

FAIRNESS MONITOR'S FINAL FAIRNESS REPORT

Toronto Transit Commission

Request for Proposals for Supply Chain SAP Transformation Project

RFP No. : P25SY23276

RFP Issued: November 3rd, 2023

Submission Deadline: Tuesday, January 29, 2024, 2:00:00 PM local time

REPORT ISSUED: June 24th, 2024

June 24th, 2024



Mr. Sean Owen, CSCMP
Category Manager – IT Services
Procurement and Category Management
Materials & Procurement Department
Corporate Services Group

**Re: Fairness Monitor Final Fairness Report
Toronto Transit Commission - Request for Proposals For Supply Chain SAP Transformation Project
RFP No.: P25SY23276**

Dear Mr. Owen,

Robinson Global Management Inc. ("RGM") was retained as the Fairness Monitor for the above-mentioned procurement on June 20th, 2022, to oversee the procurement being administered by the Toronto Transit Commission ("TTC"), for the Request for Proposals For the Supply Chain SAP Transformation Project ("RFP").

Fairness Monitor Final Report Background

The within report details our fairness findings for our monitoring of the RFP process up to and including the Completion of the RFP Evaluation Process (end of Stage IV) and the identification of the highest ranked Proponent (Stage V – partial – contract negotiations to be completed directly by TTC).

In summary, as Fairness Monitor, notwithstanding two minor fairness qualifications relating to the RFP Posting to Close Process, as set out in the within report, RGM is of the view that TTC's RFP process, up to the identification of the highest ranked Proponent, has been administered in an open, fair and transparent manner, and we have no fairness concerns.

RGM will be preparing and issuing a final update to the within Fairness Report relating to Acceptance of TTC's Procurement Recommendation Report, once advised by TTC of the completion of the Contract Negotiations aspect of the Stage V – Ranking and Contract Negotiations.

Neither RGM nor the individual author(s) of this report, are responsible for any conclusions that may be drawn from this opinion.

Capitalized terms, if not defined in this report, will be as defined in the RFP.

For further detail on the above-mentioned procurement process, we recommend that communication be sought from the Toronto Transit Commission's Procurement RFP contact directly.

Our monitoring was in the capacity as Fairness Monitor and strictly limited to our responsibilities and deliverables listed in the numbered list on the following page. In completing this report, we took the Toronto Transit Commission's Procurement Policy, and Procedures, Canadian Free Trade Agreement, Comprehensive Economic and

Trade Agreement, and the provisions of the RFP as a standard against which to audit the process.

The Fairness Monitor's responsibilities and deliverables for the RFP include:

- a) Review and understand the TTC's procurement by-laws, policies, processes, and procedures;
- b) Become familiar with the RFP document as issued and the evaluation process;
- c) Review various documents and information, including but not limited to the procurement documents, addendum, and correspondence;
- d) Review the evaluation criteria with respect to clarity and consistency;
- e) Identify situations and issues which may compromise the evaluation process, and which may result in complaints about the procurement process and provide advice on resolving complaints;
- f) Provide oversight and advice during the procurement process;
- g) Attend Pre-Bid Meetings;
- h) Review each Bid submission;
- i) Attend Commercial and Technical Evaluation Meetings;
- j) Participate in telephone calls with TTC's Legal and/or Materials and Procurement Departments;
- k) Ensure that all participants were briefed on best practices with respect to principles and duties of fairness; confidentiality of vendor submissions; conflict of interest; undue influence; scoring procedures; and the retention of documents;
- l) Upon completion of the evaluation process, prepare a report describing the Fairness Monitor's observations and findings throughout the process;
- m) Attend the TTC's Board Report Meeting to answer questions regarding the report or process, if called upon to do so;
- n) Attend Debriefing meetings (if required – optional scope) and provide comments on the fairness of the selection process.

Supply Chain SAP Transformation Project Background

As per section 1.1 of the RFP, the RFP is invitation by the Toronto Transit Commission ("TTC") to Proponents to submit Proposals for the Supply Chain SAP Transformation Project to transform procurement and category management, materials management, warehouse management, and finance processes in SAP, as further described in Section A of the RFP Particulars (Part 4) (the "Deliverables").

In accordance with RFP section 1.4 Type of Contract for Deliverables, it is TTC's intention to enter into an agreement with only one (1) legal entity. The term of the agreement is to be for a period of four (4) years (the "Initial Term"), with an option in favour of TTC to extend the Agreement on the same terms and conditions for three (3) additional two (2) year extensions.

RGM reported to the TTC Procurement, and Category Management Department ("PCM") at all times, and provided our fairness comments both in written format and in verbal forums.

A. Fairness Attestation Relating to Review of RFP Posting Documents

RGM confirms that we had no fairness objections or issues to note in our monitoring of the Review of RFP Posting Documents.

B. Fairness Attestation Relating to RFP Posting to Close Processes

1. Open Period

- Questions and Addenda**

The RFP was issued on Friday, November 3, 2023. The RFP was updated via addenda issued to the Proponents via Bonfire. All addenda and questions and answers were provided by TTC to RGM for review prior to issuance. TTC issued five (5) addenda. Parts of the RFP Timetable were updated, via these addenda. Please refer to the RFP Timetable below. RGM confirms that all questions raised during the open period were submitted by the specified date of Friday, December 15, 2023, 4:00 PM local time.

- RFP Timetable**

Please refer to the following table for the **RFP Timetable**, both initial and updated:

Activities	Initial RFP Timetable Issued on November 3, 2023	Updated RFP Timetable as per Addendum #2	Updated RFP Timetable as per Addendum #3	Updated RFP Timetable as per Addendum #5
Issue Date of RFP	Friday, November 3, 2023	Friday, November 3, 2023	Friday, November 3, 2023	Friday, November 3, 2023
Proponent Briefing	Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:00 AM local time	Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:00 AM local time	Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:00 AM local time	Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:00 AM local time
Deadline for Questions	Tuesday, November 21, 2023 11:00 AM local time	Friday, December 8, 2023 4:00 PM local time	Friday, December 15, 2023 4:00 PM local time	Friday, December 8, 2023 4:00 PM local time [Note 1]
Deadline for Issuing Addenda	Tuesday, November 28, 2023	Friday, December 15, 2023	Tuesday, January 09, 2024	Monday, January 15, 2024 [Note 2]
Submission Deadline	Tuesday, January 9, 2024 2:00:00 PM local time	Tuesday, January 9, 2024 2:00:00 PM local time	Tuesday, January 23, 2024 2:00:00 PM local time	Monday, January 29, 2024 2:00:00 PM local time
Rectification Period	Three (3) Business Days	Three (3) Business Days	Three (3) Business Days	Three (3) Business Days
Demonstration Notice	Tuesday, April 2, 2024	Tuesday, April 2, 2024	Tuesday, April 16, 2024	Tuesday, April 2, 2024 [Note 3]
Demonstration Submission Date		Tuesday, April 9, 2024	Tuesday, April 23, 2024	Tuesday, April 9, 2024 [Note 3]
Anticipated Ranking of Proponents	Tuesday, May 14, 2024	Tuesday, May 14, 2024	Tuesday, May 28, 2024	Tuesday, May 14, 2024 [Note 3]
Negotiation Completion	Friday, June 28, 2024	Friday, June 28, 2024	Friday, July 12, 2024	Friday, June 28, 2024 [Note 3]
Anticipated Execution of Agreement	Monday, July 15, 2024	Monday, July 15, 2024	July/August 2024	Monday, July 15, 2024 [Note 3]

Note 1: *The Deadline for Questions had been changed to Friday, December 15, 2023 so this date should have been reflected here – no fairness consequences as the Friday, December 15, 2023 date had passed as of Addendum #5 issuance*

Note 2: *In issuing this Addendum, the Deadline for Issuing Addenda had passed (i.e. January 9, 2024). See Minor Qualification #1.*

Note 3: *These dates do not align to the Addendum #3 dates but rather to the Addendum #2 dates so likely these dates were provided in error. While given that these dates do not affect the open period, we do not have a fairness issue, we recommend that TTC proactively send a communication to the Proponents who submit proposals to provide the correct anticipated Demonstration Notice and Demonstration Submission Date – these dates may also be updated by TTC through the evaluation process, if there are delays. **We confirm that in fact, TTC PCM did follow RGM's advice on communication to the Proponents on evaluation delays.***

- **Proponent Briefing**

In accordance with RFP section 1.5.1 of the RFP, the TTC held an optional virtual Proponent Briefing (as per the RFP Timetable) to allow for greater understanding of the RFP and to provide an additional opportunity for potential proponents to ask questions that they may have. The Proponent Briefing was scheduled for one (1) hour in duration, and the meeting was completed within that duration. The Proponent Briefing provided high level overview including, but not limited to, submission pass/fail requirements, timelines, Deliverables and scope. Only administrative questions were answered during the session. Any technical questions raised were asked to be resubmitted in writing in accordance with the procedures set out in RFP section 3.2 – Communication after Issuance of RFP. The slide deck presented at the Proponent Briefing to Proponents was issued by TTC on Bonfire, within three (3) Business Days following the session, in accordance with the RFP.

In summary, RGM has no fairness issues to note with respect to the Proponent Briefing.

2. Sufficiency of RFP Open Time Period & Issuance of Questions and Answers/Addenda

Open Period:

During the open period, and in alignment to the RFP published timetable, TTC issued:

- Two (2) sets of Questions and Answers:
 - Q&A 1 issued December 8, 2023
 - Q&A 2 issued January 13, 2024 (as per Bonfire; TTC issued these early evening of January 12, 2024)
- Five (5) Addenda **issued during the open period:**
 - Addendum 1 on November 8, 2023
 - Addendum 2 on November 28, 2023
 - Addendum 3 on December 8, 2023
 - Addendum 4 on January 9 2024
 - Addendum 5 on January 13, 2024 (as per Bonfire; TTC issued these early evening of January 12, 2024)

Minor Fairness Qualification #1:

We note the following minor fairness qualification – TTC deviated from the RFP published timetable with respect to the Deadline for Issuing Addenda, in issuing Addenda and Questions and Answers beyond the original, unamended and published Deadline for Issuing Addenda.

With TTC's issuance of the RFP on November 3, 2023, and the Submission Deadline of January 29th, 2024, the RFP was in the open period for approximately twelve (12) weeks, inclusive of any statutory holiday dates in December 2023 and January 2024. We note that TTC was responsive to the market, granting proponents' requests for extension, as well as acting on RGM's recommendation to extend given the posting of Questions and Answers #2 beyond the Deadline for Issuing Addenda.

As such, we do not have any fairness concerns on the sufficiency of the RFP Open Period.

Post-Close Addenda Issued & Submission of Updated Appendix G – Price Submission Forms

We note that the following addenda were issued post-close to those Proponents who provided a submission by the Submission Deadline of January 29, 2024 by 4:00 PM.

We confirm that RGM review approved all of these for release:

- Addendum 6 issued on February 6, 2024:
 - Correction of errors in Appendix G – Price Submission Form relating to the “Total Evaluated Fixed Price”;
 - Addendum Submission Deadline specified for Monday February 12, 2024 by 4:00PM;
 - Invitation for questions on or before the Addendum Submission Deadline;
 - Request for resubmission of Appendix G – Price Submission Form on before the Addendum Submission Deadline of Monday February 12, 2024 by 4:00 PM;
 - That the original submitted Appendix G – Price Submission Form remained sealed and unopened; and
 - Confirmation that “Should a Proponent choose not to, or fail to delete and re-submit Appendix G - Price Submission Form by the specified date and time, the original submitted document will be used for evaluation.
- Addendum 7 issued on February 12, 2024:
 - Further correction of errors in Appendix G – Price Submission Form relating to the “Total Evaluated Fixed Price”;
 - Notation of Section (8) of the General Instructions “*A Proposal that includes a Pricing Submission Form that has been changed, modified, or altered in any way, except to enter information into a yellow cell, or to add additional rows or to change the size of a cell box to accommodate the size of the Proponent's entry or in accordance with the instructions provided, will be disqualified.*”
 - Extension of the Addendum Submission Date to Wednesday, February 14, 2024 by 4:00PM
- Post-Deadline Questions and Answers #1 issued on February 13, 2024
- Addendum 8 issued on February 14, 2024:
 - Extension of the Addendum Submission Date to February 21, 2024 by 12:00PM

RGM further confirms TTC PCM's advice (confirmed by Bonfire) that all Proponents which submitted Proposals by the original Submission Deadline of January 20, 2024 by 4:00 PM submitted updated Appendix G – Price Submission Forms prior to the stipulated Addendum Submission Date.

3. *Fairness Review of Evaluation Matters*

Minor Fairness Qualification #2:

As per best practices, all evaluation matters should be finalized and locked in prior to the RFP Submission Deadline.

TTC did not create the evaluation criteria in Bonfire and present same for fairness review until January 26th, 2024, which was one (1) business day prior to the Submission Deadline. In addition, the evaluation methodology (identification of the evaluation team members, etc./evaluation training deck) was not presented to RGM for fairness review until this time.

Accordingly, we note a second minor qualification – specifically, that not all relevant evaluation materials were provided in a reasonable timeframe for fairness review ahead of the Submission Deadline (including any allowance for timeframe needed for any related TTC updates that may be required) prior to the Submission Deadline.

By way of update, RGM completed our fairness review of the evaluation criteria created in Bonfire on January 29, 2024 with one update required of TTC to complete. This update was completed on January 30th, 2024 with no Bonfire evaluation criteria matters outstanding. Accordingly, we were in agreement that TTC PCM was able to complete the evaluation of Stage 1 Mandatories. RGM recommended to TTC PCM that TTC not distribute any proposals to evaluators beyond Stage 1 until such time that RGM has completed its fairness review of all evaluation matters and any outstanding necessary updates have been completed by TTC.

TTC PCM confirmed agreement to RGM's recommendation.

Notwithstanding the minor fairness qualification #2, RGM confirmed that TTC PCM followed RGM's recommendation to mitigate any fairness risks to the process, and accordingly, TTC's process, in RGM's view, remained substantively uncompromised.

4. *RFP Transparency*

Having reviewed the RFP, we confirm that the RFP stated all proposal and submission timeline information, contract term, specified terms and conditions, evaluation criteria and associated weightings of those criteria, as required for transparency. The RFP further set out the evaluation methodology, approach, evaluation stages, and the proposal evaluation scoring scale systems to be administered during the evaluation processes.

Where there were minimum scoring thresholds, and/or pass/fail requirements for all mandatory requirements evaluation sections, these were disclosed with clear indications when such thresholds or pass/fail tests would be applied, and the impact of failing to satisfy any of these. These shall remain unchanged during the stages of the RFP evaluation process and will be confirmed by RGM as we monitor the RFP evaluation process.

5. *RFP Closing and Proposals Received*

As advised by TTC, and as confirmed by TTC's online Bonfire portal's records for this RFP, all proposals were received before the Submission Deadline, and no late proposals were received or accepted.

C. Fairness Attestation Relating to the Completion of the RFP Evaluation Process

1. Evaluation Training

a. Evaluation Training

We confirm that TTC PCM conducted an evaluation training on February 24th, 2024. The training deck covered:

- Background;
- Procurement Principles;
- Purpose and Structure of the Evaluation;
- Understanding the Process;
- Evaluation Team Commitments and Schedule;
- Your Role as an Evaluator – Rated Evaluation;
- Your Role as an Evaluator – Recorded Demonstration;
- Scoring Scale for Evaluation; and
- Comments – Supporting Your Score

We confirm that TTC PCM provided RGM with an opportunity to review the proposed training deck, and RGM monitored the training session. Having done so, we did not have any fairness concerns.

In addition, TTC PCM provided RGM with an opportunity to review the “Evaluator Training Record & Proponent Evaluation Rotation”

b. Evaluation Training – Additional Re: Evaluation of Recorded Demonstration

We confirm that TTC PCM conducted an evaluation training specific to the Stage III evaluation of the Recorded Demonstration, following the completion of the Stage II Rated Criteria evaluation stage. We confirm that RGM monitored this additional training, and we did not have any fairness concerns.

2. Stage I – Pass/Fail Requirements

The Stage I: Mandatory Forms Submission Requirements mandatory pass/fail requirements was evaluated by the qualified TTC PCM team on a pass/fail basis. We received confirmation from the TTC PCM team that the received four (4) proposals satisfied the mandatory pass/fail requirements and proceeded to Stage II: Rated Criteria. We did not have any fairness concerns with respect to this Stage I.

3. Stage II – Rated Requirements Evaluation

In accordance with the RFP, Stage II consisted of an evaluation of the Proposal content found in following Appendices *in the following sequence*:

- 2A Rated Criteria – Corporate & Resource Experience
- 2B Rated Criteria – Implementation & Solution
- 2C Rated Criteria – Contractor Management and Administration Solution

The following is an excerpt taken from the RFP which sets out the evaluation stages, weights and minimum thresholds:

3. Evaluation Stages and Weights

The following sets out the categories, weightings and descriptions of the rated criteria of the RFP. Proposals will be evaluated during Stages II and III in accordance with the criteria set out below.

Stage	Weighting (Overall points)	Minimum Threshold
Stage I: Mandatory Technical Requirements	N/A	Pass/Fail
Stage II: Rated Criteria	70	N/A
2A Rated Criteria – Corporate & Resource Experience	14	60% (8.4 overall points)
2B Rated Criteria - Implementation & Solution	41	N/A
2C Rated Criteria - Contractor Management and Administration Solution	15	60% (9 overall points)
<i>Evaluation Gate – Top 5 Proponents from Stage II move forward</i>		
Stage III: Demonstration	10	N/A
Demonstration	10	
<i>Evaluation Gate – Top 3 Proponents from Stage II and III cumulative scores move forward</i>		
Stage IV: Pricing	20	N/A
Total	100	

The following summarizes our fairness monitoring and related fairness confirmations/comments on the completion of evaluation of the Stage II:

Evaluation Stages II, III and IV	Evaluation Team	Evaluation Process, Including Consensus Sessions, Monitored by RGM?	Final Fairness Opinion Based on Fairness Review/Monitoring/Due Diligence
----------------------------------	-----------------	---	--

Fairness Observations of Best Practices in Evaluation:

The evaluation team completed the Stage II and III - Evaluation using the established best practice consensus two - step method: firstly, each evaluator, working alone, reviewed, and scored with supporting comments, each Proposal in its entirety; secondly, the evaluators met as a group to discuss their findings and largely relying on their initial comments and the evaluation team discussions during each consensus meeting, arrived at a consensus score and comment for each criterion together.

No evaluator or other individual exerted undue influence over the process, with the observance of TTC's PCM representatives and us, the Fairness Monitor. All key evaluation process decisions were made by more than one person and verified by at least one other. TTC PCM exercised diligence in ensuring and issuing reminders that communications and questions be directed through TTC PCM, with RGM as Fairness Monitor being kept in the loop.

The evaluation team ensured that the evaluation aligned with the disclosed evaluation requirements, proposal evaluation scoring scales disclosed, and maintained the disclosed point weightings. No averaging or rounding of scores took place during the evaluation process at any time.

TTC PCM adhered to the procurement best practices of assigning different proposals and rotations of proposals for the evaluators while in individual review, as shown below:

Evaluator Training Record & Proponent Evaluation Rotation

No.	Evaluator	Department	Training Date	Proponent Evaluation Rotation			
				1	2	3	4
1	Dan Guna	Information Technology Services	28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Deloitte	PWC	Infosys	Birlasoft
2	Surya Pratap		28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	PWC	Deloitte	Birlasoft	Infosys
3	Jonathan Cornacchia		28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Infosys	PWC	Deloitte	Birlasoft
4	Clarissa Jamieson		28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Birlasoft	Infosys	PWC	Deloitte
5	Monica Tudoran	Procurement and Category Management	28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Deloitte	Birlasoft	Infosys	PWC
6	Mark DeCoste		28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	PWC	Deloitte	Birlasoft	Infosys
7	Aiden Purcell	Materials Management	28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Infosys	PWC	Deloitte	Birlasoft
8	Jobin Joy		28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Birlasoft	Infosys	PWC	Deloitte
9	Mark Joseph-Kisirye	Accounts Payable	28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	Deloitte	Birlasoft	Infosys	PWC
10	Jennifer Phipps	Accounts Receivable	28/Feb/24 @ 11: 00 AM	PWC	Deloitte	Birlasoft	Infosys

Note:

Deloitte	Deloitte
PricewaterhouseCoopers	PWC
Infosys Public Services	Infosys
Birlasoft	Birlasoft

TTC PCM developed a comprehensive mapping for select evaluators to evaluate specific Stage II Rated Criteria, as shown below:

EVALUATION QUESTION MAPPING											
Stage	Question	Dan Guna	Surya Pratap	Jonathan Cornacchia	Clarissa Jamieson	Aiden Purcell	Monica Tudoran	Mark DeCoste	Jobin Joy	Mark Joseph-Kisiry	Jennifer Phipps
Stage II	1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	1.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	1.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	1.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	2.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.6A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	3.6B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	4.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	4.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Stage II	5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Stage II	5.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Stage II	5.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Stage II	5.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stage II	5.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Stage II	5.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stage II	5.7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Stage II	5.8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Stage II	6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Stage II	6.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Stage II	6.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Stage II	6.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Stage II	6.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stage II	6.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stage II	6.7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Stage II	6.8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Stage II	6.9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Stage II	6.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Stage II	6.11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
STAGE III	All	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

Stage II Rated Criteria Monitoring: RGM as Fairness Monitor ensured that the designated evaluators were present, as appropriate, during the consensus sessions to discuss their assigned State II Rated Criteria.

In accordance with the RFP, the top (5) Proponents would move onto Stage II Rated Criteria would move onto the Stage III Demonstration. Following Stage II, three (3) of the four (4) proposals, having passed the minimum thresholds, as set out in the RFP, became eligible to move to the Stage III Demonstration.

RGM confirms that we did not have any fairness concerns relating to the monitoring of the Stage II Rated Criteria evaluation process, including the individual and the consensus evaluation processes (including the completion by RGM, following the consensus sessions, the RGM completed due diligence on the Bonfire-captured consensus results).

The following summarizes our fairness monitoring and related fairness confirmations/comments on the completion of evaluation of the Stage III:

Stage III Demonstration Monitoring

Prior to issuance, RGM reviewed and approved the communication prepared by TTC PCM to the three (3) Proponents who became eligible to proceed to Stage III Demonstrations. Then, the Proponents invited to the Stage III Demonstration stage submitted their recorded demonstrations in accordance with the stipulated timelines and format (confirmed by TTC PCM and approved by RGM). Accordingly, the videos were released to the evaluators, and in accordance with best procurement practices, firstly, for individual evaluations, and then for consensus.

As confirmed with TTC PCM and our independent review of Bonfire, each evaluator completed an independent review and submitted evaluator scores and comments into Bonfire, in accordance with the scoring sheets.

In addition, RGM monitored the consensus session for the Stage III Demonstration, and as well, conducted due diligence on the Bonfire-captured consensus results of this stage.

Having done so, RGM confirms that we had no fairness issues on this Stage III evaluation stage.

The following summarizes our fairness monitoring and related fairness confirmations/comments on the completion of evaluation of the Stage IV:

Stage IV Pricing:

All three (3) proponents proceeded to Stage IV Pricing.

TTC PCM reviewed the pricing submissions, and in consultation with RGM, as the Fairness Monitor, TTC, in accordance with Section 3.2.4 Verify and Clarify in Part 3 of the RFP, TTC sought to clarify each Proponent's Appendix G – Pricing Submission Form.

In the RFC's, TTC reconfirmed the issued instructions in the Appendix G – Pricing Submission Form: *If \$0.00 is entered or a cell that is required to be filled in is left blank, it is deemed to mean that the particular service will be provided to TTC at no cost. Proponents must enter either an amount or an N/A in every yellow cell. If N/A is entered, it is deemed to mean that the particular service will not be provided to TTC.*

Each Proponent was asked to confirm Yes or No to each instance where cells were left blank or \$- that the particular item is provided to TTC at no cost, to confirm compliance with the published TTC instructions, and to confirm that all relevant inputs to the Total Evaluated Cost being evaluated in Stage IV were completed by the Proponents.

Resulting from the reviews of the responses to the three (3) sets of RFC's by TTC PCM, in consultation with TTC Legal and RGM, as Fairness Monitor, two Proponents were disqualified.

TTC PCM completed the Stage IV Pricing evaluation and RGM completed a due diligence of the Bonfire records.

RGM confirms that we do not have any fairness concerns regarding the completion of the Stage IV Pricing evaluation process.

D. Stage V – Ranking and Contract Negotiations & Next Fairness Monitor's Report

Deloitte Canada was identified as the highest ranked Proponent to proceed to Stage V – Ranking and Contract Negotiations. As Fairness Monitor, we concur with the results.

The contract negotiations portion of Stage V with the identified highest ranked Proponent, Deloitte Canada, will be completed directly by TTC. We confirm that the monitoring of these negotiations is not included in RGM's fairness monitoring scope.

RGM will be preparing and issuing a final update to the within Fairness Report relating to Acceptance of TTC's Procurement Recommendation Report, once advised by TTC of the completion of the Contract Negotiations aspect of the Stage V – Ranking and Contract Negotiations.

E. Fairness Monitor Attestation

Summary Fairness Findings

As Fairness Monitor, RGM monitored the RFP procurement process up to and including the Completion of the RFP Evaluation Process, and the identification of the highest ranked Proponent. Notwithstanding two minor fairness qualifications relating to the RFP Posting to Close Process, as set out in the within report, RGM is of the view that TTC's RFP process, up to the identification of the highest ranked Proponent, has been administered in an open, fair and transparent manner, and we have no fairness concerns.

Sincerely,



Doreen Wong, B.A., B.COMM., LL.B., CRIO, PMP, SCMP (Candidate)
Senior Fairness Monitor, Robinson Global Management Inc.

cc: Andrea Robinson, B.A, LL.M., PMP., Q. ARB., SCMP (Candidate)
Senior Fairness Monitor, Robinson Global Management Inc.

cc: Don Solomon, B.A., Cert. Tech. Arch.; Q. ARB (Candidate)
Senior Fairness Monitor, Robinson Global Management Inc.