

Appendix C – Evaluation Criteria

1. Selection Criteria

Potential bidders will be rated in a combination of technical score and price rating. For this project the total score will be established as follows:

Technical rating 60%	=	Technical Score (Points)
Price rating 40%	=	Price Score (Points)
Total Score	=	Max. 100 points

1.1 Requirement for proposal format

The following proposal format information should be implemented when preparing the proposal:

- Submit one (1) bound original plus three (3) bound copies of the proposal;
- Paper size should be - 216mm x 279mm (8.5" x 11");
- Minimum font size - 11 point Times or equal;
- Minimum margins - 12 mm left, right, top, and bottom;
- Double-sided submissions are mandatory;
- One (1) 'page' means one side of a 216mm x 279mm (8.5" x 11") sheet of paper;
- 279mm x 432 mm (11" x 17") fold-out sheets (i.e. for spreadsheets and organization charts) will be counted as two pages;
- The order of the proposals should follow the order established in the Request for Proposal SRE section.

1.2 Specific requirement for the proposal

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements is Thirty (30) pages.

The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above:

- Covering letter;
- Cover Page;
- Tab/Dividers, provided they are free of text and/or graphics
- Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix A);
- Integrity Provisions – Required Documentation;
- Front page of the RFP;
- Front page of revision(s) to the RFP;
- Price Proposal Form

Consequence of non-compliance: any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the proposal and will not be forwarded to the NRC Evaluation Board for evaluation.

1.3 Mandatory requirements

Failure to meet the mandatory requirement will render the proposal as non-responsive and no further evaluation will be carried out.

- Bidders must demonstrate that they have experience with installation and commissioning of high pressure lines for at least ten (10) years and that they have experience working with commercial and industrial construction scopes in excess of \$200,000.00 dollars. Present a project list, with at least five (5) projects, with project name, location, mechanical characteristics, budget and schedule.
- Bidders must demonstrate that they have successfully completed at least five (5) projects, similar to the one proposed in this tender. Hydraulic distribution lines for high pressure Hydraulic Power Units in occupied buildings. Projects should be listed with name of client, location, main equipment, short project description, and mechanical characteristics to facilitate comparison to the project listed in this tender.
- Bidders must demonstrate experience with engineering projects designed internally or through a long term partnership with a consulting engineering firm. Long term partner is to be understood as at least five years. This can be demonstrated by showing different projects, three or more, in the last ten years, where the supplier was responsible to design the system. Provide list of projects with name, location, mechanical characteristics, type of engineering support provided. Clear identify if the engineering support was provided by the internal team or by the long term partner. If long term partner was used, provide letter with partner name and duration of partnership.
- Bidders must be present at either one of the two mandatory site visits which will take place at:

NRC AST U-89 building,
2320 Lester Road,
Ottawa, ON

On the following times and dates: April 24th and April 26th 2018 (1pm Eastern)

When submitting the technical proposal start by demonstrating the mandatory criteria before presenting the rated requirement information.

2. RATED REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Achievement of proponent on projects (similar projects)

Describe the Proponent's accomplishments, achievements and experience as supplier on similar projects. Select a maximum of two (2) public/private sector collaboration projects, of comparable size and complexity to the present project, that were successfully completed within the last six (6) years. These projects should be functional and occupied for at least one (1) year.

Information that should be supplied:

- Provide examples of two similar projects. Demonstrate the equipment or system similarity, start and Completion Dates, budget, and key personal involved with the project.
- Demonstrate how the project challenges were managed and what was the strategy used to deal with project risks and issues.
- Provide details about the coordination with the equipment supplier during Site testing and commissioning
- Provide contact information for client references, knowledgeable in the representative project and the Bidder's role. The references will only be contacted by the Contracting Authority to confirm submitted material.
- Demonstrating experience working with the same equipment supplier as the one used in this project will be considered an asset (+1 point)

2.2 Proponent experience with engineering designed project

Demonstrate the proponent experience designing systems where engineering calculations were required.

Information that should be supplied:

- Describe the responsibilities involved during design and calculations
- Describe who was responsible to develop the engineering calculations/design, if it was the supplier internal team or the consultant partner.
- Describe how the engineering process was managed, including but not limited to drawings submittals, parts submittals, documentation review, etc.

2.3 Proponent experience working in occupied building

Present the proponent experience working in buildings where equipment was already installed and/or other activities were taking place at the same time of the project.

- Describe material and crew mobilization strategies
- Describe how material shortages were addressed. I.e. material not available due to incorrect design, material damaged during site work, unforeseen issues, etc.
- Describe the strategies used to work with the client's team to ensure minimum interference to existing equipment and/or work.

2.4 Proponent experience with Site Acceptance testing

Present the proponent experience working with Site Acceptance testing

- Demonstrate experience in writing Site acceptance testing procedures
- Describe strategies used to manage client and equipment supplier expectations
- Describe strategies used to deal with test issues and how issues were resolved (if any)

2.5 Understanding of the Project

The Proponent should demonstrate a good understanding of the goals of the project, the functional/technical requirements, the constraints and the issues that will shape the end product.

Information that should be supplied:

- Demonstrate a clear understanding of the project and its main objective;
- Explain the steps involved in developing the project;
- Describe the approach to deal with significant issues, challenges and constraints during the project.
- Explain how your company will manage the project to achieve the objective and steps proposed. Management philosophy.

3. EVALUATION AND RATING

In the first instance, price envelopes will remain sealed and only the technical components of the proposals considered responsive will be reviewed, evaluated and rated by a NRC Evaluation Board in accordance with the following criteria.

Technical Ratings:

IT	Criterion	Weight Factor	Rating	Weighted Rating
2.1	Achievement of proponent on projects (similar projects)	3.0	0 - 10	0 - 30
2.2	Proponent experience with engineering designed project	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
2.3	Proponent experience working in occupied building	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
2.4	Proponent experience with Site Acceptance testing	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
2.5	Understanding of the Project	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
	Total Technical Rating	-		0 -100

No further consideration will be given to proponents not achieving the pass mark of sixty (60) points. The successful Bidder shall be the one who accumulates the highest combined score of the technical assessment (60%) and tendered amount (40%), as shown below:

TABLE A	Bidder #1	Bidder #2	Bidder #3
Technical score	85 points out of 100	80 out of 100	75 out of 100
Tendered amount	\$320,000	\$310,000	\$300,000

For information only:

	Technical score	Tendered amount score	Final score
Bidder #1	$\frac{85}{100} \times 60(\%) = 51$	$\frac{300}{320 \text{ k}} \times 40(\%) = 37.5$	= 88.5 (successful bid)
Bidder #2	$\frac{80}{100} \times 60(\%) = 48$	$\frac{300}{310 \text{ k}} \times 40(\%) = 38.7$	= 86.7
Bidder #3	$\frac{75}{100} \times 60(\%) = 45$	$\frac{300}{300 \text{ k}} \times 40(\%) = 40.0$	= 85.0