

PROPOSAL DEBRIEFING

Date: May 11, 2018
Project: PROJECT NAME
RFP: RFP NUMBER
Consultant: CONSULTANT

Outline:

This debriefing document is organized into the following sections:

- 1) **Selection Process Review** = overview of the BUYER'S evaluation steps, including the number of proposals received and number of short listed proposals.
- 2) **Overall Strengths & Recommendations for Future Proposals** = overall feedback related to the Consultant's proposal.
- 3) **Comments & Feedback Received from the Consultant** = comments and/or feedback provided throughout the procurement process and debriefing discussion.
- 4) **Detailed Review of the Consultant's Proposal** = criteria-by-criteria breakdown of the Consultant's proposal scores.

SELECTION PROCESS REVIEW

As outlined in the RFP, the purpose of the debriefing is to provide feedback on the proposal, discussing strengths and weaknesses with the objective being to assist the firm in preparation of future proposals.

Selection & Evaluation Process:

1. BUYER received a total of **Seven (7)** compliant submissions for this RFP
 - Anonymous proposal items, which included the Execution Methodology (Appendix D), Risk Assessment (Appendix E), and Value Assessment (Appendix F) were reviewed to ensure the submittals did not contain any information that could identify the firm in order to support a blind evaluation process.
 - CONSULTANT's proposal was submitted as per the required format and anonymity requirements.
2. Proposal Evaluations
 - These three sections from each Consultant were sent to the Evaluation Committee to be reviewed individually, and then submitted back to Procurement to average the scores. The averaged totals for each submittal used to assign evaluation points.
 - Evaluations were blind, such that the Evaluation Committee did not have knowledge of the Consultants' identities or past performance references.
 - Each Consultant's past performance information submissions were scored by Procurement based upon the numerical values submitted.
 - After reviewing the written proposals, the evaluation team were provided with the Narratives of Related Experience (NRE). These were non-blind submissions.
3. Short List Determination
 - After completing the above evaluations, **top four ranked** proposals were short listed and proceeded to the interview process.
 - Note: the Evaluation Committee was not given access to scoring or ranking information until after all interview evaluations were submitted.
4. Interviews
 - The same Evaluation Committee was present for Interviews with the short listed Consultants.
 - The Evaluation Committee was provided with each Consultant's past performance information.

PROPOSAL DEBRIEFING

5. Selection Determination

- Total evaluation scores were calculated in order to identify the highest ranked Consultant. The firm with the highest score was invited to the Pre-Award Clarification stage of the process.

OVERALL STRENGTHS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROPOSALS

Based on the evaluation criteria defined in the RFP, CONSULTANT was selected as the highest ranked of all competing consultants.

- Areas of strength relative to the average and the shortlist included:
 - 10.0 Out of 10 in Execution Methodology, 1st in rank.
 - 6.0 Out of 10 in Narrative of Related Experience, T-3rd in rank
 - 3.95 points Out of 5 in Past Performance surveys, 3rd in rank.

Feedback and highlights related to the proposal submission:

1. Execution Methodology

- Strengths:
 - Early involvement of all stakeholders (including REGULATOR)
 - Discussed short term options for increased capacity
 - Discussed current financial situation and possible solutions
 - Schedule provided
 - Willing to reevaluate past actions (e.g. reconsider soil fill in ponds on NE edge)
 - Demonstrated good knowledge of current processes (specific commentary on trenches and pump rates)
 - Indicated design and build portions

2. Risk Assessment – Controllable and Non-Controllable

- Strengths:
 - Recognized funding as a source of concern
 - Recognized potential issue with the tanks (and lack of associated data)
 - Risks 4 and 5 were well-stated and insightful – potential for contaminant sources to be underestimated in past research and funding inadequacies
- Opportunities for improvement:
 - Solutions were not detailed. At times appeared to be general marketing material more than targeted risk analysis.
 - Fewer risks and more general solutions when compared with competitors

3. Narrative of Related Experience

- Strengths:
 - Provided an example that specifically included ammonia and nitrates issues in soil, ground, and surface waters. Also modelling of contaminant fate and transport. Containment with monitoring along with long term contingencies.
 - Demonstrated experience with REGULATOR
 - Discussed specific approach and challenges
 - Example 2 also provided good insight on potential alternatives that could allow for reducing the size of the remediation area.
- Opportunities for improvement:
 - Did not provide many details on specific team members' involvement

4. Interviews with Project Team

- Strengths: overall strongest team, candid, practical.
 - PM has renegotiated other sites with regulatory agencies, will be lead stakeholder engagement, has lots of experience with REGULATOR, identified that

PROPOSAL DEBRIEFING

the current system will not work long-term, biggest risk is the status quo, stakeholder engagement meeting facilitation, nitrogen experience.

- Lead Geologist has lots of nitrate experience, identified potential that clean water is being pumped out and needs to be optimized, was clear he looked at the documents and data that was available, nitrate experience in a fertilizer site.
- Lead Process Engineer has lots of municipal experience, experience presenting to public and elected officials, turn-key options in the \$1-5M market.
- Lead Chemical Engineer was familiar with REGULATOR approach, has clearly looked at the site and available data, recommended reduction in sampling and need to stop pumping clean water, identified community outreach, detailed in explanations with supporting examples.

COMMENTS & FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM THE CONSULTANT

- None at this time.

PROPOSAL DEBRIEFING

Detailed Review of the Consultant’s Proposal: A detailed view of Raw Evaluation scores is shown below.

Items highlighted in **green** indicate that the Consultant received the top-ranked evaluation in that particular category.

NO	CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Evaluation Scale	Best Score Type	CONSULTANT
1	Execution Methodology	15	1 - 10	Highest	10.0
2	Risk Assessment - CONTROLLABLE	10	1 - 10	Highest	4.2
3	Risk Assessment - NON-CONTROLLABLE	10	1 - 10	Highest	4.2
4	Value Assessment Plan	10	1 - 10	Highest	4.2
5	Narrative of Related Experience	10	1 - 10	Highest	6.0
6	Interviews – Project Team	40	1 - 10	Highest	8.3
7	PPI - Project Manager (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	9.79
8	PPI - Technical Role 1 (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	9.92
9	PPI - Technical Role 2 (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	10.00
10	PPI - Technical Role 3 (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	10.00

Average Score of all Proposals	Percentage from Average Score
5.7	75.00%
3.9	6.52%
5.3	-20.97%
4.9	-15.03%
5.7	5.53%
NA	NA
9.7	1.42%
9.8	1.43%
9.9	1.39%
9.8	2.17%

Average Score of Shortlist	Percentage from Shortlist
6.9	45.99%
4.8	-11.58%
6.1	-31.15%
6.1	-31.15%
6.1	-1.64%
6.2	32.3%
9.6	2.34%
9.8	1.38%
9.9	0.63%
9.8	1.98%

Detailed Review of the Consultant’s Proposal: A detailed view of Evaluation Points received in each category is shown below.

Items highlighted in **green** indicate that the Consultant received the top-ranked evaluation in that particular category.

NO	CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Evaluation Scale	Best Score Type	CONSULTANT
1	Execution Methodology	15	1 - 10	Highest	15.00
2	Risk Assessment - CONTROLLABLE	10	1 - 10	Highest	7.00
3	Risk Assessment - NON-CONTROLLABLE	10	1 - 10	Highest	4.67
4	Value Assessment Plan	10	1 - 10	Highest	6.00
5	Narrative of Related Experience	10	1 - 10	Highest	7.50
6	Interviews – Project Team	40	1 - 10	Highest	36.67
7	PPI - Project Manager (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	0.62
8	PPI - Technical Role 1 (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	0.62
9	PPI - Technical Role 2 (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	0.63
10	PPI - Technical Role 3 (1-10 Scores)	0.63	1 - 10	Highest	0.63

100.00

Average Weights of all Proposals	Distance from Average
8.6	6.43
6.6	0.43
5.9	-1.24
7.1	-1.06
7.1	0.39
NA	NA
0.6	0.01
0.6	0.01
0.6	0.01
0.6	0.01
0.6	0.01

Total

Average Weight of Shortlist	Distance from Shortlist
10.3	4.73
7.9	-0.92
6.8	-2.11
8.7	-2.71
7.6	-0.13
28.07	8.60
0.6	0.01
0.6	0.01
0.6	0.00
0.6	0.01

Total

7.49