



Summary Fairness Report for the City of Toronto

School Crossing Guard Services

Request for Proposal No. 9148-19-0114

May 16, 2019

PREPARED BY: MNP LLP
300 - 111 Richmond Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2G4

May 16, 2019

Landy Cheung, Project Manager
Transportation Services, Traffic Safety Unit
City of Toronto
703 Don Mills Road
Toronto, ON M3C 3N3

RE: Fairness Report for RFP No. 9148-19-0114 – School Crossing Guard Services

Introduction

MNP LLP (“MNP”) have been appointed by the City of Toronto (“the City”) as Fairness Monitor to oversee the procurement process for Request for Proposal (“RFP”) No. 9148-19-0114 for School Crossing Guard Services (“the Project”). As Fairness Monitor, MNP is an independent and impartial third party whose role is to observe and monitor the procurement process to ensure the openness, fairness, consistency and transparency of the process. The procurement process includes communication, evaluation and decision-making associated with the project.

The City issued the RFP to seek proposals from qualified vendors to provide school crossing services for the City’s School Crossing Guard Program, for a period of two years with two additional one-year periods. The services included: recruitment, hiring, training, discipline, providing equipment, supervision, and investigating, tracking, responding and resolving public complaints regarding the School Crossing Guards.

Fairness Conclusion

The RFP was issued on February 27, 2019 and closed on March 29, 2019, resulting in the City receiving four proposal submissions. All four proponents passed the mandatory requirements check (Stage 1), conducted by PMMD and the technical proposals were evaluated by the evaluation team. The consensus evaluation meeting took place on April 24 and April 25, 2019 and resulted in three of the four proponents passing the minimum Technical threshold for Stage 2-A. The three proponents moved forward to Stage 2-B – Presentation/ Demonstration. Presentations/demonstrations took place on May 6, 2019 and upon completion of the Presentation/Demonstration scoring (Stage 2-B) the final Technical evaluation score was determined with the three proponents passing the overall minimum technical threshold to proceed to the Cost evaluation (Stage 3).

The cost proposals for the three proponents were opened by PMMD. Upon review, it was determined that one vendor proposed a price that was over the City’s budget envelope. Due to the City’s budget constraints, the City was not able to consider this vendor’s cost proposal and the vendor did not move forward within the RFP process for cost evaluation and award.

As per the RFP, the City followed Alternative Scenario 2 to award the four Zones to two separate vendors as detailed within the Cost Evaluation, Process Selection and Award Process sections. Following this scenario, the two proponents were awarded zones in order of size, as determined by the methodology outlined in the RFP. The proponent with the highest overall technical and cost score was awarded the first grouped Zones, with the second proponent awarded the remaining Zones.

Based on the information and documents reviewed, meetings attended and discussions with the evaluation team and PMMD, the procurement process was followed as set out in RFP No. 9148-19-0114 and has been open, fair, consistent, transparent and in accordance with City By-laws and policy.

Yours truly,

MNP LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Veronica Bila". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Veronica Bila, CPA, CA, CIA
Partner, Enterprise Risk Services

Limitations and Disclosure

We have limited the scope of our work to documents provided by the City and are not providing an opinion on the accuracy of the information contained within. In addition, MNP was not involved with the development or review of the project's scope of work or in the competitively procured tenders.

We do not assume any responsibility or liability for losses incurred by any party as a result of the use of our work. We reserve the right (but will be under no obligation) to review all information included or referred to in this Fairness Report and, if we consider necessary, to revise same in light of any facts which become known to us subsequent to the date of presentation of same.