



**SERVICE DELIVERY AND ORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**Date and Time** Thursday, June 6, 2013 at 1:00 p.m.

**Place** County of Frontenac Administrative Boardroom 2069 Battersea Road, Glenburnie

**Members:**

Deputy Warden Bud Clayton  
Councillor Gary Davison

Councillor Denis Doyle  
Walter Knott, Community Member

Page

1. Call to order
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Disclosure of pecuniary interest and general nature thereof
4. Adoption of minutes
5. Deputations and/or presentations
6. Communications
7. Reports/Topics for Discussion
  - 2013-116  
Service and Organizational Review Committee – RFP Process
8. Other business
9. Next meeting date
10. Adjournment

2-7



**Report 2013-116**

**COMMITTEE REPORT**

**To:** Chair and Members of the Service and Organizational Review Committee

**From:** Elizabeth Savill  
CAO

**Prepared by:** Marian VanBruinessen  
Treasurer

**Date prepared:** May 30, 2013

**Date of meeting:** June 6, 2013

---

**Re:** **Service and Organizational Review Committee – RFP Process**

---

**Committee Recommendation**

THAT the Service and Organizational Review Committee receive this *RFP Process* report for information only;

AND FURTHER THAT the Service and Organizational Review Committee recommend to Council of the County of Frontenac that:

1) The timeline for the project be revised as follows:

Receive Proposals	1 p.m. Tuesday May 21, 2013
Determine Short List for Interviews	Monday June 10, 2013
<b>ADD: Council Approval of Short List</b>	<b>Wednesday, June 19, 2013</b>
<b>CHANGE:</b> Interviews/Presentations	Monday, June 17, 2013 to <b>June 24, 2013</b>
<b>ADD: Council Approval of Award</b>	<b>Wednesday, July 17, 2013</b>
<b>CHANGE:</b> Notification of Award	Friday June 28, 2013 to <b>July 17, 2013</b>

2) The short list comprised of KPMG, Ernst & Young LLP and WSCS Consulting Inc. selected for interviews be approved; and,

3) Staff be directed to confirm the interview process and the set of interview questions based on the general comments offered by the Committee;

AND FINALLY THAT the Service and Organizational Review Committee be directed to proceed with the interviews of those proponents identified in the short list and report

back to the Council of the County of Frontenac with recommendations of the preferred proponent at its regular meeting on July 17, 2013.

**Background**

The 2013 County budget supported the Service and Organizational Review project. As per the procurement process, the Request for Proposals (RFP) was developed by staff and circulated to those members of Council who were to participate in the process for comment. The Council approved RFP supports a Committee of Council including 3 appointed members of Council and a community member rather than a staff committee with Council representation.

The RFP as approved was released on April 20, 2013. The timeline provided in the RFP reflected processing through a staff committee as follows:

Receive Proposals	1 p.m. Tuesday May 21, 2013
Determine Short List for Interviews	Monday June 10, 2013
Interviews/Presentations	Monday, June 17, 2013
Notification of Award	Friday June 28, 2013

These timelines were not amended to reflect the additional time that a Council Committee process will require to meet public notice requirements.

**Comment**

**Proposals Received**

Five proposals were received on May 21, 2013.

- Gazda, Houlne and Assoc.
- Universal Care
- KPMG
- Ernst & Young LLP
- WSCS Consulting Inc.

Two committee members, Councillor Doyle and Walter Knott attended the proposal opening conducted by staff.

**Evaluation of Proposals**

A detailed breakdown of the evaluation was provided to both Councillors Doyle and Mr. Knott, based on the criteria outlined in the RFP, at the proposal opening. A copy of this evaluation was circulated to all other committee members and is attached to this report as Exhibit A. Members will note that cost is not the overriding criteria in the assessment of an RFP: cost does not necessarily reflect level of effort. Other factors, including the proposed project methodology and applicable expertise are key components to ensure a successful project.

The staff evaluation matrix is attached as Exhibit B. It is offered, based on staff's professional expertise, as input into the process with the full understanding that the

Committee members, each of whom has been asked to complete the assessment independently, may have arrived at different conclusions. It has been suggested to the Committee, through telephone conversations or via email, that the ratings of each Committee member should be forwarded to County staff prior to the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow a compilation of scores to be completed prior the meeting. It should also be noted that all evaluation matrices are public documents that must be made available to the public. This will move the discussion along and will offer some assurance that members have undertaken their assessments independently, without discussion amongst the group. This independent assessment is critical to the accountability and transparency expected by the County's procurement policy.

**Revised Timelines**

Due to the change in process, from a staff committee with Council representation to a Committee of Council, the timelines must be reconsidered to include Council approval of any decisions. A suggested revised timeline is offered:

Receive Proposals	1 p.m. Tuesday May 21, 2013
Determine Short List for Interviews	Monday June 10, 2013
<b>ADD: Council Approval of Short List</b>	<b>Wednesday, June 19, 2013</b>
<b>CHANGE: Interviews/Presentations</b>	<b>Monday, June 17, 2013 to June 24, 2013</b>
<b>ADD: Council Approval of Award</b>	<b>Wednesday, July 17, 2013</b>
<b>CHANGE: Notification of Award</b>	<b>Friday June 28, 2013 to July 17, 2013</b>

It should be pointed out that any change in the timeline might affect the proposals and confirmation of the validity of the proposals for the extended period of time must be sought from the proponents.

**Interview Process**

To expedite the review, an interview process, including questions, has been prepared by staff. However, should the Committee of Council determine it will be involved in developing the process, it will be impossible to maintain any confidentiality around the process and questions. Both the process and the interview questions will have to be reviewed and confirmed by the Committee in a public meeting. Staff suggests that this may compromise the project. However, if this is the Committee's recommendation to Council, we suggest that the process and questions be forwarded to each proponent before the interview date.

**Proponent Selection Process**

There are several steps within the selection process.

1. The interview will include a scoring matrix. Each member of the interview team must complete the form including the scoring elements. It is hoped that through the compilation of the points scored during the interview the top-scoring proponent will become obvious.
2. It is not unusual for elements required through the RFP to be missing in a proposal. This initiates a mandatory discussion between the County and the proponent to resolve the outstanding matters to allow the terms of the project to be satisfactorily met. To accomplish this, these elements must be identified, the issues detailed and a negotiation entered into to ensure the proponent will be able to meet all

requirements of the proposal within an acceptable timeframe and cost envelope. This can become an extended negotiation but it is necessary to ensure the expectations of the project are met and the process is conducted fairly and transparently. It is recommended that this work be assigned to staff to avoid any question of influence.

3. Once it has been confirmed that all elements of the RFP can be met by the top-scoring proponent, the references must be thoroughly and consistently checked. It is recommended that the reference checks be undertaken by staff following a clearly set out matrix to ensure fairness and transparency.
4. As long as the top-scoring proponent can assure the County that all elements of the RFP can be covered and the references return positively, a preferred proponent can be identified. However, if any of these elements are missed, the process must pick up with the second highest scored proponent or, alternatively if it is deemed inadvisable to proceed in this manner, the project must be reconsidered, re-advertised and the process repeated.

Once these steps are completed, it is staff’s recommendation that the Committee meet again to review the selection process completed and confirm the preferred proponent for recommendation to County Council.

**Financial Implications**

The budget for this project was estimated at \$125,000. Fees and expenses as outlined in the proposals received are as follows:

<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Total fees and expenses before HST</b>
Gazda, Houlne and Assoc.	\$31,950
Universal Care	\$36,750
KPMG	\$94,915
Ernst & Young LLP	\$126,300
WSCS Consulting Inc.	\$95,960

**Sustainability Implications**

Undertaking an organizational study will ensure and confirm the County’s capacity to support the strong governance and operations of the County and this process will support the County’s Accountability and Transparency policy.

**Organizations, Departments and Individuals Consulted and/or Affected**

Senior Management Team

County of Frontenac  
EVALUATION MATRIX - 2013 RFP Service and Organizational Review

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

		GAZDA	KPMG	Ernst & Young	WSCS Consulting Inc	Universal Care
1	<b>Proposed Approach to the Project</b>					
	Proposed methodology indicates an understanding of the project requirements	5				
	Proposed methodology indicates an understanding of the municipal operations	5				
	Number of individual hours dedicated to the project	5				
	Project phasing meets the County's reporting requirements	5				
	Innovative approaches	5				
	Depth of corporate expertise outside of individuals dedicated to project	5				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2	<b>Qualifications and Experience of Project Team</b>					
	Experience with Municipal Service and Organizational Reviews	5				
	Experience with long term care, land ambulance service, ferry services	5				
	Experience with process review and mapping	5				
	Experience with the union/non-union settings, compensation reviews and pay equity	5				
	Credentials of proponent team	5				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
3	<b>Qualifications and Experience of Project Manager</b>					
	Understanding of the municipal legislative framework and obligations	5				
	Experience working with municipal service delivery partnerships	5				
	Experience with oversight of large complex projects	5				
	Credentials	5				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4	<b>Cost Factor</b>	5				
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
5	<b>Quality of Previous Comparable Work</b>					
	Projects related to municipal service review	3				
	Projects related to organizational review	3				
	Projects in both municipal and private sector	3				
	General - communications	1				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>				
6	<b>Interview</b>	10				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>				
	<b>Comments</b>					

County of Frontenac  
EVALUATION MATRIX - 2013 RFP Service and Organizational Review

			GAZDA	KPMG	Ernst & Young	WSCS Consulting Inc	Universal Care
1	<b>Proposed Approach to the Project</b>						
	Proposed methodology indicates an understanding of the project requirements	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	1.50
	Proposed methodology indicates an understanding of the municipal operations	5	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	1.50
	Number of individual hours dedicated to the project	5	2.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	1.00
	Project phasing meets the County's reporting requirements	5	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.00
	Innovative approaches	5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Depth of corporate expertise outside of individuals dedicated to project	5	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>
2	<b>Qualifications and Experience of Project Team</b>						
	Experience with Municipal Service and Organizational Reviews	5	5.00	5.00	2.50	0.00	0.00
	Experience with long term care, land ambulance service, ferry services	5	0.00	3.00	1.67	1.50	1.67
	Experience with process review and mapping	5	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
	Experience with the union/non-union settings, compensation reviews and pay equity	5	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
	Credentials of proponent team	5	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.50	3.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>11.17</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>9.67</b>
3	<b>Qualifications and Experience of Project Manager</b>						
	Understanding of the municipal legislative framework and obligations	5	0.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	0.00
	Experience working with municipal service delivery partnerships	5	2.00	5.00	0.00	4.00	0.00
	Experience with long term care, land ambulance service	5	0.00	0.00	1.25	2.50	2.50
	Credentials	5	3.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	2.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>	<b>5.75</b>	<b>13.50</b>	<b>4.50</b>
4	<b>Cost Factor</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>31.00</b>	<b>57.00</b>	<b>37.92</b>	<b>42.50</b>	<b>23.17</b>
5	<b>Quality of Previous Comparable Work</b>						
		<b>10</b>					
6	<b>Interview</b>						
		<b>10</b>					
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>					