

Proposed Scoring Methodology, Evaluation and Ranking

Stages of Proposal Evaluation

Niagara Region will conduct the evaluation and ranking process in accordance with the stages set out below.

Stage 1 – Mandatory Requirements

Stage 1 will consist of a review to determine which proposals comply with all of the mandatory requirements. Proposals that do not comply with all the mandatory requirements as of the Submission Deadline will, subject to the express and implied rights of Niagara Region, be disqualified and not evaluated further.

Stage 2 – Rated Criteria

Niagara Region Evaluation Team will evaluate each compliant proposal as set out in Sections 1, 2 and 3 of Rated Criteria (explained below).

Stage 3 – Presentation and Interview – Section 4 of Rated Criteria

All proponents that pass Stage 1 will be invited to present and interview with the Evaluation Committee. Each Proponent will be provided with the same prescribed questions.

Stage 4 – Ranking and Selection of Top-Ranked Proponent

After completion of Stages 2 and 3, Procurement will complete the mathematical calculations and final ranking of the proponents in accordance with the evaluation and ranking method described in the RFP.

The following is a summary of the rated criteria and weightings for the evaluation of proposals.

| CRITERIA | Weighting % | Points | Weighted Score |
|---|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| The Regional Municipality of Niagara – Insurance Services Scoring | | | |
| Section 1 - Proponent/Qualifications Experience Financial Service for Transition of Policy | 10% | | |
| Section 2 - Services and Support (20%) Risk Management Services | 5% | | |
| Claims Management Services | 15% | | |
| Section 3 - Coverage/Product | 30% | | |
| Section 4 - Presentation and Interview | 5% | | |
| Section 5 - Total Program Cost (35%) | | | |
| Option #1 (NR/NRP) | 15% | | |
| Option #3 (NR, NRP + NRH) | 20% | | |
| TOTAL | 100% | | |

| Scoring Category | Description | Numeric Score Points |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Fail | Requirement is not met or is not acceptable. | 0 |
| Poor | Minimally addresses the component, but one or more major considerations of the component are not addressed. | 1 - 3 |
| Fair | The response addresses some aspects of the component, but minor considerations may not be addressed. | 4 - 6 |
| Good | The response addresses the component and provides a reasonably good quality solution. | 7 |
| Very Good | There is a high degree of confidence in the proponent's response as a proposed solution to address the component. | 8 - 9 |
| Exceptional | The proposed solution goes above and beyond the requirements as well as provides a high degree of confidence in its effectiveness. | 10 |