AMPCO Interrogatory #100

Interrogatory

Reference: Ex D2 T2 S10 P44

OPG indicates an RFP was distributed to six potential proponents in May 2011. The RFP sought engineering services for all phases of the project (i.e., preliminary, detailed, construction support, commissioning, available for service ("AFS") and close out). OPG received four proposals in response to the RFP. OPG considered these proposals, but ultimately decided to cancel the RFP as it was not satisfied with any of the technical proposals.

a) Please identify the six proponents and the four who provided proposals to OPG.

b) Please provide the Scope of Work (SOW) document.

c) Please provide the criteria used to evaluate the proposals.

d) Please indicate why OPG was not satisfied with the technical proposals.

Response

a) – d)

OPG declines to provide the requested materials on the basis of relevance. The engineering services RFP referred to in the question was cancelled. OPG ultimately determined to issue a work request for an Engineering, Procurement, and Construction ("EPC") contractor under the Extended Services Master Services Agreement ("ESMSA"). See responses to Ex. L-D2-02-AMPCO-102 through Ex. L-D2-02-AMPCO-106. The RFP neither forms part of the costs that OPG seeks to recover in this application nor provides any relevant information about the project.