

Systems Delivery and Project Portfolio Management (SDPPM)

AFIS Renewal

APPENDIX G: EVALUATION PLAN AND CRITERIA

Last Updated Date: 2016-06-08

Status: Final

Version: 2

RDIMS Document No.: 42560v9b

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 General.....	3
1.2 Document Organization	3
1.3 Evaluation Team.....	3
2. HIGH-LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION PROCESS	4
2.1 Conducting the Evaluation	4
2.2 Information to Evaluate	4
2.3 Bidder's Time for Responding during the Evaluation	5
3. EVALUATION STAGES	6
3.1 Conducting Evaluation Stages.....	6
3.2 Stage 1 – Confirmation of Compliance to Mandatory Requirements	6
3.3 Stage 2 – Evaluation of Rated Requirements	6
3.4 Stage 3 – AFIS Renewal Benchmark Testing.....	9
3.5 Total Weighted Technical Score	13
3.6 Stage 4 – Evaluation of Financial Proposal	13
3.7 Stage 5 – Contractor Selection	13

TABLES

TABLE 3-1: STAGE 2 – POINT RATED REQUIREMENTS.....	7
TABLE 3-2: TABLE A – RATING SCALE	7
TABLE 3-3: TABLE B RATING SCALE	8
TABLE 3-4: OVERALL TECHNICAL PROPOSAL WEIGHTING.....	13
TABLE 3-5: EXAMPLE OF CALCULATION OF ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE.....	14

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

1. This Appendix G to the Appendix A SOW describes the evaluation plan and criteria for the Entire AFIS renewal solution. This Appendix describes the process that the RCMP and PWGSC will follow to evaluate proposals received and select the recommended Bidder.

1.2 Document Organization

1. The high-level description of the evaluation process is described, followed by evaluation stages.
2. The evaluation stages section includes a description of the evaluation stages, the rating process and calculation that will be used to determine the recommended Bidder.
3. Attachment 1 to this appendix describes the Benchmark Test Plan that must be submitted with the Bidder's proposal, a high-level description of the evaluation test and the calculations that will be used in the Benchmark Evaluation.
4. Attachment 2 to this appendix includes the evaluation submission tables that will be used in the evaluation of the mandatory and rated criteria.

1.3 Evaluation Team

1. An evaluation team comprised of representatives of the RCMP and PWGSC will evaluate the proposals on behalf of Canada. Canada reserves the right to hire any independent consultant, or use any Government resources, which it deems necessary to evaluate any proposal. Not all members of the evaluation team will necessarily participate in all aspects of the evaluation.

2. HIGH-LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 Conducting the Evaluation

1. In conducting its evaluation of the Bidder's proposal, Canada may, but will have no obligation to, do the following:
 - a. Seek clarification or verification from the Bidder regarding any or all information provided by the Bidder with respect to this solicitation;
 - b. Contact any or all references supplied by the Bidder to verify and validate any information submitted by the Bidder;
 - c. Request, prior to award of any contract, specific information with respect to any Bidder's legal capacity or status;
 - d. Conduct a survey of the Bidder's facilities or its technical capabilities to determine if they are adequate to meet the requirements of this solicitation;
 - e. Correct any error in the extended pricing of the Bidder's proposal, by using the unit pricing; and
 - f. Verify any information provided by the Bidder through independent research or by contacting third parties, including but not limited to Software Publishers of any software being proposed and Original Equipment Manufacturers of any equipment being proposed.

2.2 Information to Evaluate

1. The following information will be used to evaluate the Proposals received:
 - a. All information provided in the Bidder's proposal to the stated requirements as defined in this RFP;
 - b. Clarifications obtained from reference checks of Bidders by the Evaluation Team;
 - c. Clarifications from Bidders, which may be requested and provided during the evaluation process;
 - d. Clarifications obtained through interviews conducted during the evaluation process with Bidder's key personnel; and
 - e. Results observed during the Benchmark Testing Stage.

2.3 Bidder's Time for Responding during the Evaluation

1. In addition to any other time periods prescribed in this solicitation, the following information will be used to evaluate the Proposals received:
 - a. Requests for Clarifications: If Canada seeks clarification or verification from the Bidder regarding its proposal, the Bidder will have two (2) working days or such longer period as is specified in writing by the Contracting Authority to provide the necessary information to Canada. Failure to meet this deadline will result in the proposal being declared non-compliant; and
 - b. Extension of Time: If additional time is required by the Bidder, time may be granted at the sole discretion of the Contracting Authority.

3. EVALUATION STAGES

3.1 Conducting Evaluation Stages

1. There are several stages in the evaluation methodology, which are described below. Notwithstanding that the evaluation and selection methodology will be conducted in stages, the fact that Canada has proceeded to a later stage shall not be deemed to mean that Canada has conclusively determined that the Bidder has successfully passed all the previous stages. For example, the benchmark tests will be used to verify/confirm written requirements reviewed in an earlier stage. Canada reserves the right to conduct stages of the evaluation in parallel or concurrently. To be considered technically compliant, a Bidder must:
 - a. Meet all the mandatory requirements;
 - b. Meet all the minimum thresholds for each stage; and
 - c. Meet an overall threshold of 70% for the Total Weighted Technical Score.

3.2 Stage 1 – Confirmation of Compliance to Mandatory Requirements

1. Each proposal will be reviewed for compliance with the mandatory requirements of this solicitation. A proposal that does not comply with any or all of the mandatory requirements will be considered non-compliant and will be given no further consideration. Proposals meeting all the mandatory requirements will advance to Stage 2.
2. If during the demonstration of requirements (e.g. benchmark testing, clarification) it is determined that a mandatory requirement, considered compliant during the written response evaluation, is found to be non-compliant, the bid may be considered non-compliant and may be disqualified.

3.3 Stage 2 – Evaluation of Rated Requirements

1. Each proposal that complies with all the mandatory requirements in Stage 1 will be reviewed and evaluated against the rated criteria in Stage 2. Proposals that do not achieve the minimum score for Stage 2 (see Table 3-1: Stage 2 – Point Rated Requirements) will be considered non-compliant and will be given no further consideration. Proposals meeting the minimum score for Stage 2 will advance to Stage 3.
 - a. Proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the specific rated evaluation criteria set out in Attachment 2 to Appendix G – Submission Tables. The maximum allowable points for each rated requirement is indicated in Attachments 1 and 2 of this Appendix;
 - b. Table 3-1: Stage 2 – Point Rated Requirements, specifies the maximum points available (out of 1365) for each section of the point-rated requirements in the written proposals, and the minimum “passing” scores that apply. The

Benchmark Plan will only be included after it has been received and evaluated (i.e. the initial passing score for determining invitations to the Benchmark Conference will be based on 60% of 1335 or 801);

Table 3-1: Stage 2 – Point Rated Requirements		
Requirements	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
1. Project Management Requirements	125	N/A
2. Functional Requirements	765	N/A
3. Technical Requirements	160	N/A
4. Implementation Requirements	285	N/A
5. Benchmark Plan	30	N/A
STAGE 2 TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE	1365	819

- c. Each requirement will be scored individually unless specifically noted in the submission tables. The rating guidelines for Stage 2 are:
 - i. All rated items that will be rated on a strictly meets / does not meet basis will be evaluated in accordance with the General Guidelines in Table A – Rating Scale (e.g. “The system should have an amber light.”) found in Table 3-2. Wherever this rating applies, the Evaluation Criteria in Attachment 2 to Appendix G will be clear that full points will be given for meeting the requirement or no points for not meeting the requirement,

Table 3-2: Table A – Rating Scale		
Rating Factor	Rating	Rating Level
1.0	Evident	The Bidder fully satisfies the requirement.
0.0	Not evident	The Bidder does not fully satisfy the requirement.

- ii. Generally, most rated items that will be rated on a more qualitative basis will be evaluated in accordance with the General Guidelines in Table B Rating Scale (e.g. “The Bidder should describe its approach on training.”). Wherever reference is made in the Evaluation Criteria column in Attachment 2 to Appendix G to General Evaluation Guidelines, the rating scale below in Table 3-3 will be used. This rating scale will be a guideline for the Benchmark evaluation team to determine how well the requirement is satisfied and assign a percentage of the requirement that is met between 0% and 100% (e.g. 0.90 = 90%, 0.88 = 88%), and

Table 3-3: Table B Rating Scale		
Rating Factor	Rating	Rating Level
1.0	Excellent	Response fully addresses the requirement and indicates that the Bidder has an excellent understanding of the intent of the requirement and that it can and will more than satisfy the requirement with considerable added value . Represents no risk to the RCMP.
0.9	Very Good	Response fully addresses the requirement and indicates that the Bidder has a sound understanding of the intent of the requirement and that it can and will satisfy the requirement with some added value . Represents minimal risk to the RCMP.
0.8	Good	Response addresses the requirement and indicates that the Bidder has a good understanding of the intent of the requirement and that it can and will satisfy the requirement with some added value . Represents minimal risk to the RCMP.
0.7	Acceptable	Response adequately addresses the entire requirement and indicates the Bidder understands the requirement and that it will satisfy the requirement. Represents acceptable risk to the RCMP that could be mitigated with minimal cost to the RCMP.
0.4 to 0.6	Some Deficiency	Response addresses most of the requirement and indicates that the Bidder does not fully understand the key intent of the requirement, or has not addressed all of the items within the requirement, and/or represents some risk to the RCMP that could be mitigated but with a cost to the RCMP.
0.1 to 0.3	Considerable Deficiency	Response addresses some of the requirement and indicates that the Bidder does not adequately understand the key intent of the requirement, or has not addressed the majority of the items within the requirement, and/or represents significant risk to the RCMP that could be mitigated but with some cost to the RCMP.
0.0	Not Acceptable	Requirement not addressed or the response does not address the requirement or indicates a complete lack of understanding of the intent of the requirement or is generally a repetition of the requirement as stated in the RFP rather than a clear response that indicates an understanding of the intent of the requirement. Represents unacceptable risk to the RCMP.

- iii. There are some rated items in Attachment 2 to Appendix G where the general guidelines in Table 3-2 or Table 3-3 are not appropriate. In those cases, the requirements will be rated in accordance with the specific criteria that are specified in the Evaluation Criteria column on the same row as the requirement; and
- d. Any proposal that does not meet a minimum overall score of 60% in Stage 2 will be considered non-compliant.

3.4 Stage 3 – AFIS Renewal Benchmark Testing

1. As part of the evaluation process those bidders that are still considered compliant after Stage 2 will participate in a Benchmark Test as described in the SOW.
2. The Benchmark Evaluation Team will consist of the following personnel, as a minimum, consisting of RCMP, its contractors and PWGSC:
 - a. Latent Technician;
 - b. Ten Print Technician;
 - c. AFIS Program Analyst;
 - d. PWGSC Representative; and
 - e. AFIS Consultants.
3. If a Bidder is not ready to commence the execution of the Benchmark tests on its scheduled date and time, the benchmark will be considered a failed benchmark test and the Bidder's proposal may be declared non-compliant and be disqualified. The only exception for not being ready to start that may be accepted is if there are circumstances outside the control of the Bidder (e.g. acts-of-God, war, terrorism or widespread power outages) in which case PWGSC may establish a revised schedule based on the situation.
4. The Bidders shall provide a detailed Benchmark Plan with its proposal based on the requirements to be tested as part of the benchmark.
5. The Bidder's detailed Benchmark Plan provided with its proposal should be clear and logical and include the following:
 - a. The continental USA or Canadian location of the Benchmark test to include physical street address and a map with recommended local hotels (indicated on the map) along with the hotel phone numbers;
 - b. The Bidder's strategy in executing the Benchmark tests;
 - c. A schedule for all Benchmark activities from background file processing through the actual Benchmark test with estimates of time required by Phase for each area of testing;
 - d. Anticipated hardware/software suite to include a hardware/software configuration checklist which will be used in the Audit and evaluation;
 - e. An explanation of the Bidder's Best Practices in loading the background files and searching the background files with the test data;
 - f. Decision points or thresholds for declaring Ten Print Hits in lights out (i.e. fully automatic) and best practice modes – these should not include any manual verification in either mode;
 - g. Confirmation that the Bidder can produce output files that can be imported into the RCMP provided Excel spreadsheets. (e.g. search results, match reports); and

- h. A description of any filters, automated processing strategies or data binning strategies that the Bidder plans to use during the Benchmark execution.
- 6. The Bidder shall submit detailed Benchmark Procedures to the AFIS Renewal RFP Contracting Authority no later than fifteen (15) working days prior the scheduled benchmark. The Bidder's Benchmark Test Procedures shall address each Phase of testing and each area of requirements, the test of the RCMP AFIS Renewal Benchmark Test Plan (Attachment 1 to Appendix G) and include as a minimum:
 - a. Introductory paragraph identifying the Phase and area being tested and the tests;
 - b. Describe the roles and responsibilities of all bidder's personnel engaged in the actual benchmark and RCMP Benchmark personnel;
 - c. Describe the Execution of the Configuration Audit by the Benchmark Team using the checklist provided by the bidder in their Benchmark Plan;
 - d. Include model number, version number, release number for hardware and software listed in the checklist;
 - e. Include a configuration diagram and associated text describing the configuration that identifies all hardware with associated IP addresses on the bidder's benchmark system with an explanation of the devices associated to the IP addresses;
 - f. Describe system start up after completion of the configuration audit;
 - g. Describe the proposed orientation overview of the benchmark facility and equipment to the Benchmark Team, including the facilities to be provided to the Benchmark Evaluation Team;
 - h. Describe to the Benchmark Evaluation Team the use of the individual workstations as part of the orientation overview;
 - i. Include a detailed schedule of all benchmark activities in the execution of actual benchmark tests;
 - j. Describe how the Benchmark system will be physically brought down to a "turned off" condition, including all components (e.g. printers, workstations, servers, disk arrays, matchers, networks, communications gear, rack-based cabinets, scanners, monitors, cameras and Redundant Array of Independent Disks (RAID));
 - k. Describe how the Benchmark system will be physically brought back up to a "turned on" condition;
 - l. Describe how all clocks on the Benchmark system will be synchronized when the system is brought back up to a "turned on" condition;
 - m. Provide the detailed step-by-step instructions for each test to include any equipment to be used;
 - n. Describe how the data is to be entered;

- o. Describe any bidder assigned numbering scheme for the background test files;
- p. Describe the explicit references to functionality and technical capabilities related to the requirements satisfied by the test;
- q. Describe the Expected results;
- r. Describe how the test results will appear containing at least the following data for each item searched in a specific test:
 - i. Unique Case Number,
 - ii. The static or dynamic threshold used to determine hits,
 - iii. Any classification data associated with the search image(s),
 - iv. Candidate match list (up to the appropriate selectivity level specified) in the RCMP AFIS Renewal Benchmark Test Plan with repository ID, position number, matcher score, and system ident assessment (i.e. if system flags one (1) or more candidate records as having a “hit”) for each candidate,
 - v. Elapsed time from submittal until the response is provided on-screen and cumulative elapsed time since the start of the test. The RCMP will record UI response time with their own stop watches. The Contractor is recommended to provide their own time measurement to ensure consistency between the RCMP and Contractor UI response times,
 - vi. Elapsed time for operations. The Contractor must provide the elapsed time for operations (e.g., search time) since these times cannot be effectively measured through the UI, and
 - vii. If one (1) or more of the test parameters cannot be automated then the bidder will describe how those test parameters will be recorded manually on paper and reported at the end of each Phase of testing;
- s. Provide the instructions for printing each test result, writing test results to a USB external memory device and the annotation procedure for the test results outputs to be used by the bidder;
- t. Provide a sample screen print of the search results for each type of search (e.g. TP – TP, TP – ULF, etc.);
- u. Provide a matrix that allocates the steps in their procedures to the tests identified in the RCMP AFIS Renewal Benchmark Test Plan;
- v. Describe the Audit procedures of the digital repository prior to the first test of a specific Phase and/or area of requirements;
- w. Describe the Printing of error and audit trail logs and writing of these logs to a USB external drive;
- x. Describe the Verification of the readability of a USB external drive, produced by the bidder;

- y. Describe the Steps to verify that all search and test data, and related mathematical representations are erased from their benchmark system or any other system(s) at the conclusion of the benchmark execution; and
 - z. Describe all the security measures in place to protect the RCMP-provided data.
7. The RCMP reserves the right to perform a network sniffer test during any portion of the benchmark execution on the bidder's benchmark system to validate the configuration diagram hardware IP addressing and data flow.
 8. Upon request to PWGSC, the Bidder will be sent a file containing example background files, example test files and example hard copies of fingerprint cards that the Bidder may use in order to familiarize themselves to the formats and media of the forthcoming background and test sets. These will include samples of each image type that must be processed and the search result format (i.e. spreadsheet) that is expected.
 9. A Benchmark Conference will be held within thirty (30) days of bid closing. Only those Bidders who have met all the mandatory requirements and met the minimum rated requirements will be invited to the Benchmark Conference. The order for the benchmark tests will be determined at that time and the Bidder selected for the first benchmark test will be given the background test data set and the first test will be thirty (30) calendar days from the next business day. The subsequent Bidders will only be given the background test data set thirty (30) calendar days in advance of their scheduled benchmark test date. If a Bidder is subsequently eliminated in Stage 1 or Stage 2, it will not proceed to Stage 3. However, the benchmark test schedule will only be adjusted to accommodate this event if it will not impact the thirty (30) working days for any of the subsequent Bidders, that is to say that no subsequent Bidder will have any more or less than thirty (30) calendar days from the date it receives the background test data set.
 10. Any proposal that does not meet a minimum overall score of **60%** in Stage 3 will be considered non-compliant.
 11. Canada reserves the right to photograph any benchmark equipment or screens during the benchmark test or request a screen print.
 12. Notwithstanding the written proposal of the Bidder, if Canada determines during any demonstration of requirements that the Bidder's proposed solution does not meet the mandatory requirements, where the Bidder's proposal stated it would be supported within the scope of the benchmark test of this solicitation, the Bidder's proposal may be declared non-compliant and be disqualified.
 13. Canada may, as a result of any demonstration of requirements, reduce the score of the Bidder on the COTS rated requirements, if the demonstration indicates that the score provided to the Bidder on the basis of its written proposal is not validated by the demonstration; where the Contractor's proposal stated it would be supported within the scope of the benchmark test. This is to ensure a Bidder's score for COTS compliancy is accurately determined. No Bidder's score will be increased as a result of any demonstration.

3.5 Total Weighted Technical Score

1. The proposals of Bidders that have successfully met all the mandatory requirements and the minimum thresholds of Stages 2 and 3 will be weighted as shown in Table 3-4: Overall Technical Proposal Weighting. Bidders must achieve an overall Total Weighted Technical Score of **70%** or higher to be deemed compliant and proceed to Stage 4.
2. The overall Total Weighted Technical Score will be based on the percentages achieved in the Rated requirements and the Benchmark. Therefore the weighted scores of the individual stages will be appropriately adjusted to reflect this.

Table 3-4: Overall Technical Proposal Weighting			
Evaluation Stage	Description	Weighting	Minimum Threshold
Stage 1	Mandatory Requirements	N/A	N/A
Stage 2	Rated Requirements	40%	60%
Stage 3	Benchmark	60%	60%
Total Weighted Technical Score	Overall	100%	70%

3.6 Stage 4 – Evaluation of Financial Proposal

1. As part of the evaluation process, the Financial Proposals of those bidders that are still considered compliant after Stage 3 will be evaluated.
2. PWGSC will independently assess the financial proposals of all technically compliant proposals.
3. The financial proposals of all technically compliant Bidders will be evaluated with respect to the requirements as described in Appendix B, Financial Proposal Evaluation and submission Tables, of this solicitation.
4. For each Proposal under consideration, the **Total Bid Evaluation Value** shall be calculated as the arithmetic sum as submitted by the Bidder with its financial proposal in response to Appendix B of this solicitation.

3.7 Stage 5 – Contractor Selection

1. For the purpose of evaluation, each bidder's **TOTAL BID EVALUATION VALUE** will be reduced in exact proportion to how much their **TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE** exceeds the **MINIMUM PASS SCORE** of seventy percent (70%). The new amount will be called the **ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE**. This will be determined as follows:
 - a. Step 1. The **PERCENTAGE** that a Bidder's **TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE** exceeds the **MINIMUM PASS SCORE** OF 70% will be determined as

follows by subtracting 70% from the Bidder's **TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE**. This difference will be the “**technical surplus percent**”.

- b. Step 2. The Bidder's **TOTAL BID EVALUATION VALUE** will be reduced by that same fifty percent (50%) of the “**technical surplus percent**”. This reduction is applied as follows. The **TOTAL BID EVALUATION VALUE** is multiplied by 50% of the **technical surplus percent**. This amount is then deducted from the **TOTAL BID EVALUATION VALUE** to determine the **ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE**.
 - c. Step 3. The Bidder that achieves the lowest **ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE** will be recommended for selection.
2. In the event that there are two (2) or more proposals with an equal **ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE**, the Bidder with the lowest unadjusted total bid evaluation value will be identified as the preferred proposal.
 3. The following example in Table 3-5 is provided to illustrate how this **ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE** is calculated:

Table 3-5: Example of Calculation of Adjusted Bid Evaluation Value				
REQUIREMENTS	Max Score	Bidder A	Bidder B	Bidder C
Total Weighted Technical Score	100%	70%	77%	90%
Total Bid Evaluation Value	N/A	\$10,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
50% of the Technical Surplus % (i.e. 50% of the % above Pass Score)		0.00%	3.50%	10.00%
Value Adjustment		N/A	-\$385,000	-\$1,100,000
Adjusted Bid Evaluation Value		\$10,000,000	\$10,615,000	\$9,900,000

4. The recommended Bidder in the above Example would be Bidder C.
5. Note: The “**ADJUSTED BID EVALUATION VALUE**” is used for bid evaluation purposes only. It is not used to determine the final contract pricing.
6. Bidders who have not satisfied any Conditions for Contracting in the time allotted by Canada will be deemed non-compliant and their proposals will be disqualified.
7. Bidders should note that all contract awards are subject to Canada's internal approvals process, which includes a requirement to approve funding in the amount of any proposed contract. Notwithstanding that a Bidder may have been recommended for contract award, issuance of any contract will be contingent upon internal approval in accordance with Canada's policies. If such approval is not given, no contract will be awarded.