AMPCO Interrogatory #101

Interrogatory

Reference: Ex D2 T2 S10 P45

Over the remainder of 2011, OPG refined the documentation for the project and created the technical specifications for a second engineering services RFP. The second engineering services RFP was issued in late 2011. The RFP featured a more developed scope of work ("SOW"), which provided greater detail on OPG's expectations for the project and also included certain mandatory criteria that proponents had to meet in order for their proposal to be considered. OPG received three proposals, but its initial review of compliance with the mandatory criteria determined that none of the proposals complied. As a result, OPG suspended further evaluation of the proposals and cancelled the RFP.

e) Please identify the proponents that received the RFP and the three who provided proposals to OPG.

f) Please provide the more detailed SOW document.

g) Please provide the mandatory criteria that proponents had to meet.

h) Please identify the mandatory criteria that could not be met and why the three proponents did not meet the criteria.

Response

e) – h)

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 EPC contractor under the ESMSA (see responses to Ex. L-D2-02-AMPCO-102 through Ex. L-D2-02-AMPCO-106). The cancelled RFP neither forms part of the costs that OPG seeks to recover in this application nor provides any relevant information about the project.