

Appendix F Sample RFP Scoring



RFP Criteria Scoring

| Component | Requirements | Value | Score |
|-----------------------|--|--------------|--------------|
| 1. Methodology | | 25 | |
| | 1.1 Does the proposal offer an attractive alternative to the current situation? | 5 | |
| | 1.2 Does the overall methodology offered build confidence in the proponent? | 5 | |
| | 1.3 Is there a comprehensive assessment of the current delivery model? | 3 | |
| | 1.4 Is there a sensitive and realistic appraisal of the human resources aspect? | 3 | |
| | 1.5 Project specific question | 2 | |
| | 1.6 Project specific question | 1 | |
| | 1.7 Has the data provided in the RFP (including appendices) been considered/carefully analysed? | 1 | |
| | 1.8 Are there indications that current municipal policies have been taken into consideration | 1 | |
| | 1.9 Does the proponent indicate an ongoing plan of change and refinement which can lead to operating efficiencies (cost reductions?) | 1 | |

| Component | Requirements | Value | Score |
|---|--|--------------|--------------|
| 2. Resources Assigned to the Project | | 15 | |
| | 2.1 Does the proponent demonstrate a good understanding of the range of resources required? | 5 | |
| | 2.2 Do the resources described meet the challenges described in the RFP | 5 | |
| | 2.3 Project specific question regarding resources | 5 | |
| | | | |
| 3. Staff Expertise Assigned to the Project | | 15 | |
| | 3.1 Are proponent's staff allocations (person days) in agreement with time lines for activities/milestones? | 8 | |
| | 3.2 If the above includes a computerized system, is staff allocation realistic to achieve data collection, input and successful operations within the time frame indicated | 5 | |
| | 3.3 Project specific questions regarding Staff Expertise? | 1 | |
| | 3.4 What management/clerical position(s) does the proponent expect the municipality to retain? | 1 | |
| | | | |
| 4. Transitional Schedule | | 15 | |
| | 4.1 Is there a realistic schedule of events/tasks to be accomplished in moving from the municipality to the proponent? | 5 | |

| Component | Requirements | Value | Score |
|--------------------|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 4.2 Are the maintenance of facilities/staff addressed? | 5 | |
| | 4.3 Is the schedule described in sufficient detail and clarity to establish confidence in the proponent's ability and understanding of the issues? | 5 | |
| | | | |
| 5. Cost | | 15 | |
| | 5.1 Do the costing proposals offer a balanced and viable approach? | 3 | |
| | 5.2 Are upfront capital proceeds matched by ongoing operating cost savings? | 3 | |
| | 5.3 Are the savings indicated reasonable and backed by analysis? | 3 | |
| | 5.4 Are the savings material in relation to the budget data forwarded? | 3 | |
| | 5.5 What length and terms of the contract are proposed? | 3 | |
| | | | |
| References | | 15 | |
| | 6.1 Are references validated (requires investigation/site visits) | 8 | |
| | 6.2 Project specific question re references | 3 | |
| | 6.3 Completeness of client information provided | 2 | |
| | 6.4 Are references provided appropriate to the type of project being undertaken? | 2 | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | |