

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Evaluation of any Bid that contains multiple weighted evaluation criteria shall be performed by a Team comprised of the appropriate expertise for a proper evaluation. The Team should consist of a technical expert, a financial representative and have access to specific Legal Services staff when required. MM may be requested to assist in the evaluation as a Team member. MM always reviews the final decision.

The term CA is used to define the Contract Administrator or Consultant Contract Administrator.

Prior to the submission deadline

MM will prepare and forward the standard scoring matrix to the CA shortly after the RFP is issued.

The Team must convene to review and understand the evaluation criteria set out in the document, if they haven't already done so when developing the RFP. At this meeting, the Team will:

- determine the scoring breakdown
- review the evaluation guidelines provided below
- review conflict of interest and confidentiality provisions provided below
- decide how to assign points (eg. whole numbers or to one or two decimal places) to ensure consistency amongst evaluators

MM will attend this meeting upon request. (If the Team is new to evaluation, MM should attend).

Scoring breakdowns must be submitted to the CO prior to the submission deadline. Proposals will not be released until the final breakdown has been received from the CA.

After the submission deadline

MM prepares the standard scoring matrix and posts it, together with the Proposals, to an FTP site. MM emails the FTP site link to the CA. This standard scoring matrix should be used by each Team member for their individual evaluations.

The CA will receive an email from the CO with the completed standard scoring matrix, which includes the completeness review, MM comments and the matrix evaluation calculation (pricing).

Each Team member is responsible to securely store all submissions.

The CA must review:

- The prices on the matrix evaluation calculation tab of the standard scoring matrix.
- CO's comments on the completeness review tab of the standard scoring matrix.

Conflict of Interest

Where the estimated value of the contract exceeds \$5 Million, the CA must prepare a Conflict of Interest form listing all participants on the Proponent, from all Proposals, proposed to perform work under the contract. If **any** Team member believes they may be in a conflict of interest situation, they should disclose to the CA. Over-riding principle: **"if in doubt, disclose"**.

Forms are available at: [See Materials Management for form](#)

Where the estimated value of the contract does not exceed \$5 Million, and prior to evaluation, the CA must determine if any of the evaluation Team members have a conflict of interest with any participants proposed to perform work under the contract. If **any** Team member believes they may be in a conflict of interest situation, they should disclose to the CA. Over-riding principle: **"if in doubt, disclose"**.

Confidentiality

- Submissions may contain commercially sensitive information;

- The evaluation process, Proponents names and submissions are confidential;
- Do not discuss confidential information outside of the evaluation Team, before, during or after the evaluation process.

Formal confidentiality agreements are required where a Team member is external to the City and when the CA determines it is necessary, based on the content of the submissions.

Forms are available at [See Materials Management for form.](#)

Evaluation Guidelines

- Only the evaluation criteria set out in the RFP shall be used to evaluate Proposals.
- Only the information contained in the Proposals may be used in the evaluation.
- Personal knowledge of a Proponent or the Proponent's previous work shall not be considered.
- The CA must review each Proposal as follows:
 - Did the Proponent:
 - Sign Form A: Bid/Proposal?
 - Submit correct and complete Forms/Charts/Information/Drawings, etc.?
 - Submit all pages of required forms?
 - Acknowledge all Addenda?

The CA must review:

- The prices/fees on the matrix evaluation calculation tab of the standard scoring matrix. (double check the math)
- CO's comments are on the completeness review tab of the standard scoring matrix.

All Proposals, including non-responsive Proposals, **MUST** be evaluated by each Team member in isolation of other Team members by:

- Reviewing each submission, noting any comments, additions, deletions, etc., that conflict with the RFP document and General Conditions;
- Determining if the Proposal meets the specifications that were stated in the RFP documents;
- Applying the same degree of scrutiny to each submission;
- Ensuring evaluation criteria is applied in an unbiased manner to each submission;
- Scoring submissions against evaluation criteria;
 - Evaluating the Proposals against the evaluation criteria, not against each other;
- Using a consistent approach in evaluating and scoring (very important);
- Taking time to thoroughly read each submission and understanding what each contains
- Relying only on the material presented in the submission;
- Taking very detailed notes supporting their scores.
 - If 0/10, state could not find or if 10/10 detailed section completely found on page #
- Checking Bid Validity dates to ensure evaluation is completed in time to award.
 - Add a note to your calendar as a reminder one week before expiry of bids in case the bids need to be extended by Materials Management.

Detailed notes may be required to debrief unsuccessful Proponents regarding only their Proposal (after award) and when/if MM requests reasons to award to the "not low Proponent".

You may need to search for information. Proper organization is not a rated criterion.

Once your Team has completed their individual evaluation, the Team must convene a consensus evaluation meeting. MM should facilitate the consensus evaluation meeting. Approximate time frame for processing is 2 weeks after closing. This will give the team enough time to evaluate proposals.

It is **MANDATORY** that all Team members read the material and attend all consensus meetings with their scores and comments completed. Only Team members can attend consensus meetings.

All independent scores shall be sent to the Contracts Officer at Materials Management at least two (2) Business days prior to consensus meeting.

During consensus, if an evaluator agrees to a consensus score for an item that is significantly higher or lower than their individual score; the evaluator shall record the reason why they agreed with the higher or lower consensus mark in their own notes. (i.e. they should note what information was shared that changed their mind).

Any clarifications must be reviewed by MM prior to issuance to the Proponent.
MM must be consulted when:

- the Proposal appears to contain conflicting information or statements that are unclear;
- the Proposal appears to be non-responsive.

Interviews

Interviews may be conducted following the consensus meetings. Interviews are not meant to obtain new information but to discuss and confirm information provided in their submission.

Any understanding gained from the interview may result in the Team revising the scores accordingly.

ALL TEAM MEMBERS MUST BE PRESENT AT EACH INTERVIEW.

Negotiations

Negotiations may be conducted following the consensus meetings with the most advantageous Proponent. Negotiations may result in a revised offer (alternative proposal). If a revised offer is received, the offer must be added to the standard scoring matrix as an additional column and evaluated alongside the other proposals.

If the most advantageous offer includes Terms and Conditions, these MUST be dealt with PRIOR to award/Admin Report process. Contact Legal Services at [Legal-purchasing@winnipeg.ca](mailto:legal-purchasing@winnipeg.ca)

After evaluation

If the most advantageous offer meets specifications, the CA or the Team are responsible to ensure the Proponent is qualified in accordance with the qualifications clause in the RFP, before recommending award.

NOT AWARDING TO LOW PRICE/FEE

If the recommendation is **not** to the low Bidder, the CA must follow the process below:

Where Award Report is **not** required:

- the CA must submit explanations to purchasing@winnipeg.ca detailing the reasons for proceeding to the recommended Proponent.

Award Report required:

- Estimated contract value does not exceed \$5 Million; the CA must include the explanations detailing the reasons for proceeding to the recommended Proponent in the award Report.
- Estimated contract value exceeds \$5 Million, or the Report is being approved by SPC or Council; the CA must include the explanations detailing the reasons for proceeding to the recommended Proponent in a separate document attached to the award Report.

EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation matrix must be included in all Reports:

- Estimated contract value does not exceed \$5 Million; the CA must include the **summary** evaluation matrix in the award Report.
- Estimated contract value exceeds \$5 Million, or the Report is being approved by SPC or Council; the CA must include the evaluation matrix **in a separate document attached** to the award Report.

Team members must retain their individual scores and comments securely in their own files.

After Award

With the exception of the CA's copy, all electronic copies of the proposals should be purged after award of contract.

For all RFPs, unsuccessful Proponent letters **MUST** be issued.

The CA is responsible to debrief Proponents upon written request. The CA can discuss the weaknesses and strengths of a Proponent's submission, but cannot discuss other Proponent's submissions or the scores.

Debriefs should:

- **Be provided verbally and not in writing.**
- Be completed after award of contract.
- Be completed in good faith and offer a genuine description of the Proponent's shortcomings in the submission.
- Speak to the Proponents submission and to share information related to the Proponent's response only.
- NOT include discussion of other submissions
- Include information about Proponent's responses only; without comparisons to other Proponent's, only how the Proponent responded relative to the evaluation criteria.
- Have City representation by someone familiar with the evaluation process. The Contract Administrator of the evaluation team is best accompanied by another representative of the evaluation team
- Have one representative be designated as the note taker.
- Not disclose the evaluation scores and be limited to consensus evaluation comments only.

The information should be limited to how they could have improved their response and where they did well by utilizing the comments from the consensus evaluation meeting.

Proponents should inform the City **in advance** of the names and positions of representatives who will attend the debrief.

Debrief team must review the submission of the unsuccessful Proponent, the competitive procurement documents and the evaluation notes in preparation for the debrief meeting.

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR BID OPPORTUNITIES (TENDERS)

After the submission deadline

Materials Management (MM) prepares a bid evaluation spreadsheet and posts it, together with the Bids, to an FTP site. MM emails the FTP site link to the Contract Administrator (CA).

The CA must review as follows:

- Did the Bidder:
 - Submit correct Forms/Charts/Information/Drawings, etc.?
 - Submit all pages of required forms?
 - Acknowledge all Addenda?
 - Sign Form A: Bid/Proposal?
- Note any comments, additions, deletions, etc. that conflict with the tender document and General Conditions;
- Determine if the Bid meets the specifications stated in the tender documents;
- Determine if the Bid is responsive, in consultation with MM;
- Verify prices on Form B to bid evaluation spreadsheet: Check the math.
 - If there is no excel spreadsheet provided from the CO with calculations already done the CA is required to double check the calculations/math of each bid.
 - For Construction only, advise purchasing@winnipeg.ca of the evaluated posted opening results (tender tab);
- Contracts Officer's (CO) comments on the spreadsheet.

After evaluation

If low Bidder meets specifications, before recommending award, the CA must verify their qualifications in accordance with the qualifications clause in the bid opportunity.

If the low Bidder **is** qualified, meets specifications and all other requirements, award can be recommended to the low responsive, qualified Bidder.

If the low Bidder is **not** being recommended for award, (i.e. not qualified, non-responsive, does not meet specifications), the recommendation should be to the next low responsive qualified Bidder.

NOT AWARDING TO LOW BID

If the recommendation is **not** to the low Bidder, the CA must follow the process below:

Where Award Report is **not** required:

- CA must submit explanations to purchasing@winnipeg.ca detailing the reasons for proceeding to the recommended Bidder.

Where Award Report required:

- Estimated contract value does not exceed \$5 Million; the CA must include the explanations detailing the reasons for proceeding to the recommended Bidder in the award Report.
- Estimated contract value exceeds \$5 Million, or the Report is being approved by SPC or Council; the CA must include the explanations detailing the reasons for proceeding to the recommended Bidder in a separate document attached to the award Report.

EVALUATION MATRIX

Where the estimated contract value does not exceed \$5 million: the summary of evaluation matrix **MUST** be included in the award Report.

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION (RFQ)

Evaluation of any Qualification that contains multiple weighted evaluation criteria shall be performed by a Team comprised of the appropriate expertise for a proper evaluation. The Team should consist of a technical expert, a financial representative (if required) and have access to specific Legal Services staff when required. MM may be requested to assist in the evaluation as a Team member. MM always reviews the final decision.

The term CA is used to define the Contract Administrator.

Prior to the submission deadline

MM will prepare and forward the standard scoring matrix to the CA shortly after the RFQ is issued.

The Team must convene to review and understand the evaluation criteria set out in the document. At this meeting, the Team will determine the scoring breakdown and discuss the evaluation process. This meeting should include how to assign points either whole or .25/.5/.75 to ensure evaluators are consistent. MM will attend this meeting upon request. (If the Team is new to evaluation, MM should attend).

Scoring breakdowns must be submitted to the CO prior to the submission deadline. Qualification submissions will not be released until the final breakdown has been received from the CA.

After the submission deadline

MM prepares the standard scoring matrix and posts it, together with the submissions, to an FTP site. MM emails the FTP site link to the CA. This standard scoring matrix should be used by each Team member for their individual evaluations.

The CA will receive an email from the CO with the completed standard scoring matrix, which includes the completeness review and MM comments.

Each Team member is responsible to securely store all submissions.

Conflict of Interest

Where the estimated value of the contract exceeds \$5 Million, the CA must prepare a Conflict of Interest form listing all participants, from all bid submissions, proposed to perform work under the contract. If **any** Team member believes they may be in a conflict of interest situation, they should disclose to the CA. Over-riding principle: **“if in doubt, disclose”**.

Forms are available at: [See Materials Management for form](#)

Where the estimated value of the contract does not exceed \$5 Million, and prior to evaluation, the CA must determine if any of the evaluation Team members have a conflict of interest with any participants proposed to perform work under the contract. If **any** Team member believes they may be in a conflict of interest situation, they should disclose to the CA. Over-riding principle: **“if in doubt, disclose”**.

Confidentiality

- Submissions may contain commercially sensitive information;
- The evaluation process, Proponents names and submissions are confidential;
- Do not discuss confidential information outside of the evaluation Team, before, during or after the evaluation process.

Formal confidentiality agreements are required where a Team member is external to the City and when the CA determines it is necessary, based on the content of the submissions.

Forms are available at: [See Materials Management for form.](#)

Evaluation

- Only the evaluation criteria set out in the RFQ shall be used to evaluate Qualification submissions.
- Only the information contained in the qualification submission may be used in that evaluation.
- Personal knowledge of a Proponent or the Proponent's previous work shall not be considered.
- The CA must review each qualification submission as follows:
- Did the Proponent:
 - Sign Form A: Qualification Submission?
 - Submit correct Forms/Charts/Information/Drawings, etc.?
 - Submit all pages of required forms?
 - Acknowledge all Addenda?

The CA must review:

- CO's comments on the completeness review tab of the standard scoring matrix.

All Submissions, including non-responsive Submissions, **MUST** be evaluated by each Team member in isolation of other Team members by:

- Reviewing each submission, noting any comments, additions, deletions, etc., that conflict with the RFP document and General Conditions;
- Determining if the Submission meets the specifications that were stated in the RFQ documents;
- Applying the same degree of scrutiny to each submission;
- Ensuring evaluation criteria is applied in an unbiased manner to each submission;
- Scoring submissions against evaluation criteria;
- Evaluating the Submissions against the evaluation criteria, not against each other;
- Using a consistent approach in evaluating and scoring (very important);
- Taking time to thoroughly read each submission and understanding what each contains
- Relying only on the material presented in the submission;
- Taking very detailed notes supporting their scores.

Detailed notes may be required to debrief unsuccessful Proponents regarding only their Submissions (after shortlist is made).

You may need to search for information. Proper organization is not a rated criterion.

Once your Team has completed their individual evaluation, the Team must convene a consensus evaluation meeting. MM should facilitate the consensus evaluation meeting. Approximate time frame for processing is 2 weeks after closing. This will give the team enough time to evaluate proposals.

It is **mandatory** that all Team members read the material and attend all consensus meetings with their scores and comments completed. Only Team members can attend consensus meetings.

All independent scores shall be sent to the Contracts Officer at Materials Management at least two (2) Business days prior to consensus meeting.

During consensus, if an evaluator agrees to a consensus score for an item that is significantly higher or lower than their individual score; the evaluator shall record the reason why they agreed

with the higher or lower consensus mark in their own notes. (i.e. they should note what information was shared that changed their mind).

Any clarifications must be reviewed by MM prior to issuance to the Proponent.
MM must be consulted when:

- the Submission appears to contain conflicting information or statements that are unclear;
- the Submission appears to be non-responsive.

Interviews/Demonstrations

Interviews may be conducted following the consensus meetings. Interviews are not meant to obtain new information but to discuss and confirm information provided in their submission.

Any understanding gained from the interview may result in the Team revising the scores accordingly.

ALL TEAM MEMBERS MUST BE PRESENT AT EACH INTERVIEW or DEMO.

Terms and Conditions MUST be dealt with PRIOR to shortlist being established. Contact Legal Services at Legal-purchasing@winnipeg.ca

After evaluation

The names of the shortlisted Proponents and their addresses will be posted to the MERX website.

Team members must retain their individual scores and comments securely in their own files.

After Shortlist is established

Proponents will be invited to provide detailed Proposals in response to an RFP. Please follow the RFP instructions.

After the award of the Contract all electronic files with the exception of your individual scoring sheets can be purged.

For all Proposals, successful and unsuccessful Proponent letters must be issued.

The CA is responsible to debrief Proponents upon written request. The CA can discuss the weaknesses and strengths of a Proponent's submission, but cannot discuss other Proponent's submissions or the scores.

Debriefs should:

- **Be provided verbally and not in writing.**
- Be completed after award of contract.
- Be completed in good faith and offer a genuine description of the Proponent's shortcomings in the submission.
- Speak to the Proponents submission and to share information related to the Proponent's response only.
- NOT include discussion of other submissions
- Include information about Proponent's responses only, without comparisons to other Proponent's, only how the Proponent responded relative to the evaluation criteria.
- Have City representation by someone familiar with the evaluation process. The Contract Administrator of the evaluation team is best accompanied by another representative of the evaluation team
- Have one representative be designated as the note taker.
- Not disclose the evaluation scores and be limited to consensus evaluation comments only.

The information should be limited to how they could have improved their response and where they did well by utilizing the comments from the consensus evaluation meeting.

Proponents should inform the City **in advance** of the names and positions of representatives who will attend the debrief meeting.

Debrief team must review the submission of the unsuccessful Proponent, the competitive procurement documents and the evaluation notes in preparation for the debrief meeting.