

The performance of the successful supplier(s) will be evaluated on each criteria listed below.

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Project Lead	Project Manager is lacking in experience and people skills. Cannot organise project work or meet schedule timelines.		Competent and knowledgeable Project Manager, cooperative; normally available when required		Project Manager provides leadership and structure to project team. Team excels due to Project Manager.	Rating
Team Management	Fails to employ individuals or subcontractors who are skilled and suitable for the work.		Consultant employs individuals or subconsultants who are skilled and suitable for the work.		Consultant manages a cohesive team with superb skills and promotes a positive team environment.	Rating
Utility Coordination	Consultant does not coordinate in the timely manner with all utilities for the project, needs prompting by City Project Managers, misses utility right of ways or getting utility approvals, utility relocates or installations are not coordinated, impacts schedules and causes delays		Consultant adequately coordinate with all utilities for the project, utility right of way, getting utility approvals required, utility relocates or installations are coordinated		Consultant proactively identifies issues, coordinates and works with all utilities for the project, utility right of way, getting utility approvals required promptly, utility relocates or installations are coordinated	Rating
Risk Management	Consultant has no or ineffective risk management methodology. Must be led by City to perform risk analysis. Cannot identify risks or formulate mitigation strategies.		Consultant has a risk management methodology and is able to perform risk analysis. Works together with City to identify risks and provide mitigation strategy. Provides risk management report.		Consultant is a leader in risk management and is able to identify risks not considered by the city and provides a detailed and documented risk management report that contains well-developed mitigation strategies and maintained throughout the project.	Rating

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Staff Availability	Staff are rarely available, don't meet commitments and don't provide supplementary qualified resources when required. Staff assigned to the project are changed without notice to the City.		Staff listed in proposal are those working on the project or if staff leave the project, they are replaced with equally qualified and experienced staff approved by the City. Staff are available when required as stated in the signed agreement and will provide qualified supplementary resources when required		Staff listed in proposal are those working on the project. If staff leave the project, they are replaced with equally qualified and experienced staff approved by the City. Staff are available when required as stated in the signed agreement and will provide qualified supplementary resources when required. Access to firm's upper management is possible and achievable. All commitments are met	Rating

Category: Schedule

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Progress Reporting	Progress reporting is poor or non-existent.		Timely and accurate progress reporting.		Progress reports highlight areas for improvements and provide plans to improve.	Rating
Delivery of Services and Deliverables	Services and deliverables are delayed or of poor quality, resulting in requirement to re-submit. 50% (or less) of design executed by Consultant is completed on time (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)		On-schedule delivery of services and deliverables in every stage. 100% of design completed on schedule (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)		All services and deliverables are delivered promptly, with excellent quality. 100% of the design completed ahead of schedule (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)	Rating

Category: Cost Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Budget Management	<p>Consultant allows budget to get out of hand, does not consider how changes due to design development will affect overall project budget.</p> <p>Consultant is not able to maintain a good balance between scope, quality, schedule and budget. Is unable to provide good advice to the City on proposed scope changes</p>		<p>Management of design development within cost plan. Timeliness of estimating and monitoring. Issues related to cost identified in the time requested by the City,</p> <p>Consultant is able to maintain a sound balance between scope, quality, schedule and budget. Is able to provide good advice to the City on proposed scope changes.</p>		<p>Consultant has good change management process. Design development and scope change estimates are continually updated, trend identified, and forecasts reported routinely. Alternative cost solutions are presented.</p> <p>Consultant is able to anticipate scope changes and acts upon them before they become an issue. Is able to maintain an excellent balance between scope, quality, schedule and budget. Is able to provide good advice to the City on proposed scope changes.</p>	Rating
Accuracy of Estimated Design Fees/Fee Management	<p>Poor monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are over 20% higher than original estimate.</p>		<p>Good monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 10% of original estimate.</p>		<p>Excellent monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 1% of original estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, industry trends</p>	Rating
Accuracy of Estimating Prelim and Construction Tender Costs (This criteria is only applicable if the tender occurs within a reasonable time following the estimate.)	<p>Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are significantly outside the accuracy range as detailed in the PSA Description of Work. Estimates do not include all factors and are not accurate.</p>		<p>Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are comprehensive and within the required accuracy range as detailed in PSA Description of Work.</p>		<p>Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are very close to the estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, and industry trends.</p>	Rating

Category: Cost Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Accuracy of Estimating Construction Quantities	Actual quantities (outside of scope changes) are significantly outside the accuracy range as detailed in the PSA. Estimates do not include all factors and are not accurate.		Consultant provides detailed bills of materials and unit prices are accurate. Construction quantities (outside of scope changes) are within the required accuracy range as detailed in PSA.		Consultant provides detailed bills of materials and unit prices are accurate. Actual quantities (outside of scope changes) are very close to the estimate as detailed in the PSA.	Rating
Invoice Administration	Invoices are late (causing extra work at year end), poorly formatted or contain errors and inadequate details. Progress claims and proposed change costing are unreasonable. Claims for disbursements not included in the agreement. No review by Prime Consultant on disbursement claims.		Invoices are issued within the prescribed timelines, in an acceptable format, with minimal errors and provide the appropriate background documentation. Only disbursements allowed under the Agreement are charged. Claims from sub-consultants reviewed by Prime Consultant before submittal to City.		Invoices are submitted promptly to the appropriate individual for processing; are clear, complete and accurate; require little review time and are in an acceptable format with all required supporting documentation. Claims are well documented, requiring minimal review by the City.	Rating
Consultant Evaluation of Contractor Change Requests and invoicing	Takes an unreasonable amount of time and reviews do not accurately reflect what is in contract documents Does not exercise ability to reject Contractor claimed extras when inappropriate.		Reviews are done accurately and in a reasonable time and identifies where change order requests are covered under existing contract requirement. Consultant rejects Contractor claimed extras when required. Consultant has the ability to make decisive actions in providing Site instructions, and design change management during construction.		Reviews are done accurately and in a prompt manner and identifies where change order requests are covered under existing contract requirement. Evaluates and proposes alternates that improve on methodology, schedule or budget.	Rating
Change Orders (extras and force accounts)	Consistently looking to up-charge with numerous unjustified Change Order Requests.		Extra fees are based on reasonable additional services provided. Contractor-requested Change Orders are detailed and realistic.		Uses discretion in requesting Change Orders. Holds the prices for additional work requested in Change Orders. Any consultant-requested Change Order is detailed and justified.	Rating

Category: Design Services - Construction Consultant

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Innovation	Design shows no innovation.		Design shows some innovation within project requirements and constraints.		Design is recognized as a new paradigm for projects of this type.	Rating
Adherence to Project Guidelines, Scope of Work and Standards (including safety) where the Scope of Work has been defined	Consultant has no understanding of guidelines, scope of work, and standards; or chooses to ignore requirements		Consultant fully understands and incorporates guidelines, scope of work, and standards. Concept Planning specific: Consultant's ability to negotiate and incorporate changes due to regulatory requirements, on time and on schedule and at cost.		Consultant recommends and demonstrates improvements to guidelines, scope of work, and standards that reduces budget	Rating
Design Elegance through EDC Response	Functional re-design determination		EDC support with conditions		EDC full support without conditions	Rating
In-field Design During Construction	In excess of 3 days, impacts contractor schedule and many iterations (increased survey costs)		Completed in 3 days and no more than two iterations		Good on first iteration - no change required and completed in 3 days.	Rating
Ability to Manage/Cope with Change	<p>Consultant is unable to manage/cope with changes in project direction, extensive City staff intervention is required in order to complete the project.</p> <p>Consultant has no understanding of scope of work and standards, extensive assumptions without any contingency or risk mitigation strategy in place.</p>		<p>Consultant is able to manage/cope with changes in project direction, adjust resources and work plan to address final required outcomes of project.</p> <p>Consultant fully understands scope of work and standards, and manages project within budget, risk management strategy in place.</p>		<p>Consultant continually monitors their change & risk management plans, makes recommendations in order to meet required outcomes (including fundamental shifts in project direction).</p> <p>Consultant recommends and demonstrates improvements to scope of work and standards that reduces budget.</p>	Rating
Coordination of Circulation and Stakeholder Consultation on Design	Does not consider any provided comments. City had to ask multiple times for the revisions and comments. City had to intervene for comments/revisions to be incorporated		Obtains input from stakeholders, deals with comments and then optimizes and addresses appropriate comments into design		Comments are gathered, optimized and addressed quickly and appropriately	Rating

Category: Design Services - Construction Consultant

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Response to Questions	Responses are very late, contain multiple errors, are unclear (all requiring multiple callbacks and exchanges with contractor / stakeholders.		Responses to contractor / stakeholders are timely, accurate and clear with minimal callbacks.		Responses are immediate, accurate and clear with no callbacks required.	Rating
As-built Documentation and Record Drawings, and all Project Close-out Documentation	As-built documentation is late, and does not accurately reflect addendum and construction changes. Does not review or poorly reviews Service Manuals. Documentation is not in City format.		As-built documentation is provided within a reasonable time, with few errors and in City format. Reviews service manuals for completeness and follows up with Contractors on any issues.		As-built documentation is updated and provided promptly after construction in section or area is complete. Documentation is accurate, complete and in City format with no revisions. Demonstrates commitment to complete this aspect of the project.	Rating

Category: Quality - Construction Consultant

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Drawing Deliverables	Quality control of deliverables is poor. Drawings contain CAD errors and must be corrected numerous times.		Quality control of deliverables is good. Drawings have minor amount of errors.		Quality control of deliverables is excellent.	Rating
Report Deliverables	Reports are poorly formatted and contain grammatical and spelling errors		Reports are correctly formatted and contain a minimum of errors.		Reports are well formatted and contain none to minor errors.	Rating
Constructability of Design	Re-work required due to non-compliance to standards or design criteria. Issue an excessive number of RFI's. Specifies materials not available or tolerances that are not achievable		Complies to all standards and no re-work or re-engineering and a reasonable number of RFI's issued		Design can be constructed in a safe, timely and cost effective manner meeting all project objectives while providing a high quality product	Rating
Maintainability of the Design	Design poses maintenance difficulties and was not modified to meet the City's requirements.		Design adequately meets the City's requirements for maintainability.		Design provides ease of maintenance and exceeds City's requirements.	Rating

Category: Public Involvement

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Development of an Overall Public Involvement Plan (in accordance with the City's Public Involvement Directive)	<p>Consultant demonstrates little understanding of the overall project or issue complexity, scope, impact, context/history, and decision being made. Poorly conveys issues with stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultant demonstrates little understanding of the purpose and required outcomes from the public involvement process.</p> <p>Consultant is very slow in addressing the public involvement process and the plan is of very poor quality. Poor recognition of stakeholder sensitivities.</p>		<p>Consultant understands the overall project or issue complexity, scope, impact, context/history, and decision being made. Adequately conveys issues with stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultant demonstrates an understanding of the public involvement process and required outcomes.</p> <p>Consultant meets the scope requirements for the public involvement process and stakeholder sensitivities.</p>		<p>Consultant demonstrates comprehensive understanding of the overall project or issue complexity, scope, impact, context/history, and decision being made. Clearly conveys and proactively mitigates issues with stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultant has provided alternatives and methods in achieving the required outcomes for the public involvement process.</p> <p>Consultant has developed a public involvement plan that greatly exceeds project scope requirements and recognizes stakeholder sensitivities.</p>	Rating
Implementation of the Public Involvement Plan	<p>Consultant is unprepared and unorganized during the implementation of the public involvement process. Communication methods are incomplete and poorly targeted.</p>		<p>Consultant is prepared and organized during the public involvement process. Project communication methods are effective, complete, professionally prepared and communicated to the Public supporting good results</p>		<p>Consultant is well prepared and organized during the public involvement process. Provides added value to the communication process. Project communication methods are effective, complete, professionally prepared and communicated to the Public supporting best results.</p>	Rating
Evaluation of the Public Input, Comments and Required Project Follow up (including monitoring, if defined in project)	<p>Consultant is non receptive to providing follow up requirements. Does not provide final report or report is incomplete.</p>		<p>Consultant completes required follow up public involvement requirements and submits final report in a timely fashion</p>		<p>Evaluation of public involvement process is completed quickly providing additional alternatives for all aspects of public comments. Submits comprehensive final report in expedited fashion.</p>	Rating

Category: Construction Contract Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Project Schedule (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)	Due to Consultant's inactions the project experienced significant delays, missing milestones and the completion date requiring increased project costs.		Consultant's actions and responses to questions were adequate with no resultant delay in meeting milestones or completion date.		Consultant's actions and responses to questions contributed to meeting all milestones and allowed for early project completion	Rating
Communication Skills (progress updates, etc.)	Consultant's communication required extensive or continuous intervention from City staff relative to timeliness, clarity or informing stakeholders.		Communication was satisfactory (in accordance with contract stated timelines, with clarity and stakeholders fully informed).		Communication was exceptional (immediate, comprehensive and positive feedback from stakeholders)	Rating
Response to Questions (technical, construction, etc)	Responses are very late, contain multiple errors, are unclear (all requiring multiple callbacks and exchanges with contractor / stakeholders.		Responses to contractor / stakeholders are timely, accurate and clear with minimal callbacks.		Responses are immediate, accurate and clear with no callbacks required.	Rating
Tender Document Preparation and Tender Process (Tender Assistance)	Consultant is not timely with tender document preparation, including unedited and incomplete specifications, special provisions, tender documents, excessive questions during tender period and slow answering questions during the tender period, do not add value to the evaluation process, numerous addendums.		Consultant is able to adequately prepare tender documents, including specification, special provisions, tender document preparation, answering questions during the tender period, assisting with evaluations, very few addendums.		Consultant prepares tender documents in a very timely manner, including carefully edited specification, special provisions, tender documents, documents generate very few questions but they are very responsive in answering those few questions during the tender period, minimum addendums during tender period, assistance in evaluation was invaluable.	Rating
Coordination of Site Activities	Poor coordination of site activities (Contractor, Staff, Utilities, City Department) requiring extensive intervention from City staff to resolve issues.		Satisfactory coordination of site activities (Contractor, Staff, Utilities, City Department) with timely resolution of any issues.		Exceptional coordination of site activities (Contractor, Staff, Utilities, City Department) with immediate resolution of issues along with proactive approach to prevent/mitigate issues in advance.	Rating

Category: Construction Contract Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Documentation	Extensive gaps and/or no documentation or late documentation of site activities or records of discussions/decisions with the Contractor.		Documentation of site activities and records of discussions/decisions with the Contractor satisfactorily maintained and timely		Exceptional, and timely, documentation of site activities (Daily Construction Progress Report and records of discussions/decisions with the Contractor).	Rating
Contract Quantity Control - Progress Payment Certificates (PPC)	Consultant has no change management process. Does not process progress claims in a timely manner or does not check actual progress in field. Requires significant City follow up to complete post construction services. Consultant does not adequately review PPC and certifies unchecked and un-rejected extras claimed by Contractor.		Consultant is able to adequately perform Contract Administration duties, including change management, processing progress claims, and resolving field issues, appropriately and timely completes post construction services. Consultant reviews, processes and certifies Contractor's Progress claims in a timely manner.		Consultant performs Contract Administration duties with little to no input from City. Handles change management, progress claims, and field issues independently. On their own initiative, appropriately and timely completes post construction services	Rating
Accuracy of Estimated Resident Engineering Fees (excluding impacts due to Contractors hours of work/duration)	Poor monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are over 20% higher than estimate.		Good monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 10% of estimate.		Excellent monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 5% of estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, industry trends.	Rating
Pre-tender Estimating Accuracy	Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are significantly outside the accuracy range as detailed in the PSA Description of Work. Estimates do not include all factors and are not accurate.		Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are comprehensive and within the required accuracy range as detailed in PSA Description of Work.		Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are very close to the estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, and industry trends.	Rating

Category: Construction Contract Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Quality Assurance of Contractor's Work	Fails to do required quality assurance tests; or tests are too infrequent; too late, with little interpretation and/or otherwise of little value to the City.		Performs the required number of quality assurance tests, in a timely manner with results produced to the City in a reasonable time.		Anticipates and schedules all quality assurance tests in advance, and is flexible with working hours; performs the tests professionally to the required standards with minimal disruption to the work; and provides meaningful interpretation to the City in a very timely fashion, with recommendations to modify testing procedures or modify work procedures, if required.	Rating
Commissioning Services	When commissioning services are part of the Consultant's scope of work, the Consultant has no commissioning plan. Required resources are not planned for. Equipment is tested haphazardly, such that no systems are commissioned together. Poor or no documentation of commissioning results or issues. Does not provide proper servicing manuals. Does not meet or coordinates meetings with City operation staff to ensure knowledge transfer.		When commissioning services are part of the Consultant's scope of work, the Consultant is able to develop a workable commissioning plan that provides required testing, releases equipment to Operations in an efficient manner, and documents issues and proposes workable solutions. Provides proper servicing manuals. Meets or coordinates meetings with City operation staff to ensure knowledge transfer.		When commissioning services are part of the Consultant's scope of work, the Consultant develops a comprehensive plan that provides detailed testing, identifies resources, releases systems of equipment in an efficient manner, and documents commissioning results. Issues are clearly documented, excellent solutions provided immediately. Provides proper servicing manuals. Meets or coordinates meetings with City operation staff to ensure knowledge transfer.	Rating

Category: Environmental Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Sustainable Design	City must provide direction and expertise for certified and sustainable design. e.g. LEED Certification.		Has certified personnel, able to produce a certified and sustainable design. e.g. LEED Certification.		Provides leadership, and designs that exceeds appropriate certification and sustainable design e.g. LEED Certification.	Rating
Environmental Management (Engineering Design Services)	Not all environmental approvals/permits obtained prior to construction resulting in financial loss or delays in construction. Approved design does not consider or mitigate environmental impact. (As an example: Permanent erosion / sedimentation (ESC) plans inadequate or late.)		All environmental approvals/permits obtained prior to construction. Approved design mitigates the main environmental impacts of project (s). (As an example: Permanent erosion / sedimentation (ESC) plans follow best management practices and are delivered on time.)		All environmental approvals/permits obtained well before construction and are considered early. Approved design mitigates the main environmental impacts of project (s) and additional environmental initiatives have been integrated into the design. (As an example: Permanent erosion / sedimentation (ESC) plans follow best management practices and are delivered early.)	Rating

Category: Environmental Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Environmental Controls (Resident Engineering Services)	Consultant unsuccessfully manages the environmental components of the project. Inspections are not completed, environmental issues are not documented, environmental issues are not resolved in a timely manner, does not communicate environmental issues to stakeholders, does not support the environmental components of the project (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites, spills, on site erosion)		Consultant successfully manages the environmental components of the project. Required inspections are completed, environmental issues are documented, environmental issues are resolved in a timely manner, clearly communicates environmental issues to stakeholders, supports the required environmental components of the project (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites, spills, on site erosion)		Consultant successfully manages the environmental components of the project beyond expectations. Inspections are completed beyond requirements, environmental issues are documented and extra initiatives have been demonstrated to mitigate environmental impacts, Consultant has taken a leadership role to ensure environmental issues are resolved in a timely manner, excellent communication on environmental issues to stakeholders, supports the environmental components of the project and goes beyond the requirements. (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites, spills, on site erosion)	Rating
Environmental Design and Resource Conservation (including natural areas, wildlife, plant life and water)	Design does not consider the environment. Consultant fails to recognize, acknowledge or implement the conditions and provisions of the appropriate Municipal, Provincial or Federal policies and statutes. Has little knowledge or experience in applicable industry standards for design or construction techniques. Opinions presented may lead to prosecution.		Consultant shows commitment to environmental design. Has demonstrated a working knowledge of the appropriate Municipal, Provincial or Federal policies and statutes. Meets industry standards and recognizes site conditions that may affect resource conservation. Suggests appropriate Best Management practices (BMP) for construction and plant establishment activities.		Design exceeds environment expectations. Consultant is fully cognizant of the appropriate Municipal, Provincial or Federal policies and statutes and has demonstrated an effective working relationship with the affected agencies. Provides innovative solutions that meet the requirement of the policies and statutes which may lead to the upgrading of the BMP.	Rating

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Consultant Working Under COE Supervision (compliance with COE safety rules and evidence of staff safety training)	The Consultant's employees repeatedly fail to comply with safety rules established by City staff (i.e. wearing PPE, shortcutting safety procedures). Consultant places self or others in imminent danger (e.g. confined space entry without testing or training, working at heights without fall protection). Consultant fails to provide evidence of staff safety training required for the job (e.g. WHMIS or Fall Protection training Certificate). Does not report all incidents including near misses in a timely manner. Does not work cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		One or two of the Consultant's staff violate minor safety rules (i.e. non-imminent danger) or procedures but remedy situation quickly and does not repeat behaviour. Consultant initially fails to provide required safety training certificates, but stops work until evidence of training is provided and does not repeat behaviour. Reports all incidents and near misses in a timely manner. Works cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		Consultant staff follows all City safety rules and wears required PPE. Evidence of safety training provided before work begins.	Rating

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
<p>Consultant Expected to Work Independently (an effective OHS management system that ensures safety of own staff)</p>	<p>Consultant fails to complete hazard assessment, develop/implement safe work procedures or train staff on hazards associated with work. The Consultant's employees repeatedly fail to comply with safety rules they establish (i.e. wearing PPE, shortcutting safety procedures). Consultant staff places self or others in imminent danger (e.g. confined space entry without testing or training, working at heights without fall protection). Consultant fails to provide evidence of staff safety training required for the job (e.g. WHMIS or Fall Protection Training Certificate). Does not provide safety orientation to all subs and owner reps. Does not work cooperatively with other contractors and employees.</p>		<p>Consultant has done hazard assessments and developed/implemented safe work procedures but may have missed something. They do regular safety inspections and occasionally find errors. They take corrective action immediately. If individual staff members violate rules repeatedly or seriously, the Consultant takes prompt action to remove individuals from the site. Minor safety violations occasionally occur but the Consultant provides evidence of staff safety training required for the job (e.g. WHMIS or Fall Protection Training Certificate). Reports all incidents and near misses in a timely manner.</p>		<p>Consultant does comprehensive hazard assessment and develops good safe work procedures. Safety inspections done by Consultant and project manager show safety practices consistently well done. Staff are well trained in required safety procedures and do not violate safety rules.</p>	<p align="center">Rating</p>

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Consultant Expected to Work as Project Prime Contractor (an effective OHS management system that ensures safety of own staff and ensures that other site contractors/employers comply with safety rules)	The Consultant fails to establish a system: to orientate new contractors on safe work procedures, ensure the completion of hazard assessment, ensure compliance with safety rules, complete safety inspections, investigate incidents or follow-up on identified safety issues for any contractor working on site (including for their own staff). Does not provide safety orientation to all subs and owner reps. Does not work cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		The Consultant has developed basic systems to check compliance with safety rules for all site contractors. Occasional gaps in compliance occur (e.g. subcontractor misses orientation, conflict in work scheduling results in inadvertent safety hazard to other contractor) but gaps show no negligence on the part of the Consultant in the role of prime contractor. Consultant takes prompt action to deal with gaps by addressing subcontractor safety performance issue. Provides safety orientation to all subs and owner reps. Reports all incidents and near misses in a timely manner. Works cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		The Consultant has good systems to ensure all contractors on site receive orientation, comply with site safety rules, complete hazard assessments and implement controls. The Consultant in the role of prime contractor has comprehensive record of inspections and orientations given, shows that all safety issues are promptly death with. No significant gaps in systems so nobody on site is endangered and no subcontractors are allowed to take shortcuts on safety. Provides safety orientation to all subs and owner reps.	Rating
Consultant's COR status stayed good throughout contract (remained intact, clear of any COR review by Province, and, if applicable, successfully renewed during the contract).						Yes/No
Lost Time Claim Rate of Consultant at start of contract						Quantity
Number of Medical Aid Claims reported to WCB by Consultant (if any during contract)						Quantity
Number of Lost Time Claims reported to WCB by Consultant (if any during contract)						Quantity

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Number of Province-issued Occupational Health and Safety citations made to Consultant during contract (if any)						Quantity
Number of OHS Section 18 serious injury or accident notifications made to Province by Consultant during contract (if any)						Quantity

Category: Disputes

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Use of Disputes by Consultant	Unusually large number of disputes arose during contract and negotiation rarely resolved the disputes requiring unreasonable amount of use of formal dispute resolution processes.		Consultant is reasonable in filing formal disputes with the City on legitimate matters.		Negotiation resolved all disputes. Advancement to a formal dispute resolution process was never required to resolve differences.	Rating
# of Consultant disputes that went to Referee						Quantity
# of Consultant disputes that went to or are going to Arbitration						Quantity
# of Consultant disputes that went to or are going to Court						Quantity
% of amount received by Consultant to amount claimed						Quantity
# of Consultant disputes ruled in favor of City						Quantity
# of disputes ruled in favor of Consultant						Quantity