

# A GUIDE TO PREQUALIFICATION OF CONTRACTORS



Ontario General Contractors Association

This guide is produced by the Ontario General Contractors Association in cooperation with its industry partners.

The primary purpose of the Guide is to provide Owners, Consultants and Proponents with recommended “best practices” for conducting and participating in the Prequalification Process. These procedures are intended to apply to any public or private sector project, large or small, where Owners wish to pre-select their Proponents. They can be equally applied to the prequalification of construction managers and major subtrades. This process can also be applied either on a project-by-project basis or on a roster system for groups of projects of a similar size and complexity.

The recommended practices in the Guide reflect the underlying principles for conducting a fair, open and transparent prequalification. The use of these practices can reduce or minimize the potential for costly misunderstanding, disputes, delays and other difficulties.

The Guide generally avoids setting out practices in detailed, prescriptive terms, as the practice of prequalification tends to vary based on local customs and project requirements.

Most of the recommended practices and the underlying principles conveyed in this Guide are generally applicable, regardless of the form of prequalification used.

It is the position of the OGCA that **all** qualified Proponents (those meeting the mandatory requirements set out by the Owner) be invited to submit a tender and that it be left to the individual Proponents to determine if they submit a tender or not.

It is to be noted that other organizations may hold a different position to the one expressed by the OGCA.

General enquiries, and suggestions for future editions, should be directed to:

Ontario General Contractors Association  
6299 Airport Road, Suite 703  
Mississauga, Ontario  
L4V 1N3  
Phone: (905) 671-3969  
Fax: (905) 671-8212  
Email: [info@ogca.ca](mailto:info@ogca.ca)  
Website: [www.ogca.ca](http://www.ogca.ca)

©Copyright 2006

This document may not be copied in whole or in part without the written consent of the Ontario General Contractors Association.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
  
- 2.0 Elements of a Prequalification System
  
- 3.0 Prequalification Submission Criteria
  
- 4.0 General Project Information
  - 4.1 Mandatory / Optional Site Meetings
  - 4.2 Project Description
  - 4.3 Schedule
  
- 5.0 Closing
  
- 6.0 Submission Format and Evaluation
  - 6.1 Mandatory Material
  - 6.2 Evaluation Requirements
  - 6.3 Evaluation Process
  
- 7.0 Professional Courtesy
  
- 8.0 References and Appendices



# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

## Prequalification CONCEPTS

The purpose of prequalification is to ensure that the Proponents invited to bid the work are capable of delivering quality and value specific to the project requirements. Prequalification is frequently used for public projects, where the opportunity to be considered as the Proponent must be open to all, while at the same time allowing the Owner to manage the risks associated with the open tender process. The Owner, through pre-determined criteria, eliminates candidates who do not demonstrate that they have the necessary financial capacity, technical expertise, managerial ability, project success, and relevant experience for the project at hand. Prequalification also has the potential to simplify the award of the contract process. The prequalification process should be completed prior to the issuance of the tender documents.

For the purpose of this document, definitions of terms and words shall be considered to be consistent with CCDC documents.

This guide has been designed for use in conventional design-bid-build, stipulated sum projects, although it may be used for other types of construction delivery contracts.

## 2.0 ELEMENTS OF A PREQUALIFICATION SYSTEM

The design of a prequalification system should place emphasis on qualifying construction service providers rather than on disqualifying firms.

To this end, the Owner should produce a written document containing all of the information required to be submitted by Proponents seeking qualification, typically referred to as a Request for Prequalification (RFPQ).

Prequalification systems shall clearly define and document the communications process that will be utilized. Communication is essential in any qualifying process: applicants need the ability to get clarifications and answers to questions. In order to ensure that a fair and objective process is implemented, the qualifying agency must relay clarifications and answers to questions to all applicants. Clear documentation of the evaluation process must be communicated to applicants who do not qualify to avoid the appearance of bias and to assist the applicant in developing their resources for future projects.

In the design of a prequalification system, there are three founding principles:

**Transparent:** Owners should be able to communicate why a Proponent was or was not selected. This information will assist the prequalifying firms in improving their capabilities and standing when prequalifying for future projects. Owners should always be impartial and provide clear, understandable procedures and rules that identify how Proponents will be evaluated and the requirements for success and failure. Owners should provide Proponents with a debriefing if they are not successful in order to clearly communicate the reasons for failure. This will provide Proponents the means to improve their capabilities and communication for future submissions.

**Open:** The process should be open to all Proponents to submit. Public funds require this and private funds can benefit from this process. At issue is how to make 'all Proponents' aware that the prequalification process is happening. Advertising in local newspapers can be used on small projects; however, this has the potential of being perceived as 'local preference' on publicly funded projects. Advertising in trade papers can be costly and so a 'project size' schedule should be developed to determine if a project should be advertised locally / provincially / nationally / internationally. Owners may choose to limit the number of prequalified Proponents for the following reasons:

1. Reduce the number of hard copy documents produced during the bidding stage. This may be considered in order to reduce production costs, however, the cost of document production is relatively low compared to the overall project costs and the bid documents can be re-used as construction documents if a refundable deposit is requested and the bid documents are returned following the close of tenders.

2. Reduce the overall number of Proponents to ensure that the ones selected remain interested in bidding - because the number of Proponents is relatively small (6 to 8). There have been instances where this action has produced both positive as well as negative results. A positive result would be where all 6 to 8 invited Proponents submit a tender on time. Although it can be argued that by limiting the number of Proponents you have increased the chances that all Proponents will submit a tender, some clients have found that even after selecting only 5 or 6 Proponents, only 1 or 2 actually submitted a tender upon close. This could result in a failed bid process.

There is no guarantee that all invited Proponents will close because the nature of the bidding process (and the construction industry) is that the status of a firm can change on a week-to-week basis and, during the bidding period, a firm could be submitting bids on multiple projects and, in fact, find themselves with enough work prior to submitting a bid on your project.

**Fair:** The words 'objective' and 'subjective' are often used in defining the success or failure of this component. If a 'weighting system of points awarded' is to be used to determine qualified Proponents, then the goal is to keep the allocation of these awarded points as objective as possible. It may be possible to subdivide the requested criteria into two categories. Some criteria can be simple yes / no or pass / fail evaluations of which all responses must be positive or the applicant is not considered any further.

## **3.0 PREQUALIFICATION SUBMISSION CRITERIA**

Proponents are required to submit materials outlining their credentials and ability to perform the types of construction for which they are being prequalified. Generally, the criteria falls under two headings - mandatory and evaluated. The mandatory criteria are an objective evaluation and Proponents must meet all the mandatory requirements to be considered for prequalification. If they fail to meet the mandatory criteria, their submission is rejected. Following the mandatory requirements, Owners may use an evaluation team to assess the evaluated criteria to determine if the Proponent is prequalified.

### **Mandatory Requirements**

The following is a general list of the types of mandatory criteria that purchasers of construction may consider using:

- Bonding Verification
- Bonding Limits
- Insurance
- CCDC Document 11
- Bank Reference
- WSIB Clearance Certificate (Workplace Safety & Insurance Board)
- Declarations

### **Evaluated Requirements**

The following is a general list of the types of evaluation requirement that purchasers of construction may consider using:

- Experience
- Value of Completed Work
- Details of Similar Projects
- Résumés of Key Personnel
- Organizational Structure
- Resources
- Methodology
- Quality Control Program
- Safety Qualifications
- Safety Policy Statement / Record
- References
- Membership Affiliation
- Litigation



## 4.0 GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

This opening section is to introduce the Proponent to your project. Every RFPQ should include general information regarding the project in question. The purpose of providing this basic but essential information is to clearly outline some parameters that a Proponent needs to determine their ability to prequalify and to determine their desire to continue with the process in general.

A typical RFPQ should include the following basic information:

- Name of the project
- A general description of the project
- Type of contract anticipated
- Location of proposed site (including municipal address if applicable)
- Realistic budget
- Anticipated timelines
- Communication protocol (RFPQ should identify a single point of contact and that individual's contact information)
- Evaluation process clearly indicating the criteria and weighting

## 4.1 MANDATORY / OPTIONAL BRIEFINGS

There are some projects that may require the Proponents to visit the site or to attend briefings to ensure they have a full understanding of a project. The RFPQ should be very clear as to whether the site visit is mandatory or simply an option to the Proponent.

If a site visit has been deemed necessary, then the following information should be included:

- Location, provide a map if required
- Date and Time
- Safety requirements
- Contact person
- Provide total disclosure: for example – any existing buildings that require demolition, or presence of toxic / hazardous materials, or zoning issues such as heritage designation

If the site visit is mandatory or if late attendees will not be allowed to take part, then very clear consequences should be included in the RFPQ so that all Proponents are aware of these criteria prior to attending. It is recommended practice that the briefings are minuted and distributed to those present, and attendance recorded.

## 4.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this section is to provide as much information as possible to all potential Proponents in order to assist them in their decision as to whether or not to submit a proposal on any particular project.

Proponents will often decide on whether or not to apply for prequalification based on the project's size, schedule or complexity.

By providing as much clarity as possible, the chances of unqualified Proponents submitting is reduced, thereby reducing the overall time spent on reviewing the applications in general.

This gives Proponents an opportunity to develop their submission to suit the particulars of the RFPQ and demonstrate their best qualities.

- Type or Use – based on the building code, major occupancy classification. This will indicate to Proponents if a project is of particular interest to them, if they happen to specialize (or want to specialize) in this type of project.
- Cost and Size – the Project's overall budget (realistic) and building size in storeys and gross square metres (feet). Proponents will be able to determine if the project is within their scope of capacity.
- Project Description – some of the major systems / components may be described at this time. The structure, exterior finishes, main mechanical and electrical systems may be described in general terms. Pre-engineered buildings will be of interest to some Proponents and, perhaps, not others.
- Multiple Projects – there are occasions when the Owner may wish to proceed with a single RFPQ to prequalify Proponents for a number of similar projects in the same area within a clearly identified timeframe.
- Unique features – the project may have specific features that require previous experience / expertise on the part of the Proponent. A recreation centre may include a wave-action pool.
- Occupancy During Construction – the project, if a renovation, may impose specific restrictions on hours of operation and access to the site. It is also important to know if work is to occur 'after hours' as this will impact on the Proponent's projected work schedule.
- Schedule – as much information as possible should be indicated at this time. Anticipated start and completion dates will assist the Proponents in projecting their own overall work schedules and assist in their decision to submit or not. Phased projects or projects that may not start for 6 months or longer will have an impact on this decision.
- Site Limitations – any restrictions concerning access to the site or the 'limits' of the construction portion of the site should be made clear. Urban properties vs open sites.

- Quality Control Program – when the Owner expects the Proponent to provide a Quality Control Program, the Proponent will be expected to provide a full description of his program; how it works, personnel who provide it, standards by which the effectiveness of the program can be measured, a record of results on previous projects and other information.
- Special Requirements - the project may have specific requirements that require previous experience / expertise on the part of the applicant. Heritage structures or high security detention facilities make such demands. Projects that involve special programs, such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™), should be mentioned.
- Project Team – the names of Prime Consultant and Major Subconsultants could be of interest to some Proponents.
- Owners should make clear any Union agreements to which they are subject.

## 4.3 SCHEDULE

Owners should clearly outline the schedule showing milestone dates. This allows Proponents to properly plan and allocate resources to the construction project. If there is uncertainty regarding the schedule, Owners should identify this in the RFPQ to inform the Proponents of the risk of delays.

Key milestone dates that should be included are:

- RFPQ issue date
- Inquiries - Owners should identify a deadline, prior to the RFPQ closing, for the cut-off of inquiries. Owners should set this deadline so that there is sufficient time to communicate any changes to all Proponents.
- RFPQ closing date
- Proponent notification of prequalification
- Anticipated date of tender
- Anticipated date of tender closing
- Anticipated date of construction start
- Any milestone dates required during the construction period such as phase completions
- Anticipated date of Substantial Performance and Anticipated date of occupancy
- If there is a change in the schedule, Proponents should be advised accordingly. Proponents should respond that they are still interested in participating.
- If this RFPQ is not project specific, anticipated term of roster as applicable.

## 5.0 CLOSING

As with any proposal, there is a deadline associated with its submission. In order to prevent confusion, the more accurate the information provided to the Proponent the better.

A typical RFPQ should include the following basic closing information:

- Closing Date
- Closing Time (before 00:00:00)
- Delivery Location
- Addressee
- Specific closing requirements (i.e. separate envelopes, Owner-supplied envelopes, etc.)

This portion of the RFPQ should clearly outline that the responsibility to deliver the RFPQ rests with the Proponent. It should allow for clear instructions and consequences should the RFPQ be late.

Submissions received after the deadline should not be accepted and should be returned unopened. Owners may refer to CCDC 23-2005 (A Guide to Calling Bids and Awarding Contracts) for guidance.

## 6.0 SUBMISSION FORMAT REQUIREMENTS

This section discusses setting the requirements for the format in which materials are to be submitted.

The goal of the submission format requirements is to assist Proponents in preparing their submissions in a consistent structured format to allow evaluators to assess a variety of Proponents' abilities in an organized and qualitative manner.

Owners or Owner's Consultants need to recognize the costs of preparing a prequalification submission and act accordingly.

Proponents need to recognize that the requirements are intended to overcome the challenges in evaluating prequalification submissions, especially when these arrive in a variety of formats.

In addition, submission format requirements can call for material (contents and format) at several levels of priority:

1. material that is mandatory;
2. material that is to be evaluated;
3. material that is supplementary (discretionary or optional); or
4. material that is prohibited.

The request for prequalification submissions should precisely and clearly define expectations for the material to be submitted, such as:

- Define which materials are required or mandatory (that is, failure to submit results in automatic disqualification), which are evaluated, which are supplementary (discretionary or optional) and which are prohibited. *Note: Even where failure to submit selected material may not result in immediate or automatic disqualification, the omission may entail such a low evaluated score as to result in a Proponent not succeeding in the prequalification process.*
- Define the consequences for non-compliance with the content and format requirements.
- Define format, such as font, line spacing, two-sided copies, page sizes, use of colour paper (such as if required for defining sections of the submission), maximum number of pages per topic, number of copies to be submitted.
- State whether or not original documents only are required or if copies of (selected) documents are required. In general, copies of documents other than the cover letter should be considered acceptable. Recognize that some documents, such as the WSIB Certificate of Clearance, are only readily available as facsimile copies.
- If order or organization of material is important, define the order in which the submission is to be made, such as providing a table of contents.

- Define if photographs of completed works are required, desired, acceptable or prohibited. Establish the format, and define if colour or black and white photographs are expected.
- Define if preprinted corporate information packages are required, desired, acceptable or prohibited in the submission.
- Define the means, if any, to be used in binding the submission: staple, cerlox, binder, etc.
- Define the level of detail expected in each component (where applicable). For example, define if project descriptions should have gross areas, location, year completed, construction types, functions, renovation / new construction, special features or challenges, level of detail for project references (could include one or more of contact name, position, telephone number, facsimile number, email, etc.)
- Clearly indicate how, where and to whom the materials are to be delivered – by facsimile, in an envelope, labeling, electronically, etc.
- Define if the Owner or Owner's Agent will advise the Proponent if material is missing and will allow supplementary submission of missing non-mandatory data.

## 6.1 MANDATORY MATERIAL

The following is a general list of the types of criteria that Owners may consider using as mandatory requirements for the prequalification process. The Owner shall clearly identify in the RFPQ which items shall be mandatory, and that failure to provide a mandatory item will result in disqualification.

### **Bonding Verification**

This is typically a letter from their bonding company confirming the surety's relationship with the Proponent and their willingness to provide the required bonding for a project of the estimated construction value. A copy of the surety industry standard prequalification letter is attached.

Owners are cautioned that use of liquid security such as Letters of Credit (LOC) can tie up a Proponent's liquidity and borrowing power. Should that Proponent encounter financial problems, their inability to access their cash resources or credit line can have the paradoxical effect of creating the problem you wish to avoid.

### **Bonding Limits**

When a surety company provides a bonding facility to a Proponent, they will typically determine appropriate individual project and aggregate backlog limits for that Proponent. Occasionally, an Owner will ask that a surety prequalification letter include information about these bonding limits with the intention of using this information as a means of determining the Proponent's ability to undertake work.

The surety industry cautions Owners against using this information for such a purpose as this. The Surety Association suggests that bonding limits by themselves are not indicative of a Proponent's ability and warn that Owners risk making erroneous decisions by using the information in this manner.

**Insurance**

This is typically a valid certificate of insurance or a letter from the insurer stating that the Proponent has the ability to obtain the required insurance should they be successful. Owners may require proof of the Proponent's ability to obtain other specific types of insurance (such as environmental). Proponents are advised that additional insurance requirements (such as auto, All Risks, etc.) may be requested in the Contract.

**CCDC Document 11**

A current, completed CCDC Document 11 – Contractor's Statement of Qualification, 1996 edition. It is recommended that the CCDC 11 document be signed by the person who completed the document, and that this requirement be clearly stated in the RFPQ.

**Bank Reference**

A letter from the Proponent's financial institution regarding their general financial position (including the number of years with that institution, dollar values of accounts, history of NSF, general standing, etc.). Provide a named reference from the financial institution with contact information.

**WSIB Clearance Certificates**

A current Workplace Safety and Insurance Board clearance certificate.

**Declarations**

These are typically original executed declarations confirming they comply with the Owner's policies. These may include Conflict of Interest declarations or declarations stating that the Proponent is currently not involved in any legal claim with the Owner. These may also include a declaration that the Proponent recognizes and will abide by the Owner's labour agreements.

## 6.2 EVALUATED REQUIREMENTS

The following is a general list of the types of criteria that Owners may consider using as evaluation requirements for the prequalification process. Clearly state in any RFPQ what qualities you are looking for in a Proponent.

**Experience:** The Proponent's direct or relevant previous experience in completing similar work should be considered.

**Value of Completed Work:** The approximate annual value of the Proponent's construction work completed over the last five years and currently underway.

**Details of Similar Projects:** Details of similar projects delivered by Proponent that have been completed or are currently underway which demonstrate the Proponent's experience and ability to undertake the type and complexity of Work for which they are being prequalified.

The evaluation of a Proponent's similar projects should not simply be assessed on matching projects, but rather on similar building types and complexity. For example, if the prequalification is for a library, the Owner should not make it an exclusionary requirement that the Proponent has to have previously constructed a library. Any institutional facility of comparable size and complexity should be adequate in demonstrating the Proponent's ability to undertake the library's construction.

**Résumés of Key Personnel:** Owners should request résumés for the key individuals who will be undertaking the Work (superintendents, project managers, etc.), and such résumés should clearly outline the role, responsibilities and achievements of the key individuals, and not just a list of completed projects. Details should include project dates, construction budgets and project descriptions. Consideration may be given to those individuals who are Gold Seal Certified, or otherwise accredited. The entire work experience of key personnel should be recognized, not just the time employed by the current Proponent.

**Organizational Structure:** The organization chart shows the Proponent's corporate structure.

**Resources:** The amount of resources the project will require compared to the total resources the Proponent has available should be considered. Resources include: financial, manpower, management personnel, backup management personnel, résumés, key personnel lists, equipment, bonding and insurance capacity, information / communication / job tracking systems used and the overall capacity to complete the work.

**Methodology:** Details of the Proponent's proposed methodology for all or part of the work such as for quality controls, recycling or disposing of construction waste in an environmentally sensitive manner, undertaking construction in occupied buildings, public safety, managing costs, dealing with deficiencies, corrections and warranty follow-up, or for achieving schedule requirements.

**Safety Qualifications:** The company safety record, safety training, and safety awards earned should be considered.

**Safety Policy Statement / Record:** Proponents are required to submit a copy of their Health and Safety policy statement and record. Proponents will be required to submit a complete copy of their Health and Safety Policy and Manual. Further requirements may include a copy of the CAD-7 and Cost and Frequency Report.

**References:** Owners may require references for both key personnel and the company, which can be obtained from other Owners or Architects and Engineers who have worked on projects with the Proponents.

**Membership Affiliation:** Consideration may be given for membership in an industry association, such as the Ontario General Contractors Association (OGCA), Mechanical Contractors Association of Ontario (MCAO), Electrical Contractors Association of Ontario (ECAO), etc.

**Litigation:** The past and current history of the company record of litigation, claims and conflict resolution should be considered.



## 6.3 EVALUATION PROCESS

Owners may consider that Proponents who have met mandatory requirements are generally qualified to bid the work and may not require further evaluation. For Owners who wish to consider greater detail of a Proponent's ability, an evaluation process may be used. This section provides recommendations on how to implement a fair, open and transparent evaluation process.

Once all submissions have been received and verified that they meet all the mandatory requirements and any other procurement / purchasing policies (i.e. sufficient number of submissions received), the prequalification submission will be evaluated. Submissions that do not meet the mandatory requirements should not be evaluated and may not be prequalified.

Owners may want to include the evaluation process when the project's complexity and / or schedule restrictions require a higher level of scrutiny to potential Proponents.

The evaluation process is subjective; therefore the focus should be on getting qualified Proponents on the list rather than excluding them. Owners should consider the following when developing an evaluation process:

- The selection of any evaluation committee should be carefully considered and include members who have the necessary experience and technical information to properly evaluate the Proponent's submission(s).
- Provide details on the weighting to be given to each of the qualities that are being requested.
- Clearly state if you are going to restrict the number of Proponents to a specific number or if you are looking for Proponents to achieve a minimum score that outlines success or failure.
- Proponents' skill sets should be evaluated against the skill sets required to complete the project (i.e. if you are building a library, be open-minded to Proponents who have built institutional work of a similar size, schedule, etc. rather than focusing only on Proponents who have previously built a library).
- It is recommended that the Evaluation Committee read all submissions prior to scoring. Each evaluator should re-review while scoring. The committee should then assess the relative scores of each evaluator and Proponent to identify any significant inconsistencies.
- Proponents may be requested to attend an interview and/or provide written explanation to assist the Evaluation Committee in further review and/or clarification of their submission.

## **Evaluation Guidelines**

This section is intended to provide some direction to Owners and Consultants preparing the RFPQ and conducting the evaluation. Owners should consider what evaluation criteria are relevant to the project's success and what to look for in the Proponent submissions. The evaluation criteria that have been suggested in this document are a sample only, and Owners may consider using others.

### **Experience**

Consider the Proponent's direct or relevant previous experience in completing similar work.

### **Value of Completed Work**

The value of work completed provides Owners some assurance that the Proponent that is seeking qualification has undertaken projects of similar size and complexity. If a given Proponent has historically undertaken \$2M of construction projects per annum and the project in question is valued at \$10M, then the Owner should question the Proponent's financial ability to undertake the project. Owners should not use financial history as a sole guide in determining a Proponent's ability. A project's complexity is not always directly related to a project size and this should be carefully considered during the evaluation.

### **Details of Similar Projects**

The Proponent's history undertaking projects of similar size, type and complexity reveals a great deal about a Proponent's ability. Owners should not necessarily be concerned about whether the Proponent has undertaken a project that is exactly the same. It is the skill set and the Proponent's demonstration that they have the technical and financial resources to undertake the proposed project which is important (i.e. a Proponent does not have to have previously constructed a library to construct a library if they have an excellent history undertaking institutional work).

### **Résumés of Key Personnel**

The Proponent's key personnel can play a significant role on the success of a project. Evaluators should look for individuals with a history of successful delivery of services in a similar role but not necessarily with the Proponent. Owners should concentrate their evaluation on the personnel that have the overall responsibility for project delivery such as the site superintendent or project manager.

### **Organizational Structure**

The Proponent's organizational structure reveals a considerable amount about the Proponent's overall resources. A Proponent with only one superintendent and crew may have resource problems if they are awarded multiple contracts in a construction season. A Proponent with more organizational breadth will have a greater ability to allocate resources to projects. Owners should be cautioned against discriminating against smaller Proponents as the Proponent's size is not the only indicator of a Proponent's ability.

### **Resources**

The amount of resources the project will require compared to the total resources the Proponent has available should be considered. Resources include: financial, manpower, management personnel, backup management personnel, résumés, key personnel lists, equipment, bonding and insurance capacity, information / communication / job tracking systems used and the overall capacity to complete the work.

**Methodology**

The methodology is a written description, usually accompanied with a schedule, explaining how the Proponent would carry out the proposed work. The methodology reveals that the Proponent understands of the project. The methodology can be of particular importance when the work is being carried out in occupied space where careful staging and planning are essential to project success. Proponents may also propose innovative solutions to the planned construction that had not been considered by the design consultants, such as building portions of the work off-site.

**Quality Control Program**

When the Owner expects the Proponent to provide a Quality Control Program, the Proponent will be expected to provide a full description of his program; how it works, personnel who provide it, standards by which the effectiveness of the program can be measured, a record of results on previous projects. Submissions should be supported by schedules, photos and other graphic materials along with commentary from Owners, Architects and Engineers of Record and Payment Certifiers.

**Safety Qualifications**

The company safety record, safety training, and safety awards earned should be considered.

**Safety Policy Statement / Record**

A Proponent's safety record should be of significant importance to evaluators as an organized and clean site will limit overall risk to the Owner, the public and other stakeholders. This is especially true where construction is being undertaken in occupied facilities. A Proponent's safety record can be indicative of how a Proponent conducts business in general. Proponents with good safety records are often Proponents that conduct work methodically, both in the physical completion of the work as well as the administration of the contract.

**References**

References can be obtained directly from other Owners who have contracted with the Proponent or from design professionals who have worked with the Proponent. References can be very revealing about the Proponent's overall capability as well as how they conduct themselves while carrying out the projects.

**Membership Affiliation**

Owners may consider a Proponent's membership in a construction association as being indicative of their overall professionalism. Membership and good standing in organizations such as the OGCA, indicates a certain level of past project performance.

**Litigation**

The past and current history of the company record of litigation, claims and conflict resolution should be considered.

**Supplementary Information**

Owners may want to consider having the Proponent submit for their review two or three project profiles and reference letters which best match the skill types that would be required to complete the proposed project. This section would allow the Proponent to further expand on the previously listed relevant experience and allow him to back up his claims with reference letters attached.

## Sample Evaluation Form

(suggested/sample weighting based on 6.3 Evaluation Process)

| <b>Evaluated Item</b>                   | <b>Weighting</b> | <b>Score</b> |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| <b>Experience</b>                       | <b>5</b>         |              |
| <b>Value of Completed Work</b>          | <b>9</b>         |              |
| <b>Details of Similar Projects</b>      | <b>14</b>        |              |
| <b>Résumés of Key Personnel</b>         | <b>14</b>        |              |
| <b>Organizational Structure</b>         | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Resources</b>                        | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Methodology</b>                      | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Quality Control Program</b>          | <b>11</b>        |              |
| <b>Safety Qualifications</b>            | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Safety Policy Statement / Record</b> | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>References</b>                       | <b>19</b>        |              |
| <b>Membership Affiliation</b>           | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Litigation</b>                       | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Total Weighting / Score</b>          | <b>100</b>       |              |

*\* Note: This is a sample document. It should be customized to suit the requirements of specific project circumstances. It is advisable to provide a copy of the score/weight sheet to be used with the RFPQ package.*

## 7.0 PROFESSIONAL COURTESY

The prequalification process is often the first contact between a Proponent and an Owner or the Owner's Consultant. Each party should recognize the opportunity and the need to establish cordial and professional communications.

In this regard, the Owner or the Owner's Consultant should:

- Reply to all enquiries from parties to the prequalification process in a timely manner.
- Recognize that events change quickly in construction, and that a firm that is prequalified may have legitimate reasons to withdraw from a project after being prequalified. For example, a firm may obtain a large project for Owner 'A' after being prequalified by Owner 'B' and wish to withdraw from Owner 'B's project due to a lack of capacity. An Owner should accept such a withdrawal without penalty, and may consider moving another firm (the next in line) from the prequalification process onto the list of firms invited to bid; this position should be outlined in the prequalification call document.
- Treat all Proponents equally, advising them of the same project information at the same time.
- Promptly inform the Proponents of any revisions.
- A debriefing for all unsuccessful Proponents is recommended. The Owner (or his agent) should inform all Proponents of the outcome of the RFPQ and provide them with a copy of their score sheet and ranking, if requested.
- Once the prequalification process is complete and Proponents have been identified (bid list established), additional Proponents shall not be added unless a Proponent withdraws and the terms and conditions of the RFPQ permit a substitution.

The Proponent should:

- Reply to all enquiries from an Owner or an Owner's Consultant in a timely manner.
- Prepare and submit all enquiries well in advance of the submission deadline.
- Where a Proponent wishes to withdraw from the prequalification process, or the bid process after being prequalified, do so at the earliest possible time in writing to the Owner or an Owner's Consultant, describing the reasons for the action. Doing so allows the Owner or an Owner's Consultant to avoid investing time in assessing a prequalification submission or issuing documents to an unwilling Proponent. It is poor practice not to submit a bona fide bid without withdrawing well in advance in writing, and such withdrawal should be in a timely manner to allow an Owner or an Owner's Consultant to replace the Proponent if they so choose. Failure to do so may result in loss of business opportunities with the Owner or an Owner's Consultant in the future.
- The Proponent should promptly inform the Owner of any changes in their submission.

All parties involved in the RFPQ process should respect the privacy and confidentiality of the information and materials contained in or produced for the RFPQ.

## **8.0 REFERENCE MATERIAL AND APPENDICES**

CCDC 11 (ATTACHED)

PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA (ATTACHED)

ADVERTISEMENT EXAMPLE (ATTACHED)

SCORE CARD EXAMPLE (ATTACHED)

SURETY ASSOCIATION OF CANADA PREQUALIFICATION LETTER

### **WEBSITES AND LINKS**

Canadian Construction Association (CCA) [www.cca-acc.com](http://www.cca-acc.com)

Canadian Construction Documents Committee (CCDC) [www.ccdc.org](http://www.ccdc.org)

Ontario Association of Architects (OAA) [www.oaa.on.ca](http://www.oaa.on.ca)

Ontario General Contractors Association (OGCA) [www.ogca.ca](http://www.ogca.ca)

Surety Association of Canada (SAC) [www.surety-canada.com](http://www.surety-canada.com)

Workplace Safety & Insurance Board (WSIB) [www.wsib.on.ca](http://www.wsib.on.ca)

Apply CCDC 11 copyright seal here.

**CONTRACTOR'S QUALIFICATION STATEMENT**

This document is intended to provide information on the capacity, skill, and experience of the Contractor. Applicant may supplement information requested with additional sheets if required.

**Project Number:**

**Project Title and Location:**

**1. Submitted to:**

Firm Name:

Address:

Phone:

Fax:

E-mail:

**2. Submitted by:**

Firm Name:

Address:

Phone:

Fax:

E-mail:

**3. Legal Structure of Contractor:**

Year Established:

Joint Venture

Corporation , Partnership , Registered , Sole Proprietor , Other:

Names and Titles of Officers, Partners, Principal:

**4. Financial References**

a. Bank Name:

Location:

Contact Person(s):

Phone:

Fax:

E-mail:

b. Bonding Company:

Location:

Contact Person(s):

Phone:

Fax:

E-mail:

**5. Annual value of construction work for the past five years**

| Year | Value | Year | Value | Year | Value |
|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
|      | \$    |      | \$    |      | \$    |
|      | \$    |      | \$    |      | \$    |

**6. Principal projects completed in the past five years. Listed in Appendix A.**

**7. Similar or related projects completed. Listed in Appendix B.**

**8. Major construction projects underway this date. Listed in Appendix C.**

**9. Key office personnel proposed for the project, attach resume of qualifications and experience:**

(e.g. Principal in Charge, Project Manager, Estimator, etc)

Name Title / Position

**10. Key site personnel proposed for the project, attach resume of qualifications and experience:**

(e.g. Project manager, Superintendent, Foreman, etc)

Name Title / Position

**I declare that the information provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.**

name and title of contact person



**Principal projects completed in the past five years.**

Project Title and Location:

Description: Project Value: \$  
 Owner: Date Completed:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:  
 Consultant:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:

Project Title and Location:

Description: Project Value: \$  
 Owner: Date Completed:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:  
 Consultant:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:

Project Title and Location:

Description: Project Value: \$  
 Owner: Date Completed:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:  
 Consultant:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:

Project Title and Location:

Description: Project Value: \$  
 Owner: Date Completed:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:  
 Consultant:  
 Refer to: Phone: Fax:

**Similar or related projects completed.**

Project Title and Location:

|              |                   |      |
|--------------|-------------------|------|
| Description: | Project Value: \$ |      |
| Owner:       | Date Completed:   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |
| Consultant:  |                   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |

Project Title and Location:

|              |                   |      |
|--------------|-------------------|------|
| Description: | Project Value: \$ |      |
| Owner:       | Date Completed:   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |
| Consultant:  |                   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |

Project Title and Location:

|              |                   |      |
|--------------|-------------------|------|
| Description: | Project Value: \$ |      |
| Owner:       | Date Completed:   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |
| Consultant:  |                   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |

Project Title and Location:

|              |                   |      |
|--------------|-------------------|------|
| Description: | Project Value: \$ |      |
| Owner:       | Date Completed:   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |
| Consultant:  |                   |      |
| Refer to:    | Phone:            | Fax: |

**Major construction projects underway as of the date of submission.**


---

 Project Title and Location:

|                            |                    |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Description:               | Project Value: \$  |      |
| Scheduled Completion Date: | Percent Completed: | %    |
| Owner:                     |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |
| Consultant:                |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |

---

Project Title and Location:

|                            |                    |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Description:               | Project Value: \$  |      |
| Scheduled Completion Date: | Percent Completed: | %    |
| Owner:                     |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |
| Consultant:                |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |

---

Project Title and Location:

|                            |                    |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Description:               | Project Value: \$  |      |
| Scheduled Completion Date: | Percent Completed: | %    |
| Owner:                     |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |
| Consultant:                |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |

---

Project Title and Location:

|                            |                    |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Description:               | Project Value: \$  |      |
| Scheduled Completion Date: | Percent Completed: | %    |
| Owner:                     |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |
| Consultant:                |                    |      |
| Refer to:                  | Phone:             | Fax: |

**S A M P L E  
PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA**

|  |   |       |  |
|--|---|-------|--|
| <b>1. Experience:</b>                  |   |       |  |
|  | Unsatisfactory  | 0 pts |  |
|  | Satisfactory  | 2 pts |  |
|  | Excellent   | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |
| <b>2. Value of Completed Work:</b>     |   |       |  |
|  | Unsatisfactory  | 0 pts |  |
|  | Satisfactory  | 3 pts |  |
|  | Excellent   | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |
| <b>3. Details of Similar Projects:</b> |   |       |  |
|  | Projects listed are unsatisfactory  | 0 pts |  |
|  | List is satisfactory  | 3 pts |  |
|  | List indicates excellent qualifications   | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |
| <b>4. Résumés of Key Personnel:</b>    |   |       |  |
|  | Résumés indicate doubtful qualifications  | 0 pts |  |
|  | Résumés satisfactory  | 3 pts |  |
|  | Résumés indicate excellent performance  | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |
| <b>5. Organizational Structure:</b>    |   |       |  |
|  | No similar projects in terms of size and type                                   | 0 pts |  |
|  | Similar projects in size and type similar and/or varied enough to be considered | 3 pts |  |
|  | Similar projects in size and type   | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |
| <b>6. Resources:</b>                   |   |       |  |
|  | List indicates firm is inactive and staff resources are likely not available    | 0 pts |  |
|  | List seems appropriate  | 3 pts |  |
|  | List is excellent   | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |
| <b>7. Methodology:</b>                 |   |       |  |
|  | No description provided   | 0 pts |  |
|  | Description provided is satisfactory  | 3 pts |  |
|  | Description is excellent  | 5 pts |  |
|  |   |       |  |

**S A M P L E  
PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA**

|   |                                      |       |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------|--|
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>8. Quality Control Program</b>           |                                      |       |  |
|   |                                      | 0 pts |  |
|   |                                      | 3 pts |  |
|   |                                      | 5 pts |  |
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>9. Safety Qualifications:</b>            |                                      |       |  |
|   |                                      | 0 pts |  |
|   |                                      | 3 pts |  |
|   |                                      | 5 pts |  |
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>10. Safety Policy Statement / Record</b> |                                      |       |  |
|   | No description provided              | 0 pts |  |
|   | Description provided is satisfactory | 3 pts |  |
|   | Description is excellent             | 5 pts |  |
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>11. References</b>                       |                                      |       |  |
|   | Poor                                 | 0 pts |  |
|   | Satisfactory                         | 3 pts |  |
|   | Excellent                            | 5 pts |  |
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>12. Membership Affiliation</b>           |                                      |       |  |
|   | yes                                  | 5 pts |  |
|   | no                                   | 0 pts |  |
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>13. Litigation</b>                       |                                      |       |  |
|   | yes                                  | 0 pts |  |
|   | no                                   | 5 pts |  |
|   |                                      |       |  |
| <b>TOTAL POINTS</b>                         |                                      |       |  |

**Wallace & Grommet Architects Inc.**

---

**S A M P L E**

Advertisement to be published in the Daily Commercial News

**Request for Pre-Qualification from General Contractors**

**The (Owner's Name) is accepting Applications to Pre-qualify from General Contractors for proposed renovations to their existing facility located at (Location of Project).**

Pretender budget: \$1.0m

Tender period: Sept/Oct/05

Construction start: Nov/05

**Completion date: Mar/06**

Renovations (New construction) - include brief description of Project such as: includes the relocation and upgrading of existing facilities within the existing lower, ground and second floors (approx. 2,400m<sup>2</sup> / 26,000 square feet) of a predominantly masonry building. Work also involves a new front entrance and reception area.

The facility must remain fully operational throughout construction.

Interested parties may obtain a copy of the RFPQ by contacting: (Owner's, or their agent's name and telephone number). Cost of the documents is (state amount and in what format – cheque, cash etc.) or delete this sentence if there is no cost.

Deadline for submissions is: time and date

Page - 23 -of 1

---

123 Main Street North Burlington Ontario L1L 2L2

t: 905-555-1212 f: 905-555-1213

## SCORE CARD EXAMPLE

(suggested/sample weighting based on 6.3 Evaluation Process)

| <b>Evaluated Item</b>                   | <b>Weighting</b> | <b>Score</b> |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| <b>Experience</b>                       | <b>5</b>         |              |
| <b>Value of Completed Work</b>          | <b>9</b>         |              |
| <b>Details of Similar Projects</b>      | <b>14</b>        |              |
| <b>Résumés of Key Personnel</b>         | <b>14</b>        |              |
| <b>Organizational Structure</b>         | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Resources</b>                        | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Methodology</b>                      | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Quality Control Program</b>          | <b>11</b>        |              |
| <b>Safety Qualifications</b>            | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Safety Policy Statement / Record</b> | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>References</b>                       | <b>19</b>        |              |
| <b>Membership Affiliation</b>           | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Litigation</b>                       | <b>4</b>         |              |
| <b>Total Weighting / Score</b>          | <b>100</b>       |              |

*\* Note: This is a sample document. It should be customized to suit the requirements of specific project circumstances. It is advisable to provide a copy of the score/weight sheet to be used with the RFPQ package.*



## *Standard Surety Prequalification Letter*

Date

To

**Re: Surety's Letter for Prequalification- for [Description of Project]**

Dear Sirs:

We are the Surety for **(Client)**. They have demonstrated to us in the past an ability to complete their projects in accordance with the conditions of their contracts and we have no hesitation in recommending their services to you.

Our client wishes to be prequalified as a bidder on the captioned project, which we understand will be in the range of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. Based on the limited information available at this time and subject to our assessment of the project and our client's work program at the time of tender, we do not anticipate a problem in supporting the captioned project and supplying the requisite bonds, if asked to do so. However, the execution of any bonds will be subject to an assessment of the final **contract terms, conditions, financing and bond forms** by our client and ourselves.

If we can provide any further assurances or assistance, please don't hesitate to call upon us.

Yours Sincerely,

---

Attorney-In-Fact