

APPENDIX D – EVALUATION PROCESS

EVALUATION STAGES

This Appendix “D” explains the evaluation process stages and associated scoring methodology. Proponents remain responsible for understanding fully all of their obligations and all of Seneca’s rights and discretion with respect to the conduct of this procurement process, as more fully described in the RFP.

Seneca is conducting this procurement process in stages as provided in Table 1: RFP Evaluation Stages below. Proponents should note that it is Seneca’s option whether to conduct Stage IV – Supplemental Evaluation Stage.

References required	3
Maximum Number of Preferred Proponents	One proponent

Table 1: RFP Evaluation Stages

Stage	Description	Participants
I	Review of Mandatory Forms (Pass/Fail)	Proponents
II	Evaluation of Rated Requirements	Shortlisted Proponents
III	Pricing	Shortlisted Proponents
V	Final Evaluation and Selection – Negotiation and Award	Preferred Proponents

1.1 STAGE I – Review of Mandatory Forms (Pass/Fail)

Stage I will evaluate the Mandatory Forms submitted by the Proponent.

- Proponents should take particular note of the Conflict of Interest statement in Appendix “G” – Form of Offer Submission Form where Proponent must declare, to its best knowledge and belief, whether it would be in an actual or potential Conflict of Interest with respect to the submission of the Proposal or performance of the contemplated Agreement other than those disclosed in the Form of Offer Submission Form. If, in the determination of Seneca in the exercise of its discretion, a Proponent is found to be in an actual or potential Conflict of Interest, Seneca may, in addition to any other remedies available at law, disqualify the Proponent or terminate for cause the Agreement concluded with the Proponent as a result of this Proposal process.
- Notification to Proponents whether they passed or failed Stage I – Review of Mandatory Forms will be provided by the Seneca Contact. Only those Proponents who meet the requirements of Stage I will advance to Stage II.

1.2 STAGE II – Rated Requirements

Stage II will evaluate the rated requirements set out in Appendix “C” – Evaluation – Rated Requirements and Pricing.

APPENDIX D – EVALUATION PROCESS

Proposals which fail to achieve the minimum score required for one or more rated requirements, as determined by Seneca, may, in Seneca's discretion, be rejected by Seneca and not evaluated further.

Proposals must clearly provide all the necessary information so that a thorough assessment of the Proponents' experience, qualifications and capabilities can be made. Responses and substantiating documentation should be direct and grouped together with an index provided to ensure the Evaluation Team is able to locate relevant information.

If contradictory information or information that contains conditional or qualifying statements is provided with respect to a rated requirement, Seneca will, in its discretion, determine whether the response complies with the requirements, and may seek clarification from the Proponent. The contradictory or qualifying information may result in the Proponent receiving a low score for that particular rated requirement.

The response to each rated requirement should:

- be complete and clear;
- demonstrate the Proponents understanding of Seneca's business needs and provide detailed responses to the information requested; and
- be provided in the same sequential order as set out in Appendix "C" – Evaluation – Rated Requirements and Pricing.

The point allocation and minimum score requirements, if any, for the rated requirements of this RFP are set out in Appendix "C" – Evaluation – Rated Requirements and Pricing.

A minimum score for rated requirements may, in Seneca's discretion, be required for a Proponent to move into Stage III – Pricing.

Only those Proponents who meet the requirements of Stage II will advance to Stage III.

1.3 STAGE III – Pricing

In Stage III, Appendix "F" – Pricing Submission Form will be evaluated and scored as described in Appendix "C" – Evaluation – Rated Requirements and Pricing. Seneca will not accept pricing assumptions.

Only those Proponents who meet the requirements of Stage III will advance to Stage IV (if applicable) or Stage V.

1.4 STAGE IV – Supplemental Evaluation

Seneca may, in its discretion, invite a select number of the highest ranked Proposals from Stage III to participate in additional evaluation activities, including, without limitation, oral presentations, interviews and/or question and answer sessions (collectively, the "Supplemental Evaluation"). If Seneca does invite Shortlisted Proponents to participate in the Supplemental Evaluation, all Shortlisted Proponents who are not invited will be deemed not to have been selected as Preferred Proponents. The purpose of the Supplemental Evaluation will be to allow an invited Shortlisted

APPENDIX D – EVALUATION PROCESS

Proponent to address the major elements of its Proposal, to obtain any required clarification, and to allow members of the Evaluation Team to interact directly with key representatives of the Shortlisted Proponent's proposed team. To the extent the Evaluation Team identifies any errors/inconsistencies in a Shortlisted Proponent's Proposal during the Supplemental Evaluation, Seneca may, in its discretion, adjust the evaluation results of such Shortlisted Proponent's written Proposal. In advance of the Supplemental Evaluation, each listed Proponent invited to participate in the Supplemental Evaluation will be notified in writing of the matters on which clarification will be sought, and the agenda for any meeting. Invited Shortlisted Proponents will not have the opportunity to modify written Proposals or otherwise introduce new information during the Supplemental Evaluation. The Supplemental Evaluation, if applicable, will be evaluated on the basis of the framework set out in Appendix "C" – Evaluation – Rated Requirements and Pricing.

1.5 STAGE V – Final Evaluation and Selection – Negotiation and Award

Following Stage III, and following Stage IV, if applicable, all scores will be added and Seneca may select one or more Shortlisted Proponents as Preferred Proponent(s) to participate in the negotiation of an Agreement.

Seneca will engage in negotiations with Preferred Proponent(s), using the Form of Agreement (if applicable) as the basis for negotiations. At the conclusion of these negotiations, Seneca, in its discretion, may enter into an Agreement with Preferred Proponent(s) based on the terms reached through negotiation.

APPENDIX D – EVALUATION PROCESS

RFP#45-829-JJ Seneca, Newnham
 Building K Lab 3170 Renovation

Page 4 of 6

PROPOSAL EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The stages, Overall Points allocated to each stage, and the applicable minimum scores of the evaluation process are as set out in the table below.

Stage #	Stage Description	Overall Points	Minimum Score
Stage I	Mandatory Forms	Not Applicable	Pass/Fail
Stage II	Rated Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent's Corporate Background (see Appendix B, Section 1) • Personnel , Knowledge & Experience (see Appendix B, Section 2 &3) • Work Plan (see Appendix B, Section 4) • References (see <u>Appendix "J" – Reference Form</u>) and previous experience with Seneca 	5 15 25 5	25
	Subtotal Stage II	50	
Stage III	Pricing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix F-Pricing Submission Form 	50	Not Applicable
Total for Stage II & III Points = Overall Points		100	

APPENDIX D – EVALUATION PROCESS

EXPLANATION OF SCORING METHODOLOGY

1.6 EVALUATION OF REQUIREMENTS – GENERAL

A Proposal must meet all Mandatory Requirements and obtain any minimum score identified for point-rated criteria to be declared responsive at any Stage. A Proposal must receive a score that is equal to or greater than the scoring threshold for a given Requirement, Stage or section.

- A Proposal must meet all of the mandatory requirements of the RFP. If a Proposal does not meet all of the mandatory requirements, that Proposal may be rejected.

Unless otherwise provided in this RFP in relation to a particular point-rated criterion, each point-rated criterion will be evaluated as follows:

- A score of 0 to 5 will be awarded for each point-rated criterion being evaluated, unless otherwise noted. Only whole number scores will be provided;
- In order to receive the available score for each point-rated criterion, each element for each point-rated criterion must be met. If any element of a point-rated criterion is not met, even if all other elements of that point-rated criterion are met, the Proposal will not receive the available score for that point-rated criterion. Partial scores will not be awarded; and
- The percentage score out of five will be multiplied by the Overall Points allocated to each point-rated criterion.

For example, if the Proponent obtains a score of 3 out of 5 for a point-rated criterion, and the criterion is worth 10 Overall Points, then the score for that criterion is equal to 60% of 10 Overall Points available, or 6 Overall Points.

Unless otherwise provided in the RFP for any Rated Requirement, the following rating scale will be used:

Proposal Rating	Rating Requirements	Score
Superior	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully responds to Seneca’s stated requirements and objectives for that point-rated criterion, with relevant details that are specific and comprehensive.• Demonstrates superior capability to meet Seneca requirements and objective for that point-rated criterion (e.g., through extensive experience, or through superior knowledge).• Where relevant, the information is commensurate with the size, scope and complexity of the scope of work.	10 out of 10
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully responds to Seneca’s stated requirements and objectives for that point-rated criterion, with relevant details that are specific.• Demonstrates sufficient capability to meet Seneca requirements and objective for that point-rated criterion (e.g., through sufficient experience, or through sufficient knowledge).• Where relevant, the information is commensurate with the size, scope and complexity of the scope of work.	8 out of 10

APPENDIX D – EVALUATION PROCESS

Proposal Rating	Rating Requirements	Score
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully responds to of Seneca's stated requirements and objectives for that point-rated criterion, but with information of a general nature. • Demonstrates sufficient capability to meet Seneca requirements and objective for that point-rated criterion (e.g., through sufficient experience, or through sufficient knowledge). • However, if relevant, the information is not commensurate with the size, scope and complexity of the scope of work. 	6 out of 10
Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to many of Seneca's stated requirements and objectives for that point-rated criterion. • Demonstrates insufficient capability to meet Seneca requirements and objective for that point-rated criterion (e.g., through limited experience, or through limited knowledge). • If relevant, the information is not commensurate with the size, scope and complexity of the scope of work. 	4 out of 10
Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to few of Seneca's stated requirements and objectives for that point-rated criterion. • Demonstrates very limited capability to meet Seneca requirements and objective for that point-rated criterion (e.g., through limited experience, or through limited knowledge). • If relevant, the information is not commensurate with the size, scope and complexity of the scope of work. 	2 out of 10
Does Not Meet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to none of Seneca's stated requirements and objectives for that point-rated criterion. • Demonstrates no capability to meet Seneca requirements and objective for that point-rated criterion. 	0 out of 10

In the event that less than three (3) Proposals meet any scoring threshold(s), Seneca may exercise its discretion and lower all such thresholds by 5% (e.g., 75% thresholds would be lowered to 70%).

In the event that this lowering of thresholds still results in less than three (3) Proposals that meet the reduced scoring thresholds, Seneca may exercise its discretion and lower all such thresholds one final time by a further 5% (e.g., thresholds already reduced to 70% would be further lowered to 65%).

Seneca is not required to exercise its discretion to lower any thresholds and may elect not to lower any thresholds and proceed with less than three (3) Shortlisted Proponents.