TORONTO Professional Services Performance Evaluation version 1.0 - April 20 - 21		☐ Final ☐ Interim #	ŧ	2	DATE	: Apr	20-21
			Administration				
Project Name/Description: Consultant Project for the City of Toronto			Stud				
Project Category: Water/Wastewater Plant					Pankii	ng	
Purchase Order No: 6xxxxx	START DATE: Jan 01-19			Ranking For definitions refer to Page 2			
			-			_	
Purchase Order Value: \$1,000,000	COMPLETION DATE:	Jun 01-22	Ŭ		ME EI		Δ
A. Health and Safety sub-score			3.00) \	Weigh	it 12	2.6%
1. Did the consultant comply with OHSA, Regulations and other legal H&S requirements?				4	√		
Did the consultant comply with agreement-specific H&S requirements and other le Environmental Laws, Employment Standards, By-Laws and Standards?	egal requirements suc	h as WSIA,			✓		
Was the consultant effective at documenting and reporting observed contractor F	18.5 issues?				√		
			3 U(Weigh	+ 26	0%
B. Quality of Deliverables1. Did the consultant provide appropriate QA/QC for their project deliverables?		Sub-score	3.00		vveigr	11 20	0.570
Did the consultant provide appropriate QA/QC for their project deliverables? Was all documentation clear, concise, technically correct and complete?					▼		
				\dashv	<u> </u>	+	\vdash
3. Were designs completed in compliance with all project requirements, standards, specifications & regulations?				\dashv	∨ ✓	+	\vdash
4. Was the project constructable as-tendered?5. Were cost estimates within the accuracy range for the prescribed Estimate Class	<u> </u>			\dashv	∨	+	
			2.00		-	. 10	00/
C. Organization	lianaa with their ear	sub-score	3.00	<u> </u>	Weigh	it 10	0.070
1. Did the consultant submit a satisfactory baseline schedule of their activities in compliance with their agreement?						4	\vdash
Did the consultant regularly update their baseline schedule?				\dashv	√ /	4	\vdash
3. Did the consultant set up and maintain appropriate issue-decision tracking logs for their assignment?				\dashv	√ /	4	\vdash
4. Did the consultant provide the project team proposed, and was there continuity in staffing during their work?				\dashv	√ /		\vdash
5. Did the consultant effectively coordinate and manage the work of its employees and sub-consultants?				\dashv	√		\vdash
6. Did the consultant, acting as the City's agent, effectively represent the City's interests?						. 26	00/
D. Execution 1. Did the consultant complete their project as per their agreed achedule?		sub-score	3.00) 	Weigh	it Zu	.9%
Did the consultant complete their project as per their agreed schedule? Did the consultant complete their project as per their agreed schedule?				\dashv			\vdash
2. Did the consultant complete their work for the agreed price?				\dashv	√	4	\vdash
3. Did the consultant appropriately address technical comments from City staff & other stakeholders during the project?				\dashv	✓		
4. Did the consultant's contract administrator and/or site inspector effectively review and report on the construction? 5. Were the following convices/deliverables accurate complete and delivered in a timely manner:					v		
5. Were the following services/deliverables accurate, complete and delivered in a timely manner:					1		
5.1 Response to RFIs from the contractor, City staff and other stakeholders				\dashv	√		
5.2 Meeting management and meeting minutes Contractor's change directives/orders and payment cortificates				\dashv	∨ ✓		
5.3 Contractor's change directives/orders and payment certificates	+ Overtone Training of	-		\dashv	∨ ✓	+	
5.4 Commissioning Services - Such as Disinfection, Startup, Work Managemen		C		\dashv			
5.5 Did the consultant conduct timely review of shop drawings during the project				\dashv	√		\vdash
5.6 Project close out Services - Such as As-builts, manuals, training and other close out documentation 5.7 Third Party Permits and Approvals				\dashv	∨	+	
E. Administration		sub-score	2 U(Weigh	+ 15	60/
Did the consultant communicate, cooperate, collaborate with City lead, all stakeholders, and public?					vveigr	It 10	0.070
Did the consultant communicate, cooperate, collaborate with City lead, all staken Did the consultant cooperate in resolving non-technical problems and display initi	<u> </u>	utions?		-	<u>√</u>		\vdash
Did the consultant cooperate in resolving non-technical problems and display into Did the consultant demonstrate accountability for issues for which they were resp		ulloris !			<u>√</u>		
Did the consultant demonstrate accountability for issues for which they were resp Did the consultant submit accurate, complete invoices in a timely manner?	OHSIDIE :			\dashv	<u>√</u>		
5. Did the consultant submit their own timely, supportable change order requests? 5. Did the consultant submit their own timely, supportable change order requests?				\dashv	▼		
6. Did the consultant accept responsibility for the full scope of the consultant assignment for which they are responsible			,	-	<u> </u>		\vdash
7. Did the consultant accept responsibility for the full scope of the consultant assignment for which they are responsible public and City operations?					<u>√</u>		
7. Did the consultant coordinate to minimize disruption to the public and only operation	.0113 :		3.0	<u>, 0, </u>	Total So	core (w	-iahtad
Nome	l Cia	4			I Utai U	JUIE (W	eignieu
Name (Print or Type)	ວາຍູ	gnature and	Dat	<u>e</u>			
Duciast Managari							
Project Manager:							
Manager:							
Director: (required for Final only)							
NOTE: If the consultant disagrees with this evaluation, it is to subm	sit its shipstions in writing w	ith currenting evic	lance	with	in five (5)	
business days to the Division Manager (for Interim Reports) or to the	-		ICHOO	With	III 11 10 1	3)	