

February 14th, 2024

ADDENDUM No. 1

REQUEST FOR SUPPLIER QUALIFICATIONS REVISED CLOSING: 11:59pm EST, March 22, 2024

FOR: Prefabricated Overcladding Rosters

Please refer to the above Request for Proposal (RFP) document in your possession and be advised of the following:

REVISIONS

1. Closing Deadline

The Closing date is being changed from March 8, 2024, to 11:59pm EST, March 22, 2024 (REVISED). Please see the revised Schedule of Events below -

Milestone	Scheduled Date
RFSQ issue date	November 9, 2023
Information Session (optional)	November 28, 2023
Final day for Clarifications / Questions	February 23, 2024 (REVISED)
Final day to register	March 1, 2024 (REVISED)
Submission Deadline	March 22, 2024 (REVISED)
Approval and roster award date	April 22, 2024 (REVISED)
Form of Agreement signed	May 17, 2024 (REVISED)

2. Section 1.0 Purpose

- i. Since the issue of this RFSQ, TAF has agreed to support two multi-residential deep retrofit projects in the GTHA (over 200 apartments in total) that will kick off in 2024 and will include prefabricated overcladding. Both building owners would like to leverage the Rosters developed through this process for these projects.

3. Section 2.0 Scope of Work

- i. REPLACE under Section 2.0 Scope of Work.
The successful Proponents will - Meet or exceed the technical requirements (see Appendices A and B)
- ii. CLARIFICATION under 2.0 Scope of Work, Section D. Principal Projects Completed
Examples of at least two prefabricated overcladding panel projects successfully completed during the five years prior to the RFSQ submission date. Examples can include projects that were retrofits or new construction.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q1: Challenges exist in communication and infrastructure between suppliers and housing providers. For example, there is not a contract structure in place that is readily useable and there are restrictions around IPD use.

A1: The team discussed the importance of collaborative contracting and their intent to prioritize it in future. It was noted that NRCan recently released PEER guidelines that talk about importance of IPD and collaborative contracting models and how these may resolve some of the pain points involved in the design-bid-build process.

Q2: CSA certification is an expensive process that some prospective suppliers have undertaken. Has TAF discussed the value-add of CSA in the process and how it will be evaluated?


A2: TAF had not discussed CSA certification with regards to this process. However, it is valuable to the evaluation and should be highlighted in the supplemental requirements submission.

Q3: Prefabrication companies should be involved in all phases of the process, not just as a supplier.

A3: TAF will attempt to encourage participation from suppliers in earlier phases of projects. In an IPD project the supplier would ideally be brought on early as part of the IPD team.

Q4: The highest profitability for a cladding provider is to assemble as much as possible in factory, as paying installers represents a business expense.

A4: From the building owner perspective, there needs to be some ownership of installation from panel providers because it doesn't matter how good a panel is if it's installed poorly. We know that not all panel providers do installations, but the evaluation team wants to understand



who does or can do the installation, and hope that suppliers will identify trusted installers or provide information on how they qualify installers as part of their application.

Q5: Has there been a discussion about the carbon impact of panels? Some housing providers don't allow Cellulose, even though it has lower embodied carbon.

A5: Embodied carbon is important and does factor into the evaluation. However, housing providers may have competing technical priorities, and it will be left to building owners to determine their comfort with specific materials on a project-by-project basis.

Q6: Will only qualified proponents be invited for future prefab TCHC retrofit projects?

A6: There is no obligation for TCHC or any housing provider to use the roster and housing providers will be able to use suppliers not on the roster at their discretion. TAF hopes the rosters will be used extensively, as technical prequalification could help streamline the procurement process for TCHC and other housing providers.

Q7: How many parties have been invited to apply for the RFSQ?


A7: This is not a limited call, TAF has shared the RFSQ with anyone who would be interested in partaking in or understanding the process, and it has been made accessible to the public.

Q8: How are cladding and exterior finish systems included in the analysis?

A8: The evaluation team wishes to understand the full range of solutions and questions about cladding and exterior finish systems are included in the application. Proponents are encouraged to highlight the range of options in their applications.

Q9: On RFSQ, Page 2 - "Proponents are allowed to submit multiple applications, where each application is for an individual product." At what point is a panel variation to be considered an individual product and therefore require a unique application? Could you provide direction on this? For example: e.g. 1) a supplier has both combustible and non-combustible versions of the same panel - is the supplier to apply as 2 versions of the same panel (1 application) or as 2 different products (2 applications)? e.g. 2) a supplier offers different R values by adjusting the panel thickness (and subsequently different thermal bridge value) of the same assembly type/panel concept - Does the supplier submit each an application for each R value version as a new product (with application for each) -OR- submit as one product with multiple R value options (submitted in one application)?

A9: A panelized system product line will include variation in elements within the design of that system. All else being equal, varying thickness of insulation would not define a separate panelized system and, therefore, not require a separate submission. The application will be evaluated based on the highest R-value option for the system, the range of R-values that the



system can achieve should also be described in your submission. Refer to Appendix B for more information on how the R-value is weighted and scored.

Variations in the material or design of the system that results in different performance (excluding clear field R-value) or system attributes, would result in a unique panelized system product line and require a separate submission. That includes but is not limited to changes that result in different water penetration resistance, air leakage resistance, panel joint design, or combustibility of the system. If there are combustible and non-combustible versions of the same panel, each version would need its own submission.

Different exterior finishes or finish cladding panels, with all else being equal per Tables A.1 and A.2, would not need a separate submission, but the range of different finish options should be described in the submission.

Q10: On the RFSQ, Page19 - "Submit an Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) or similar independent, third-party verified embodied carbon disclosure document, with detailed breakdown, for a standard panel size that includes the embodied carbon of all components in the panelized system". Is it appropriate to provide our own embodied carbon analysis of our panel assembly using industry-standard LCA applications like ATHENA or the BEAM Estimator?

A10: An Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) - or similar independent, third party verified document - would receive a maximum score for this category. Estimating tools for embodied carbon such as ATHENA or BEAM Estimator should be submitted if an EPD is not available but would not receive a maximum score as they are not considered equivalent to an EPD. An EPD includes embodied carbon information on specific product designs, as opposed to generic values, and needs third-party verification.

Q11: For clarity, how is combustibility being rated (out of 8). Does non-combustible score higher?

A11: Panel system attributes such as Combustibility have a score range of 0 to 2, and a weight of 6. Refer to Appendix B for scoring criteria for this category.

A non-combustible design will not necessarily score higher than a combustible design. Non-combustible designs will score 1 or 2 depending on how much back-up documentation is provided. Combustible designs will score 2 if the submission simply describes the system as combustible or 0 if they don't indicate combustibility.