

**Negotiated Request for Proposals
for
Prepurchase of the Pelletizer Equipment
System for the Ashbridges Bay Treatment
Plant**

Fairness Monitor's Report
FINAL
November 12, 2025



Table of Contents

1. Project Highlights	3
1.1 Introduction and Project Background	3
1.2 Scope of the Fairness Monitor Engagement.....	3
2. Competitive Selection Process – Negotiated Request for Proposals	5
2.1 Development of the Negotiated Request for Proposals	5
2.2 nRFP Open Period Process	5
2.3 Evaluation Preparation.....	5
2.4 Bid Receipt.....	5
2.5 Stage 1 – Mandatory Submission Requirements	6
2.6 Stage 2 – Technical Requirements Evaluation.....	6
2.7 Stage 3 – Pricing and Initial Ranking	6
2.8 Debriefing	6
3. Conclusion.....	7

1. Project Highlights

1.1 Introduction and Project Background

- The City of Toronto (the “City”) released a Negotiated Request for Proposals # Doc5163445632 (“nRFP”) on June 17, 2025, to Suppliers to procure an Equipment Supplier to provide the Pelletizer Equipment Systems:
 - Two (2) Rotary Drum Dryer Systems
 - Two (2) Pellet Storage and Loadout Systems

The selected Supplier will be requested to enter into direct contract negotiations to finalize an agreement with the City for the provision of the deliverables. It is the City’s intention to enter into an agreement with only one legal entity. The Project for which the Equipment is being procured is anticipated to take 8 years.

1.2 Scope of the Fairness Monitor Engagement

P1 Consulting was retained in March 2023 to perform fairness monitoring services and provide an independent attestation on the nRFP procurement process. Our mandate was to review and monitor the Proposal documents and communications, provide advice on best practices, review and monitor the evaluation and decision-making processes that are associated with the nRFP to ensure fairness, equity, objectivity, transparency and adequate documentation throughout the evaluation process. We are also to attend, observe and provide guidance at City meetings, as well as Supplier interactions. In particular, in our role as Fairness Monitor, we ascertained that the following steps were taken to ensure an open, fair and transparent process:

- **Review of the nRFP and Addenda:**

P1 Consulting reviewed the nRFP and addenda, as required, and all other documents related to the procurement process to ensure that the requirements were met.
- **Review of Questions and Answers (Q&A), Clarification Questions and the Responses:**

P1 Consulting reviewed all Q&As and the responses submitted to the Suppliers. P1 Consulting also reviewed any clarifying questions submitted by City.
- **Review of Evaluation Criteria and Procedures:**

P1 Consulting reviewed the evaluation criteria and procedures for the nRFP to ensure that the requirements were met.
- **Advice on Best Practices:**

P1 Consulting attended training sessions to ensure that all project team members were provided with briefings on best practices including the principles and duties of fairness, care and protection of confidential information, avoidance and disclosure of conflict of

interest, bias and undue influence, scoring procedures and sign-off on individual scoring sheets, preparation, treatment and retention of evaluation documents.

- **Evaluation Meetings:**

P1 Consulting observed the evaluation meetings, including the evaluation training session, and the consensus sessions. Additionally, during the evaluation process, we provided verbal and written advice with respect to fairness, objectivity, consistency of process, conflict of interest and confidentiality to ensure strict accordance with the specifications and criteria set out in the nRFP documents.

- **Supplier Interaction:**

P1 Consulting attended and monitored the virtual site visits with Suppliers.

All of the tasks above were completed in a manner that was fair, open and transparent.

2. Competitive Selection Process – Negotiated Request for Proposals

2.1 Development of the Negotiated Request for Proposals

P1 Consulting reviewed the nRFP prior to it being posted to the Suppliers and all of our comments related to fairness were satisfactorily addressed by City. We confirm that, from a fairness perspective, the requirements were clear and the nRFP provided the Suppliers a fair process.

2.2 nRFP Open Period Process

Throughout the nRFP open period, the City responded to the questions from the Suppliers and issued addenda to provide greater clarity on the requirements and process. P1 Consulting reviewed all documents that were posted to confirm that they were acceptable from a fairness perspective. An optional information meeting and virtual site visit for the project was held on July 7, 2025. P1 Consulting reviewed the meeting materials in advance, from a fairness perspective, and attended the session.

2.3 Evaluation Preparation

The City developed evaluation procedure documentation in advance of the evaluation process, which was reviewed by the Fairness Monitor. All participants in the evaluation process were required to participate in a training session in preparation for their role in the process, which described roles and responsibilities and the approach to the evaluation. Each evaluation participant was required to sign a participant undertaking, which included a continued commitment to the avoidance of conflicts and respect of confidentiality commitments. Project participants were notified of the appointment of a Fairness Monitor. There were no conflicts identified of which we were aware, which prevented a party from participating in the nRFP evaluation.

2.4 Bid Receipt

The nRFP Submission Deadline was 12:00 noon (local time) September 12, 2025. As per the nRFP, Bids must have been submitted through the City Online Procurement System prior to the Submission Deadline for them to be compliant.

Two bids were received in advance of the Submission Deadline through the City Online Procurement System from the following Suppliers:

- ANDRITZ Separation Limited
- Berlie Technologies Inc.

The evaluation was conducted according to the following stages:

1. Stage 1 – Mandatory Submission Requirements
2. Stage 2 – Technical Requirements Evaluation

- a. Stage 2A – Mandatory Technical Requirements
 - b. Stage 2B – Technical Proposal Rated Evaluation
 - c. Stage 2C Interviews OR Supplier Presentations
3. Stage 3 – Pricing and Rankings

2.5 Stage 1 – Mandatory Submission Requirements

Prior to releasing the Bids to the evaluators, the City reviewed each Bid to determine if they complied with the mandatory requirements of the RFP. Both Suppliers' bids met the mandatory requirements and proceeded to Stage 2.

2.6 Stage 2 – Technical Requirements Evaluation

The members of the Evaluation Team undertook an individual evaluation and scoring of Bids against the rated criteria described in the nRFP. After completion of the individual evaluations, a consensus evaluation process was used to evaluate the using the established technical evaluation criteria. The participants engaged in a fulsome exchange of views leading to evaluation results, which were agreed to by the evaluators for each Supplier. All participants performed their roles diligently throughout the evaluation process.

P1 Consulting attended the consensus meetings and observed that the proceedings were in accordance with the nRFP and the City's evaluation procedure documents. P1 confirms that the process was fair, transparent and unbiased.

Both Bids met or exceeded the minimum threshold identified in the nRFP for Stage 2A and 2B. In accordance with the nRFP the City opted to waive this 2C for all Suppliers, both bids therefore proceeded to the Stage 3 evaluation.

2.7 Stage 3 – Pricing and Initial Ranking

The City reviewed and evaluated the pricing submitted for both Suppliers accordance with the price evaluation method set out in the Pricing Form of the nRFP. After the completion of Stage 3, all scores from Stage 2 and Stage 3 were added together and the Bids were ranked based on their total scores. Berlie Technologies Inc. was identified as the top ranked Supplier. P1 Consulting reviewed the final evaluation documents and confirms the proceedings were in accordance with the nRFP and the City's evaluation procedure documents. P1 confirms that the process was fair, transparent and unbiased.

2.8 Debriefing

At the time of this report, no debriefings have been conducted related to this procurement.

3. Conclusion

Our fairness review was conducted without influence and as of the date of this report, we confirm that we are satisfied that, from a fairness perspective, the processes undertaken related to the Negotiated Request for Proposals for Prepurchase of the Pelletizer Equipment System for the Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant have been conducted in a fair, open and transparent manner. As Fairness Monitor for this Project, we are satisfied that City have followed the procedures in accordance with the applicable nRFP and policy documentation and that the participants followed the procedures and fairly applied the evaluation criteria.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Braithwaite".

Stephanie Braithwaite
Fairness Monitor
P1 Consulting Inc.