverables outlined in the RFP.</p> <p>The proposed approach and methodology must be outlined for each of the following areas: project management, concept development, concept design, revisions to the concept design, Client communication and collaboration and stakeholder involvement. Descriptions of the approach, methodology and schedule for detailed design, fabrication and installation are not required at this time.</p> <p>The proposed approach must demonstrate to the Evaluation Team an understanding of the nature, scope and purpose of this project, as well as the potential challenges and how they might be overcome.</p> <p>Included with this must be a detailed project schedule that outlines the significant activities, milestones and deliverables in this project, the expected points of Client input, review and approval, and required meetings. The schedule should identify who is responsible for each of the significant activities. The schedule must reflect key dates of delivery and should meet Client expectations on delivery dates.</p> <p><i>The Evaluation Team is looking for all Phase 1 work outlined to be completed within 16 weeks of contract award.</i></p>	100

**The Proposed Approach, Methodology, and Project Schedule will be evaluated on the following point rated technical criteria. A passing mark must be obtained for the final total score to be considered further.**

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Point Criteria	Maximum points	Weight	Maximum Weighted Points
R2A. 1.	The proposed approach and methods are easy to visualize. They are detailed, well thought out, flexible and meet all the requirements of the RFP. Bidder has sufficient skills and resources to meet the project needs.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Proposed approach and methods cannot be visualized and/ or does not meet the needs/ timelines of the project. Not detailed, poorly laid out. Inflexible. Poor techniques used. Level of services/ skill is poor and inadequate to meet project needs. Lacking detail and/ or skill.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Proposed approach can be visualized and meets most of the needs of the project. Sufficiently detailed and laid out. Meets some requirements of the RFP. Somewhat flexible. Sufficient detail on services/ skills/ resources. Level</p>	10	3.5	35



		<p>of services/ skills/ resources is adequate to meet project needs.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Proposed approach can be visualized and meets the needs of the project. Detailed and well laid out. Met all requirements of the RFP. Appropriately flexible to project plans. Good level of detail on services/ skills/ resources. Levels of services/ skills/ resources are good and sufficient to meet project needs.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Proposed approach can be easily visualized and more than meets the needs of the project. Very detailed and very well laid out proposed project plan. Approach and methodologies meet all requirements of the RFP. Innovative and flexible approach to project plans. Excellent level of detail on services/ skills/ resources. Level of service, resources, and skills are outstanding and more than meet project needs.</p>			
R2A .2.	<p>The proposed project schedule reflects all required steps, activities, and deliverables. Demonstrates ability to meet deadlines and allocates sufficient time for each step.</p>	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Not enough details on steps, activities, and deliverables, etc. provided. Timelines are not suitable and realistic, and/ or do not include adequate level of client involvement. The time provided for each review stage is questionable in most areas. Inadequate solutions to schedule challenges.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Enough details on steps, activities, and deliverables, etc. provided. Timelines are mostly suitable and realistic, and include limited to adequate level of client involvement. The time provided for each review stage is questionable in some areas. Limited to adequate solutions to schedule challenges.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Good level of details on steps, activities, and deliverables, etc. provided. Timelines are suitable and realistic, and include an adequate level of client involvement. The time provided for each review stage is appropriate. Good solutions to schedule challenges.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Very good details on steps, activities, and deliverables, etc. provided. Timelines are very suitable and realistic, and include a more than adequate level of client involvement while offering</p>	10	1.5	15

		flexibility. The time provided for each review stage is more than appropriate. Innovative solutions to schedule challenges.			
R2A.3.	The proposed approach to communications and collaboration is effective and appropriate.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Not enough details and/ or poor approach to communications. Limited to no provisions identified for working in collaboration.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Sufficient approach to communications. Adequate provisions identified for working in collaboration.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Good approach to communications. Good provisions identified for working in collaboration.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Excellent approach to communications. Excellent provisions identified for working in collaboration.</p>	10	2.0	20
R2A.4.	The proposed approach, project plan and schedule demonstrate an understanding of the nature, scope and purpose of this project, as well as potential challenges and how they might be overcome.	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided is unsuitable or insufficient.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Not enough details provided demonstrating understanding of the nature, scope, purpose, and potential project challenges. The proposed approach, project plan and schedule lack analysis of scope and challenges and/ or solutions.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Sufficient understanding of the nature, scope, purpose, and potential project challenges. The proposed approach, project plan and schedule provide adequate analysis of scope and challenges with some solutions.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Good understanding of the nature, scope, purpose, and potential project challenges. The proposed approach, project plan and schedule provide good analysis of scope and challenges with good solutions.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Outstanding understanding of the nature, scope, purpose, and potential project challenges. The proposed approach, project plan and schedule provide excellent analysis of scope and challenges with well thought out solutions.</p>	10	3.0	30

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria
<b>R3.</b>	<b>Client References</b>
<b>A.</b>	<p>Bidders must provide a client reference for each of the project examples provided. Acceptable references may include the Project Authority and/or designated client lead and/or owner/manager of the previous client company/organisation. Parks Canada may choose two (2) of the three (3) references to contact, and ask the following questions of each:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Bidder has provided a description of work completed, or currently underway, for you as the Client in the year XXXX. Can you please confirm that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The description of the work is accurate, and;</li> <li>b. The Bidder has completed this work, or that the work is at the stage noted by Bidder in their description, and</li> <li>c. The role(s) the Bidder describes as having undertaken in the project is(are) accurate?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Did you find the Bidder's approach to communication and collaboration with you as the client to be positive and effective?</li> <li>3. What is your level of satisfaction with the creativity and practicality of the work achieved?</li> <li>4. Would you hire this Bidder to do similar or new work for you in future?</li> </ol>

The Client References will be evaluated on the following point rated technical criteria.

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Point Criteria	Maximum points (out of 10 per reference)	Weight	Maximum Weighted Points
<b>R3A. 1.a</b>	Client Reference confirms that the description of work provided by the Bidder is accurate; the work is completed, or is currently at the stage described by the Bidder; and that the role(s) the Bidder describes as having undertaken in the project is (are) accurate. <b>Reference A.</b>	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided by the Bidder is inaccurate or misrepresented.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> The information provided by the Bidder is accurate and well represented.</p>	10	1	<b>10</b>
<b>R3A. 2.a</b>	Client reference confirms the Bidder's approach to communication and collaboration as positive and effective. <b>Reference A.</b>	<p><b>0 – 4 points:</b> Bidder's approach to communication and working collaboratively was poor and there were significant issues.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Bidder's approach to communication and working collaboratively was mostly positive and there were minor issues that were easily resolved.</p>	10	1	<b>10</b>

		<p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Bidder’s approach to communication and working collaboratively was very positive and there were no major issues.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Bidder’s approach to communication and working collaboratively was excellent and there were no issues.</p>			
<b>R3A. 3.a</b>	Client reference describes level of satisfaction with the creativity and practicality of the work achieved. <b>Reference A.</b>	<p><b>0 points:</b> Client reference was completely unsatisfied.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Level of satisfaction fair to poor. Some or most expectations were not met.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Level of satisfaction good. Almost all expectations met.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Level of satisfaction high. Expectations met in full.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Level of satisfaction very high. Expectations exceeded.</p>	10	1	<b>10</b>
<b>R3A. 4.a</b>	Client reference expresses willingness to hire this Bidder to do similar or new work in future. <b>Reference A.</b>	<p><b>0 points:</b> The reference would not re-hire Bidder.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Client reference demonstrates a high level of hesitation to re-hire Bidder and has significant cautions to share.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Client reference demonstrates a willingness to re-hire Bidder, but with some minor caveats and cautions.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Client reference would be willing to re-hire Bidder. No real concerns and only minor caveats.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Client reference highly recommends Bidder and would not hesitate to re-hire.</p>	10	1	<b>10</b>
<b>R3A. 1.b</b>	Client Reference confirms that the description of work provided by the Bidder is accurate; the work is completed, or is currently at the stage described by the Bidder; and that the role(s) the Bidder describes as having undertaken in the project is (are) accurate. <b>Reference B.</b>	<p><b>0 points:</b> The information provided by the Bidder is inaccurate or misrepresented.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> The information provided by the Bidder is accurate and well represented.</p>	10	1	<b>10</b>

<p><b>R3A. 2.b</b></p>	<p>Client reference confirms the Bidder's approach to communication and collaboration as positive and effective. <b>Reference B.</b></p>	<p><b>0 – 4 points:</b> Bidder's approach to communication and working collaboratively was poor and there were significant issues.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Bidder's approach to communication and working collaboratively was mostly positive and there were minor issues that were easily resolved.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Bidder's approach to communication and working collaboratively was very positive and there were no major issues.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Bidder's approach to communication and working collaboratively was excellent and there were no issues.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>
<p><b>R3A. 3.b</b></p>	<p>Client reference describes level of satisfaction with the creativity and practicality of the work achieved. <b>Reference B.</b></p>	<p><b>0 points:</b> Client reference was completely unsatisfied.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Level of satisfaction fair to poor. Some or most expectations were not met.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Level of satisfaction good. Almost all expectations met.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Level of satisfaction high. Expectations met in full.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Level of satisfaction very high. Expectations exceeded.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>
<p><b>R3A. 4.b</b></p>	<p>Client reference expresses willingness to hire this Bidder to do similar or new work in future. <b>Reference B.</b></p>	<p><b>0 points:</b> The client reference would not re-hire Bidder.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 points:</b> Client reference demonstrates a high level of hesitation to re-hire Bidder and has significant cautions to share.</p> <p><b>5 – 7 points:</b> Client reference demonstrates a willingness to re-hire Bidder, but with some minor caveats and cautions.</p> <p><b>8 – 9 points:</b> Client reference would be willing to re-hire Bidder. No real concerns and only minor caveats.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> Client reference highly recommends Bidder and would not hesitate to re-hire.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>

**Point Rated Technical Criteria Summary Table**

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria	Maximum points	Weight	Maximum Weighted Points
<b>R1.</b>	<b>Qualifications and Experience</b>			<b>230</b>
<b>R1A.1.</b>	Previous experience (depth and diversity) of team members in <u>industrial design</u> for projects of similar size, scope and complexity.	10	4.0	<b>40</b>
<b>R1A.2.</b>	Education, certifications and other relevant qualifications of project team members in their respective roles for this project.	10	1.0	<b>10</b>
<b>R1A.3.</b>	Experience working collaboratively with clients, stakeholders, consultant groups and other trades to achieve successful completion of industrial designs.	10	2.0	<b>20</b>
<b>R1B.1.</b>	Examples of previous work are similar in nature, scope, and complexity to this project.	10	2.0	<b>20</b>
<b>R1B.2.</b>	Previous work examples demonstrate creativity, innovation, technical skills and quality of work.	10	3.0	<b>40</b>
<b>R1B.3.</b>	Previous work examples demonstrate comparable or similar products or amenities that are highly durable, easily maintained, with low technological expertise and time required for maintenance.	10	2.0	<b>40</b>
<b>R1B.4.</b>	Previous work examples use creative techniques to effectively communicate brand identity.	10	3.0	<b>30</b>
<b>R1B.5.</b>	The previous work examples provided are visually appealing. Concepts are attention-grabbing, welcoming, beautiful, and clearly depict function, form and appropriate material use.	10	3.0	<b>30</b>
<b>R2.</b>	<b>Proposed Approach, Methodology, and Project Plan</b>			<b>100</b>
<b>R2A.1.</b>	The proposed approach and methods are easy to visualize. They are detailed, well thought out, flexible and meet all the requirements of the RFP. Bidder has sufficient skills and resources to meet the project needs.	10	3.5	<b>35</b>
<b>R2A.2.</b>	The proposed project schedule reflects all required steps, activities, and deliverables. Demonstrates ability to meet deadlines and allocates sufficient time for each step.	10	1.5	<b>15</b>
<b>R2A.3.</b>	The proposed approach to communications and collaboration is effective and appropriate.	10	2.0	<b>20</b>
<b>R2A.4.</b>	The proposed approach, project plan and schedule demonstrate an understanding of project challenges and how they might be overcome.	10	3.0	<b>30</b>
<b>Total Weighted Points Available</b>				<b>330</b>

Item No.	Evaluation Criteria		Maximum Weighted Points Available	Minimum Weighted Points Required
1.	Qualifications and Experience		230	161
2.	Proposed Approach, Methodology, and Project Plan		100	70

<b>Required Minimum Weighted Points Overall</b>			<b>231</b>
---	--	--	------------

Note to Bidders: If Parks Canada chooses not to contact the Client References provided by the Bidder, the total points available and final score received will be complete at this point. If Client References are contacted, the total points available and final score received will incorporate the Client reference points available and scores.

R3.	Client References	Maximum points	Weight	80
R3A.1.a	Client Reference confirms that Bidder worked to understand vision/ purpose of project and reflected that understanding in the work completed. Reference #1	10	1	10
R3A.2.a	Client reference confirms the Bidder's approach to communication and collaboration as positive and effective. Reference #1.	10	1	10
R3A.3.a	Client reference confirms that the Bidder able to effectively overcome any challenges and/or obstacles that occurred during the project. Reference #1.	10	1	10
R3A.4.a	Client reference expresses willingness to hire this Bidder to do similar or new work in future. Reference #1.	10	1	10
R3A.1.b	Client Reference confirms that Bidder worked to understand vision/ purpose of project and reflected that understanding in the work completed. Reference #2	10	1	10
R3A.2.b	Client reference confirms the Bidder's approach to communication and collaboration as positive and effective. Reference #2.	10	1	10
R3A.3.b	Client reference confirms that the Bidder able to effectively overcome any challenges and/or obstacles that occurred during the project. Reference #2.	10	1	10
R3A.4.b	Client reference expresses willingness to hire this Bidder to do similar or new work in future. Reference #2.	10	1	10
Item No.	Evaluation Criteria		Maximum Weighted Points Available	Minimum Weighted Points Required
3.	Client Reference		80	56

