

GM21.12

Attachment 2

Award for Request for Proposal 2110-16-3160 to BSM Technologies Ltd. for the Provision of Telematics Solution

Attachment 2



Knowles

A Hill International Company

April 13, 2017

Elena Caruso
Manager, Goods and Services
Purchasing and Materials Management Division
City Hall, 17th Floor, West Tower
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2

Dear Ms. Caruso:

Re: Telematics Solution for Municipal Vehicle Fleet (Request for Proposals No.2110-16-3160)

Knowles Consultancy Services Inc. was retained to act as Fairness Consultant for the captioned procurement. Our responsibilities included but were not limited to the following:

- Review of the RFP to identify inconsistencies and lack of clarity
- Review of the evaluation criteria with respect to clarity and consistency
- Oversight of communications during the RFP open period, including addenda
- Ensuring that selection committee members (evaluators) were briefed on best practices with respect to principles and duties of fairness; confidentiality of vendor submissions; conflict of interest; undue influence; scoring procedures; and, the retention of documents.

- Attendance at selection committee consensus evaluation sessions
- Monitoring and reporting of any deviations from the process established in the RFP, conflicts of interest or the exercise of undue influence over the process
- Assessment of the procurement evaluation process

The report is based on our first hand observations of the process used and information provided by the procurement project team. Any other person who wishes to review this report must first obtain the written permission of the City of Toronto. Knowles and the individual author of this report bear no liability for opinions that unauthorized persons may infer from this report.

The RFP was issued on December 9, 2016 as a two envelope system. Envelope one (1) being the technical response and envelope two (2) being the Cost of Service response.

The RFP clearly stated the mandatory requirements, process and the technical requirements as well as the evaluation criteria and points allocation, including minimum scores in several categories. It designated a single point of contact and explained the process for communication during the open period. It stated the closing time and established the following steps in the evaluation process:

1. Review of each proposal by procurement staff to determine whether it met the mandatory process and technical requirements set out in the RFP.
2. Evaluation of the proposals against scored evaluation criteria set out in the RFP, except price.
3. Evaluation of price.

The RFP closed on January 23, 2017 and Proposals were received from four (4) proponents before the closing time. Two (2) proposals received were declared non-compliant and two (2) were declared compliant at the time of closing.

The technical evaluation of all proposals was performed by a selection committee. The committee met as a group to review the proposals and arrived at a consensus score for each criterion.

In accordance with the RFP evaluation criteria, one (1) proponent passed the technical scoring threshold of 75% and proceeded to the pricing evaluation, envelope two. Evaluation of the pricing component was conducted by PMMD in accordance with the RFP evaluation criteria. Technical and pricing scores were combined to arrive at a total evaluated RFP score for the one (1) proponent. The total scores were discussed and reviewed by PMMD and the selection committee to arrive at a highest scoring Proponent(s).

As fairness monitors, we can attest to the following:

- Care was taken to develop selection criteria that objectively reflected the legitimate needs of the City and to produce an RFP that was clear and consistent.

- Communications during the RFP open period and after closing were conducted through a single point of contact and in accordance with the RFP.
- Selection committee members brought a broad range of knowledge and experience to their work and were qualified to evaluate the proposal.
- The selection committee was briefed on best practices with respect to principles and duties of fairness; confidentiality of vendor submissions; conflict of interest; undue influence; scoring procedures; and, the retention of documents. The City's procurement staff provided an evaluation process workbook to each evaluator to guide their conduct during the evaluation.
- The evaluators performed their work diligently and made appropriate reference to the fairness consultant and PMMD.
- Evaluators viewed the proposal objectively and adhered to the criteria established in the RFP as well as the detailed scoring guide developed for the purpose.
- Discussion during consensus scoring sessions was fulsome and a free exchange of views took place.
- No evaluator or other individual exerted undue influence over the process.
- The procurement and evaluation processes were conducted in accordance with the information published to the proponents in the RFP.

We are not aware of the existence of any conflict of interest or breach of confidentiality.
In summary, the procurement process was conducted in a fair, open and transparent manner.

Yours truly,

Knowles Consultancy Services Inc.
Paul Cook,
Fairness Consultant