**RFI - Qualification Based Selection Model and Social Procurement**

**ANNEX A**

**QUESTIONS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Response** |
| Q1 | Please provide a brief description of your organization (100 words or less). Your response could also include any experience you have in responding or working with QBS RFP’s. Also, based on the definition of a diverse supplier (see section 4.), do you meet the criteria to qualify as a diverse supplier? Include the name, mailing address, phone number, and email of a designated contact. | R1 |
| Quality Based Selection Model | | |
| Q2 | What advantages or disadvantages does the QBS method present in the selection of a Design Consultant? What advantages or disadvantages does the current model (using 90% technical and 10% cost) present in the selection of a Design Consultant? Would you recommend any other options? | R2 |
| Q3 | Is there potential for QBS to have a positive/negative impact on the ability to support small and medium enterprises in the real property design Industry? | R3 |
| Q4 | PSPC’s intention is to only issue Phase 2 of the RFP to the three highest responsive bidders. The highest responsive bidder would provide PSPC a fee proposal to initiate negotiations; if this negotiation fails PSPC then begins negotiations with the second highest responsive bidder. What are your views? Or would you prefer to eliminate Phase 2 in its entirety and have a single phase QBS process? | R4 |
| Q5 | How would the initial cost of design, due to innovations and improvements to Scope/TOR, be outweighed by final project performance that results from good design solutions (costs, schedule and quality)? | R5 |
| Q6 | What type of project (or project characteristics) would most benefit from the QBS method?  What type of project (or project characteristics) would benefit the least from the QBS method? | R6 |
| Q7 | How could this process allow for the discussion of innovative ideas, alternative approaches, and new technologies which should reduce life cycle costs? Could you provide an example and explain to which extent? Furthermore, In the event that three firms bring forward very different solutions, how can we fairly assess proposals? | R7 |
| Q8 | Would oral presentations be valuable to validate the content of the submissions presented in Phase II? How do we ensure this is a success? | R8 |
| Q9 | To what extent would the scope and schedule need to form part of the negotiations in order for QBS to be of value in the selection of a Design Consultant? | R9 |
| Q10 | Under NAFTA and other trade agreements, Canada may not be allowed, under the QBS context, to negotiate the Terms of Reference resulting in a change or deviation from the scope, project description, etc., set out in the solicitation document.  Do you think that QBS could be achieved without negotiating the TOR? | R10 |
| Q11 | How could PSPC conduct fee negotiations in the framework of QBS? How could Canada support best value as a result of these negotiations? | R11 |
| Q12 | Would the price support clause, referred to in section 3.3, be valuable or the most difficult during fee negotiations to support best value? Please explain your response. | R12 |
| Q13 | In your experience, would the use of Engineering or Architectural Association fee guidelines such as the following, be appropriate to support price during fee negotiations? How would this ensure best value for taxpayers? Could it serve better that the current process?  Association des firmes de génie-conseil du Québec  Schedule of Fees 2015-2016 edition  <http://www.afg.quebec/uploads/AFG_Bareme_honoraires_2015_EN.pdf.pdf>  Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE)  Fee Guideline 2015  <https://www.ospe.on.ca/public/documents/general/2015-fee-guideline.pdf>  The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada © 2009  A Guide to Determining Appropriate Fees for the Services of an Architect  <https://www.mbarchitects.org/docs/guide_architectservicefees(e).pdf> | R13 |
| Q14 | Please see previous question: do you know of any other supporting documentation that could be used to support best value during fee negotiations?  What other documentation or supporting method would you propose? | R14 |
| Q15 | The QBS Model in the United States has a maximum on the professional AES fees of 6% (of the construction costs) relating to the production of tender drawings and specifications. All remaining costs are negotiated. Is this 6% cap deemed fair in the Canadian marketplace? | R15 |
| Q16 | How appropriate would it be to apply a percentage cap to the Consultant’s fees for the entirety of the services?  If appropriate, what % cap would be considered fair and reasonable? | R16 |
| Q17 | It would be Canada’s plan that the basis of the price negotiation could include as an option an “open book” approach to negotiation.  Under this scenario, potential consultants could be required to provide Canada with the necessary supporting costing details of its operations and the planned project costs.  How would this condition affect your firm’s decision to participate in the RFP process? | R17 |
| Social Procurement | | |
| Q18 | Could you recommend approaches for incorporating social procurement measures along with A&ES procurements?  For example, one approach could be to include a rated criterion in the RFP Phase I to award 5-15% of the total technical score to diverse suppliers. A diverse supplier is currently defined as a business owned or led by Canadians from underrepresented groups, such as women, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities and visible minorities. Each business is usually defined as being owned, operated and controlled by 51% of a given group (e.g., women-owned business, Indigenous-owned business, persons with disabilities-owned business, or visible minority-owned business). | R18 |
| Q19 | With respect to increasing supplier diversity what measures would you propose PSPC consider? | R19 |
| Q20 | What approaches could PSPC undertake to increase accessibility and capacity of diversity in the procurement system? | R20 |
| Q21 | Are you aware of any other organizations, besides those listed in section 4 of this RFI, that certify diverse suppliers or social enterprises? | R21 |
| Q22 | Certification bodies typically charge a fee to certify a business as a diverse supplier or social enterprise. Are you willing to pay an extra fee to be certified? Do you think it is fair or creates a barrier for your entry? | R22 |
| Q23 | Should PSPC use attestation (self-certification) followed by audits, or certification by established certification organizations to qualify diverse suppliers and social enterprises? What other methods would you propose we use to verify diverse suppliers? | R23 |
| Q24 | Do you anticipate the government of Canada’s commitment to increasing the diversity of businesses owned or led by Canadians from underrepresented groups will have an impact on your participation in A&ES procurements? | R24 |
| Q25 | What other measures could be incorporated into this method of supply to leverage the government’s buying power to support the objectives of the Minister’s mandate letter stated in 4.2 of the RFI? | R25 |
| Q26 | Do you have any other comments or recommendations? | R26 |