



## ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF EVALUATION CODE OF CONDUCT

I, \_\_\_\_\_ the undersigned, hereby acknowledge receipt of or will receive a copy of the compliance plan from the Proposal(s) of one or more Respondents in response to the Request for Proposals for “Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program” Specification No. 416117.

Evaluation Committee (“EC”) voting members (“Evaluators”) are expected to adhere to the Evaluation Guidelines agreed upon and signed by each member. Each Evaluator is expected to conduct themselves in a fair, professional and unbiased manner. Evaluation of proposal content must be based on the published evaluation criteria in the RFP and any applicable laws, rules, and regulations, and the merits of the information submitted in each proposal and/or oral presentation without factoring in criteria not part of the RFP or outside influences. Outside influences can include, but not limited to, news media accounts, personal opinions, innuendos or other unrelated and/or unsubstantiated matters, either current or historical, involving individuals, partners, subcontractors or any team members of any Respondent which are not pertinent to the proposal submission.

I agree to be fair and impartial in evaluating all compliance plans and/or Proposals received. Any negative or unsubstantiated news/media articles, commentary, rumors and/or innuendos regarding particular Respondents who responded to the above referenced RFP will not be factored into the evaluation. Evaluations will be based on the merits of each Proposal taking into consideration the evaluation and selection criteria in the RFP and any applicable laws, rules, and regulations. I understand any breach of the rules set forth herein will result in my immediate removal from the Evaluation Committee and that the Department of Procurement Services may have an obligation depending on the nature of the breach to notify my superior or employer and the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General.



**ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT  
AND CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT**

I, \_\_\_\_\_ the undersigned, hereby acknowledge receipt of or will receive a copy of the compliance plan from the Proposal(s) of one or more Respondents in response to the RFP for “Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program” Specification No. 416117.

I understand that the proposals, including any portion thereof, are not to be distributed to anyone who is not a member of the Evaluation Committee or Advisor to the Evaluation Committee, neither are the proposals to be reproduced, photocopied, or discussed with any Respondent or anyone not a member of the Evaluation Committee or Advisor to the Evaluation Committee, without the consent of the Chief Procurement Officer and that, while in my possession, the proposal documents and my evaluation worksheets, including the instructions for the evaluation, are to be maintained in such a way as to assure confidentiality. I further understand that it is a breach of ethical standards to knowingly use confidential information for actual or anticipated personal gain, or for the actual, or anticipated personal gain of another.

I agree to direct any inquiry I receive from a Respondent or any other person who is not a member of the Evaluation Committee or an Advisor to the Evaluation Committee to the Department of Procurement Services. I understand any breach of the rules set forth herein will result in my immediate removal from the Evaluation Committee and that the Department of Procurement Services will notify my superior or employer and the City of Chicago Office of the Inspector General.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Name**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Department**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES AND METHODOLOGY**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES –  
TARGET MARKET PROGRAM**

**Specification No. 416117**

**The undersigned member of the Evaluation Committee for the subject RFP has reviewed the attached evaluation guidelines and proposal evaluation worksheets and agrees to adhere to these guidelines in evaluating proposals received.**

**Issued to (Signature):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Approved on:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (“RFP”)

For

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES – TARGET MARKET PROGRAM

Specification No. 416117

### 1. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDELINES

This proposal evaluation methodology is designed to provide individual evaluators with uniform guidelines for reviewing and evaluating proposals submitted in response to the RFP for Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program. The methodology defines the standard procedures and rating scale to be used for purposes of evaluating and selecting the highly qualified vendor for entering into a Professional Services Agreement based on the published evaluation criteria in the RFP. Phase 1 (completed by the Department of Procurement Services) and Phase 2 Proposal Evaluation Worksheets will be completed by each voting member of the Evaluation Committee (“EC”) and serve to document the results of the evaluation process.

#### A. The Evaluation Committee

Evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP for Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program will be conducted by an Evaluation Committee comprised of the following members:

Derrick Brownlee Department of Innovation and Technology <b>Voting</b>	Kevin Kirby Department of Innovation and Technology <b>Voting</b>
Kenya Merritt Business Affairs and Consumer Protection <b>Voting</b>	Diego Ferrer Chicago Department of Aviation <b>Voting</b>
Ruben Madrigal Office of Emergency Management & Communications <b>Voting</b>	Frank Rico Public Building Commission <b>Voting</b>
Stacey Mansker-Young Department of Innovation and Technology <b>Non-Voting</b>	Enrique Morales Department of Innovation and Technology <b>Non-Voting</b>
Isaac Perez Department of Innovation and Technology <b>Non-Voting</b>	Michelle Frisque Chicago Public Library <b>Non-Voting</b>
Melissa Clark Department of Innovation and Technology <b>Non-Voting</b>	Steve Maris Chicago Police Department <b>Non-Voting</b>
Roderick Warren Department of Innovation and Technology <b>(Non-Voting)</b>	Joseph Chan Department of Procurement Services <b>(Non-Voting)</b>

## B. Confidentiality

Under no circumstances should any aspect of this RFP be discussed with any person, entity or firm other than EC members, CPO, Corporation Counsel, and Commissioners. All inquiries from Respondents about the RFP should be referred to Joseph Chan of the Department of Procurement Services (DPS).

State law sets out the general parameters for the letting of contracts and places great emphasis on the integrity of the procurement methodology, especially with respect to the bidding process. State law reinforces the City's prohibition on making false statements or claims, a **Class 3 felony punishable by two to five years in prison**. State criminal law also addresses the acts of bribery, influence pedaling, bid rigging and bid rotating (deliberately steering an award to a particular bidder or group of bidders for money, influence or favors). Additionally, State law addresses the seemingly less blameworthy conduct of sharing information about a particular bidding or evaluation process without necessarily intending a particular outcome. If the information is not publicly available through published solicitation documents, sharing it in any way may constitute a **Class 4 felony punishable by one to three years in prison**. Each EC member is strongly encouraged to also review the City's Governmental Ethics Ordinance (Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code), particularly Chapter 2-156-070 which applies to current and former City employees.

Responsibilities of Evaluation Committee ("EC") members are as follows:

1. Review and agree to the Proposal Evaluation Guidelines and Methodology and Phase 2 Proposal Evaluation Worksheets prior to the distribution of the proposals. Signing the cover page of this Proposal Evaluation Methodology constitutes an understanding and acceptance of the guidelines specified herein.
2. Sign the attached Evaluation Code of Conduct and Confidentiality Statement ("Statement") which prohibits EC members from photocopying, distributing or discussing any part of the submittals or sharing any information with any non-EC members or individuals who have not signed an Evaluation Code of Conduct and Confidentiality Statement. Any person who is given access to the submittals must also submit a signed Statement to the Chief Procurement Officer's Office. Any documents submitted by the Respondent may be examined by other City departments and Consultants of the City provided a signed Statement is on file with the Department of Procurement Services (DPS) for each individual given access to such documents. Proposals are considered confidential materials and must be treated as such.
3. Avoid discussing any aspect of the proposals or evaluation process with vendors or other outside parties, unless deemed necessary and directed to by the EC. All telephone inquiries are to be directed to Joseph Chan at 312-744-7659 in the Department of Procurement Services.
4. Refrain from e-mail communications with non-EC members related to proposal content, EC analysis, EC deliberations, EC deliberation procedures, voting or findings, and/or polling of EC members.
5. Receive all submittal packages along with the evaluation guidelines and evaluation sheets, and handle with appropriate care and diligence according to the Confidentiality Statement and evaluation guidelines.

6. Evaluate the proposals based only on the information submitted. Respondents may be asked to clarify or provide additional information as necessary for the EC to complete its evaluation, but Respondents cannot be allowed to change, alter or modify their original submittal or proposal.
7. Read all submittal materials, not just the parts that interest individual EC members or parts related to their area of expertise. If portions of the submittal are highly technical, the Chief Procurement Officer may authorize a Consultant or other EC member with such expertise to evaluate those portions and report their findings to the EC.
8. Attend all scheduled EC meetings, site visits, demonstrations or vendor oral presentations, as applicable. Non-voting EC members' attendance is optional unless requested to attend by EC. If an EC voting member is unable to continue for the duration of the evaluation process, their Department Head may request, in writing to the CPO, another individual to act in their place by granting proxy to that individual. If approved by the Chief Procurement Officer, the replacement individual must sign an Evaluation Code of Conduct and Confidentiality Statement and adhere to these same guidelines.
9. Advise the EC and Chief Procurement Officer of any potential conflicts of interest which could jeopardize the integrity of the evaluation and selection process due to a direct or indirect economic or business interest or other relationship with any person(s) or with any of the firms responding to the RFP, either as a prime, joint venture partner or subcontractor. The EC member is expected to voluntarily withdraw from the EC. If it is determined no conflict of interest exists, the person may be reinstated.

#### B. Evaluation Forms

EC members must complete the following forms for each proposal submitted:

1. Phase I Proposal Required Content Checklist (DPS)
2. Phase II Evaluation Worksheets (All EC Voting Members)
3. Reference Check Questionnaire (Designated EC Members)
4. Phase III Oral Presentations (All EC Voting Members)

## II. **EVALUATION & SELECTION PROCEDURES**

### A. Proposal Evaluation Tasks

#### 1. Evaluation Code of Conduct / Confidentiality Statement

Each EC member must execute a Statement and return it to Joseph Chan in DPS prior to receipt of proposals.

#### 2. Phase I - Preliminary Proposal Assessment (Responsiveness)

Department of Procurement Services will assess the Respondent's compliance with and adherence to all submittal requirements requested in Section V, "PREPARING PROPOSALS: REQUIRED INFORMATION" and related exhibits of the RFP. DPS will use the Phase I Proposal Required Content Checklist form provided. If the proposal(s) are responsive to all submittal requirements in the RFP, the proposal(s) is eligible to advance for detailed analysis in Phase II – Proposal Evaluation using the Evaluation Worksheets provided. If the submittal is incomplete or lacking key component(s) necessary to complete the evaluation, at the discretion of the EC, the proposal can be rejected from further consideration and ranked as Non-Responsive.

### 3. Proposal Evaluation Guideline, Methodology Review and Approval

The full EC will meet to review and agree to the Proposal Evaluation Guidelines and Proposal Evaluation Worksheets for Phase II, which must be agreed upon by all voting members prior to distribution of proposals. Each EC voting member must sign and return the cover sheet to Joseph Chan prior to receipt of proposals.

### 4. Distribution of Proposals

Each EC member will receive a complete set of Proposals upon approval of Proposal Evaluation Guidelines and Methodology.

### 5. Phase II - Proposal Evaluation- Individual Evaluation of Proposals

After a complete set of proposal packages has been delivered to or picked up by each EC member and after the evaluation guidelines, levels of importance, weights, scoring/ rating scale definitions and worksheets have been agreed upon, each EC voting member can begin their individual rating of proposals.

As part of the evaluation process, the EC will review information required by the RFP document. The EC may also review any other information that is available to it, including but not limited to information gained by checking references and by investigating Respondent's financial condition. This may include vendor background checks, previous track record with the City and other factors. In addition, the EC may seek clarification of information submitted in response to this RFP, and/or request additional information at any time during the evaluation process. Any material misrepresentation made by a Respondent may void the Proposal and eliminate the Respondent from further consideration.

Evaluate the extent to which a Respondent's proposal meets the project requirements set forth in the RFP. Complete one Phase II Evaluation Worksheet form for each proposal eligible from Phase I. Reference checks (as applicable) or financial condition checks may be assigned to a designated EC member.

On an individual basis, each EC voting member must read each proposal, and evaluate the proposals in accordance with the published evaluation criteria in the RFP using the attached Evaluation Worksheet forms. EC voting members should prepare notes/comments/questions for general discussion and a justification for the individual rating given to each Respondent. Each EC voting member must attend all EC meetings and be prepared to discuss and support their proposal ratings. EC non-voting members are encouraged similarly to review and evaluate the proposals. See Section II.B Group Evaluation of Proposals.

### 6. Phase II – EC Recommendation Options

During the meetings, EC members will discuss their individual evaluations and develop an Overall Ranking based on the total Composite Score calculated using the weights and rating scale points as outlined. EC members can change their assessment on any particular area of a submittal if deemed appropriate based on the arguments presented by other EC members. Non-voting members can voice their opinions and/or concerns in the discussion in an advisory capacity.

At the end of Phase II, rankings will be discussed and compiled on a composite worksheet and the EC may recommend any one of the following courses of action:

- 1) Recommend a “short list” of Respondents with the highest score EC Overall Proposal Rating of “Highly Qualified,” or “Qualified” in order to advance to Phase III, Site Visit, Oral Presentations and/or Product/Equipment Demonstrations (preferred)
- 2) Recommend the selection of a Respondent with the highest score EC Overall Proposal Rating of “Highly Qualified” if information provided is clear and sufficient for the EC to make a final determination, and recommend selection of a finalist determined by rankings; and/or
- 3) Reject any or all proposals if determined to be non-responsive or unacceptable.

For all options above, the Chief Information Officer and the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) must concur with the recommendation or propose an alternative course of action to the EC.

For option 1) above, if the EC submits a short list of Respondents for further review, the Chief Procurement Officer, at her discretion, may invite those short-listed Respondents to appear before the EC for an oral presentation; to clarify in more detail information that was submitted in Respondent’s proposal; and/or to ask Respondent to respond to additional questions. (See Section VII, Phase III).

For option 2) above, the EC may decide to forego a short list and vendor oral presentations, and instead recommend that contract negotiations begin with the selected Respondent.

For option 3) above, as part of the recommendation, the EC will detail the reasons for rejecting any or all proposals. If the Chief Information Officer concurs, the Chief Information Officer will request in a letter to the Chief Procurement Officer that proposal(s) be rejected.

#### 7. Phase III – Site Visit and/or Oral Presentations

The EC may request oral presentations from the short listed Respondents ranked Qualified or higher in Phase II. Such presentations give the EC an opportunity to meet key members of the Respondent’s proposed team and to clarify their proposal. The EC may outline specific topics or questions to be addressed by the Respondent at the oral presentation.

For oral presentations or interviews, all short listed Respondents will be notified in writing by the CPO of the date, time and place. Each short listed firm will be given the same time limits, as well as a series of questions related to their proposal and/or topics to address in order to prepare a written response in advance of the meeting. The Respondent may be required to deliver an Executive Summary presentation of their proposal to the Evaluation Committee and/or be subject to site visit. Further information (agenda, dates) regarding the Oral Presentation will be provided to shortlisted Respondents.

Subsequent to the site visit, oral presentation, and/or product/equipment demonstrations, the EC will reconvene to consider the additional information obtained and adjust their rating, if necessary, for purposes of reaching a majority decision to select finalist(s). The EC will make a final evaluation, including a final ranking of Respondents, and will submit recommendation to the Chief Information Officer.

#### B. Group Evaluation of Proposals

The EC will meet as soon as practicable after all voting members have had the opportunity to



individually review the proposals. During the meeting, EC members will discuss their individual evaluations and determine an EC Overall Proposal Ranking based on the total composite score calculated using the weights and rating scale points as directed below.

This Overall Proposal Rating will be used to rank each of the proposals from Highly Qualified to Less Qualified or Non-Responsive. For purposes of the overall proposal ratings, the following ratings scale will be used to describe the decision of the EC:

**Table 1**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Highly Qualified (Excellent) Composite Score: 85.0 to 100.00</b>	Response is clear, logical and concisely presented. Very well organized response. Highly qualified personnel, extensive capacity and experience in all service areas, comprehensive and strong implementation plan and approach that meets or exceeds the basic requirements of the RFP and highly cost effective.
<b>Qualified (Good) Composite Score: 70.0 to 84.9</b>	Response is acceptably presented and organized. Qualified personnel, adequate capacity and experience in all service areas and adequate implementation plan and approach that meets the basic requirements of the RFP and reasonably cost effective.
<b>Less Qualified (Poor) Composite Score: 50.0 to 69.9</b>	Response is less than acceptably presented and organized. Not clear. Questionable qualifications, experience and/or capacity to provide services. Implementation strategy and approach does not address or satisfy the basic requirements of the RFP.
<b>Non-Responsive 0 to 49.9</b>	Response judged to be non-responsive or missing required key components. Respondent failed to answer questions appropriately, response was incomplete. As a result, evaluator cannot make a determination of capability.

Subsequent to deliberations on each proposal, EC members with voting rights will have the opportunity to change their assessment on any particular area of a proposal if deemed appropriate based on the arguments presented by other EC members based on their areas of professional expertise. Non-voting members can voice their opinions and/or concerns in the discussion in an advisory capacity.

Once each individual response is scored, the EC will finalize the Composite Scores, making adjustments if necessary based on additional clarifying information gained during the oral presentations. Following oral presentations and/or product/equipment demonstrations, the Evaluation Committee will make a final evaluation of the Respondents and submit its recommendation to the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Innovation and Technology. Such recommendation may be to enter into negotiations with only one Respondent or may be to enter into concurrent competitive pricing negotiations with more than one Respondent.

### C. Proposal Ranking

Proposals will be ranked by the overall numeric rating (high to low scores). Highly Qualified proposals will be those that receive ratings with the Composite Score over 85.0 and Qualified

proposals will be those that receive ratings with the Composite Score over 70.0.

#### D. Selection Process

Once the final selections are reached by the EC, the EC will provide the Chief Information Officer with a written Evaluation Summary Report signed by all EC members (or electronic approved e-mails). The Evaluation Summary Report must include a summary of the evaluation and selection process, and a grid outlining the EC Overall Proposal Rankings (Highly Qualified, Qualified, Less Qualified or Non-Responsive).

Upon receipt of the EC's recommendation, the Chief Information Officer will submit a decision (concurrence or rejection of the EC's recommendation) to the Chief Procurement Officer. The Chief Procurement Officer shall then consider the Chief Information Officer's recommendation and exercise her authority to either notify the Respondent(s) to enter into contract negotiations or reject the recommendation and offer alternate options.

When the Chief Information Officer make a selection recommendation, a letter will be sent to the Chief Procurement Officer requesting authorization to begin negotiations with the selected Respondent(s).

If the Chief Information Officer and the Chief Procurement Officer concur with the EC recommendation for option (1), (2) or (3), all Respondents will be notified of either their selection or rejection in writing by the Chief Procurement Officer. In addition, a concurrence letter will be sent to the Chief Information Officer from the Chief Procurement Officer.

For contracts awarded through an RFP or RFQ process, a Contractor Selection Certification ("CSC") form, copy attached, certifying that political reasons or factors did not play a role in the selection of contractors must be signed by the following individuals:

1. Commissioner/Executive Director of the Using Department
2. Contract Signatory (Comptroller, CPO, Mayor)
3. City employee directly participating in the final selection of the contractor. All EC voting members

#### When to get Signed Certifications

#### **If City Employee EC Voting Member:**

Each EC voting member must individually sign their CSC form and forward to Joseph Chan for attachment to the EC Evaluation Summary Report at time of vendor selection recommendation. The CSC form signed by all EC voting members is in addition to the Evaluation Code of Conduct/Confidentiality Statement signed by EC voting members.

#### **If Commissioner:**

The signed CSC form should be attached to the RFP selection recommendation memo sent to CPO accompanying the final EC Evaluation Summary and recommendation.

#### **If Contract Signatories: (Comptroller, CPO and Mayor):**

The CSC form must be signed when the contract is routed through the City signature cycle. The DPS Senior Procurement Specialist must fill in information on the form and attach a separate

certification form for Comptroller, CPO and Mayor (marked accordingly) behind the Contract Signature Page in the contract folder.

**E. Contract Negotiations**

The City reserves the right to negotiate a Professional Services Agreement with the Respondents ranked “Highly Qualified” (or highest score “Qualified” if no Highly Qualified) meeting project requirements. The City will require the selected Respondent(s) to participate in contract negotiations. During negotiations, the Respondent may be required to provide a Best and Final Offer (BAFO). In order to award a contract that represents the best value to the City, as determined by the Commissioner(s) and the Chief Procurement Officer, the City reserves the right to enter into concurrent competitive price negotiations with one or more qualified Respondents(s). The City’s requirement that a selected Respondent negotiate is not a commitment by the City to award a contract. If the City is unable to reach an acceptable contract with the selected Respondent including failure to agree on terms or conditions, the City Commissioner(s), may ask the Chief Procurement Officer to terminate negotiations with selected Respondent(s).

The City reserves the right to terminate the RFP solicitation at any stage if the Chief Procurement Officer determines this action to be in the City’s best interest. The receipt of Proposals or other documents will in no way obligate the City of Chicago to enter into any contract of any kind.

**F. Debriefing**

If any Respondent requests a debriefing, it may be granted at the discretion of the Chief Procurement Officer after the contract award process has been completed. No EC member will individually debrief a Respondent at any time.

**III. EVALUATION CRITERION-RATING SCALE AND WEIGHTS**

The Evaluation Committee will review each Proposal for the Respondent’s understanding of the objectives of the Services and how these objectives may be best accomplished. Each Respondent will be evaluated on their overall strategy, methodology, timetable, and approach to meeting the City’s requirements.

**Level of Importance Definitions**

Weights	Evaluation Criterion 1 through 3 will be scored on a Rating Scale of 1 to 10 points as defined below and indicated on Phase II of the Proposal Evaluation worksheet. The percentage weights on a scale of 100% will be determined and agreed upon by EC voting members. These criterion are critical to the quality of performance and success of the project. Failure to meet the criteria that provides management/implementation of the requested services is of serious concern, as it could result in operational difficulties for the City.
Pass/No Pass	Evaluation Criterion 4 through 9 are important to the success of the program, but no quantitative rating scale will be used. These qualitative criterion represent potential disqualifiers if they are not satisfactorily met. For individual evaluations, the possible responses are “Pass”, “No Pass”, or Clarifying Information Required”. In the case where one or more of these criteria has been finally determined as “No Pass”, then that Proposal may be rejected by the EC on that basis.

## **Rating Scale Definitions**

The EC will use a quantitative rating scale to rate the proposals using the following Rating Scale (**Highly Qualified = 9 to 10, Qualified = 7 to 8, Less Qualified = 2 to 6 and Non-Responsive = 0 to 1**) for this applicable evaluation criterion as follows:

**Criterion 1: Professional and Technical Competence: a) Ability to provide the Services described in the RFP, including capacity to perform the Scope of Services described in Exhibit 1 of the RFP. b) Professional Qualifications and Specialized Experience of Respondent and its Team. c) Professional Qualification of Respondent's Key Personnel and Local Availability. d) References e) Response to all requested information in the Scope of Services. (See Section VI.B.1 page 26 of RFP) . (Weight = 45 Percent)**

**Highly Qualified:** The Respondent (and team) has extensive ability to provide the Services as described in the RFP and resources to dedicate to the Chicago account and capacity to achieve project goals, objectives and scope of services. **(Rating = 9 to 10)**

**Qualified:** The Respondent (and team) has the ability to provide the and Services as described in the RFP and resources to dedicate to the Chicago account and capacity to achieve project goals, objectives and scope of services **(Rating = 7 to 8)**

**Less Qualified:** The Respondent (and team) lacks ability to provide the Services as described in the RFP and adequate resources dedicated to the Chicago account and/or has limited capacity to achieve project goals, objectives and scope of services. Question whether or not they can assemble the necessary resources to the Chicago account. **(Rating = 2 to 6)**

**Non-Responsive:** The Respondent (and team) did not provide sufficient information regarding dedicated resources to the Chicago account. **(Rating = 0 to 1)**

**Criterion 2: Quality, Comprehensiveness and Adequacy of the proposed Implementation / Management Plan (See Section VI.B.2 page 27 of RFP.) (Weight = 45 Percent)**

**Highly Qualified:** The Respondent provided a complete and comprehensive implementation and management plan, and approach for implementing the Services, capacity to support the project based on staffing plan including supervisory key personnel who will manage and oversee the operations and in some areas exceeds the project requirements outlined in Exhibit 1, Scope of Services, in the RFP. **(Rating = 9 to 10)**

**Qualified:** The Respondent provided a complete and comprehensive implementation and management plan, and approach for implementing the Services, requirements, capacity to support the project based on staffing plan including supervisory key personnel who will manage and oversee operations outlined in Exhibit 1, Scope of Services in the RFP **(Rating = 7 to 8)**

**Less Qualified:** The Respondent provided an incomplete implementation and management plan for implementing the Services, capacity to support the project based on staffing plan including supervisory key personnel who will manage and oversee the operations; and/or that does not address all project

requirements outlined in Exhibit 1, Scope of Services in the RFP or shows a lack of understanding of the requirements. **(Rating = 2 to 6)**

**Non Responsive:** Response did not include an implementation and management plan, or approach to implementing Services or capacity to support the project based on staffing plan including supervisory key personnel who will manage and oversee operations; and/or was missing key components of the plan making it an incomplete response. **(Rating = 0 to 1)**

**Criterion 3: Schedule of Compensation / Cost Proposal  
(See Section VI.B.3 page 27 and Exhibit 2 of the RFP) (Weight = 10 Percent)**

**Highly Qualified:** Respondent's Cost Proposal is highly economical for the City. **(Rating = 9 to 10)**

**Qualified:** Respondent's Cost Proposal is economically feasible for the City. **(Rating = 7 to 8)**

**Less Qualified:** Respondent submitted a Cost Proposal that is not economically feasible for the City. **(Rating = 2 to 6)**

**Non-Responsive:** Respondent failed to submit a Cost Proposal or submitted a Cost Proposal that was incomplete or not in the required format/content in the RFP making cost comparisons impossible. **(Rating = 0 to 1)**

**Criterion 4: Minority and Women Business Enterprise Compliance Plan (Pass/ No Pass) Section VI.B.4, page 27 Exhibit 6 of the RFP.**

**Pass:** Respondent's Proposal provided their MBE/WBE Certification Letter pursuant to the MBE/WBE Special Conditions. **(Rating = Pass)**

**No Pass:** Respondent's Proposal did not provided their MBE/WBE Certification Letter pursuant to the MBE/WBE Special Conditions. **(Rating = No Pass)**

**Criterion 5: Legal Actions Section VI.B.5, page 27 of the RFP (Pass/ No Pass).**

**Pass:** The proposal indicates no legal or administrative actions pending against any team members (Prime, joint venture partners or subcontractors) that would compromise the Respondent's ability to successfully provide the Services or which involve allegations of prior deficient performance under a contract or illegal activity. **(Rating = Pass)**

**No Pass:** The proposal indicates legal or administrative actions pending against one or more team members (Prime, joint venture partners or subcontractors) that might compromise the Respondent's ability to successfully provide the Services or which involve allegations of prior deficient performance under a contract or illegal activity or Respondent has inadequately provided a listing and a brief description of all material legal actions, together with any fines and penalties, for the past 5 years involving (i) Respondent or any division, subsidiary or parent entity of Respondent, or (ii) any member, partner, etc., **(Rating = No Pass)**

**Criterion 6: Financial Stability Section VI.B.6, page 27 of the RFP. (Pass/ No Pass)**

**Pass:** The financial statements indicate that the Respondent, as applicable, has the financial stability/capacity necessary to meet financial obligations in a timely manner. **(Rating = Pass)**

**No Pass:** The financial statements indicate that the Respondent, as applicable, may not have the financial stability/capacity necessary to meet their financial obligations in a timely manner. **(Rating = No Pass)**

**Criterion 7: Compliance with Laws, Ordinances and Statutes Section VI.B.7, page 27 and Exhibit 5 of the RFP. (Pass/No Pass)**

**Pass:** Economic Disclosure Statement (EDS) submitted by team members (Prime or joint venture partners) does not disclose any violations of city, state or federal laws or regulations that might prohibit the City from doing business with the Respondent per Exhibit 5. **(Rating = Pass)**

**No Pass:** Economic Disclosure Statement (EDS) submitted by team members (Prime or joint venture partners) disclosed violations of city, state or federal laws or regulations that might prohibit the City from doing business with the Respondent. Further clarification and investigation of the disposition of these matters will be required per Exhibit 5. **(Rating = No Pass)**

**Criterion 8: Degree to which the Respondent accepts the City's Term and Conditions in the Sample Professional Services Agreement in Exhibit 9 of RFP and Section VI.B.8, page 27 of the RFP (Pass/No Pass)**

**Pass:** The Respondent accepts the City's standard terms and conditions in the Agreement in Exhibit 11. **(Rating = Pass)**

**No Pass:** The Respondent does not accept nor has significant exceptions to the City's standard terms and conditions in the Agreement in Exhibit 11. **(Rating = No Pass)**

**Criterion 9: Conflict of Interest Section VI.B.9, page 28 of the RFP. (Pass/No Pass)**

**Pass:** There appears to be no apparent conflicts that would compromise the Respondent's ability to satisfactorily provide the Services outlined in the RFP or undermine the competitive process. **(Rating = Pass)**

**No Pass:** There appears to be a conflict that would compromise the Respondent's ability to satisfactorily provide the Services outlined in the RFP or undermine the competitive process. **(Rating = No Pass)**

**Phase I**  
**Checklist for Required Content**  
**RFP for Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program**  
**Specification No. 416117**

Respondent Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Required Content of Proposal	Responsive		Notes/Comments
	Yes	No	
<b>1. Cover Letter</b>			
<u>Overview of the Company</u>			
<u>Legal Name of Company</u>			
<u>Contact Person Information.</u>			
<u>Statement of Objections to the City's Standard Terms &amp; Conditions</u>			
<u>Addendum Acknowledgement</u>			
<b>2. Executive Summary</b>			
<b>3. Professional Qualifications and Specialized Experience of Respondent and Team Members Committed to this Project</b>			
(a) Company Profile Information (Exhibit 3)			
(b) Minimum of 3 Company References/Client Profile (Exhibit 4)			
(c) Capacity to Perform City Project			
(d) Business License/Authority to do Business in Illinois.			
<b>4. Professional Qualifications Specialized Experience of Key Personnel who will be dedicated to the Services described in this RFP.</b>			
Summary of Key Personnel & Resumes			
<b>5. Implementation and Management Plan</b>			

Required Content of Proposal	Responsive		Notes/Comments
	Yes	No	
(a) Approach to Implementing Plan			
(b) Organization Chart			
<b>6. Dedicated Resources</b>			
(a) Facilities, Equipment and Personnel			
(b) Staffing Plan			
<b>7. Cost Proposal</b>			
<b>8. Minority and Women Business Enterprise Commitment per Exhibit 5.</b>			
<b>9. Financial Statements</b>			
Completed Audited Financial Statements for the last 3 years or acceptable alternate documentation.			
<b>10. Online Economic Disclosure Statements (“EDS”) per Exhibit 6.</b>			
Certificate of Filing and Attachment A, Online EDS Acknowledgement			
<b>11. Legal Actions for past 5 years, if any.</b>			
<b>12. Insurance per Exhibit 7.</b>			
Insurance certificate submitted (Optional) or Statement they can comply with City’s insurance requirements.			
<b>CD-ROM Redacted Copy of entire proposal per section IV.E of RFP.</b>			

**Evaluator’s Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_



**Phase II: Proposal Evaluation Worksheet**  
**RFP for Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program**  
**Specification No. 416117**

**Respondent Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Assign a rating for each Criterion with the rating scale below. Use the rating scale definitions for each evaluation criterion in Section II (Evaluation & Selection Procedures) of the Proposal Evaluation Guidelines and Methodology. Record one (1) rating per criterion and make notations/comments for EC group discussions. Use additional sheets if necessary.

**Rating Scale: Highly Qualified = 9 to 10; Qualified = 7 to 8; Less Qualified = 2 to 6; and Non-Responsive = 0 to 1.**

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Rating Assessment Notes/Comments	Score
<b>Criterion 1: Professional and Technical Competence:</b> a) Ability to provide All Services described in the RFP, including capacity to achieve the project requirements as described in, Exhibit 1, Scope of Services of the RFP. b) Professional Qualifications of the Respondent and its team. c) Professional Qualification of Respondent's Key Personnel. d) References (See Section VI.B.1 page 17 of RFP)	<b>45%</b>		<b>Rating 1 to 10</b>
<b>Criterion 2:</b> Quality, Comprehensiveness and Adequacy of the proposed Implementation / Management Plan and Proposed Solution (See Section VI.B.2 page 18 of RFP)	<b>45%</b>		<b>Rating 1 to 10</b>

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Rating Assessment Notes/Comments	Score
<b>Criterion 3: Cost Proposal in</b> (See Section VI.B.3 page 18 and Exhibit 2 of the RFP)	<b>10%</b>		<b>Rating 1 to 10</b>
<b>Criterion 4: Minority and Women Business Enterprise Plan</b> (Pass/ No Pass) Section VI.B.4 <i>Exhibit 5 of the RFP.</i> )	<b>Pass/ No Pass</b>		
<b>Criterion 5: Legal Actions</b> See Section VI.B.5 page 18 of the RFP. <i>Potential Disqualifier</i> )	<b>Pass/ No Pass</b>		
<b>Criterion 6: Financial Stability</b> (See Section VI.B.6 page 18 of the RFP. <i>Potential Disqualifier</i> )	<b>Pass/ No Pass</b>		
<b>Criterion 7: Compliance with Laws, Ordinances and Statutes</b> (See Section VI.B.7 page 18 of the RFP and Exhibit 6, EDS of the RFP. <i>Potential Disqualifier</i> )	<b>Pass/ No Pass</b>		
<b>Criterion 8: Degree to which Respondent accepts Terms and Conditions in the Sample Professional Services Agreement in Exhibit 9</b> (See Section VI.B.8 page 18 of the RFP.)	<b>Pass/ No Pass</b>		
<b>Criterion 9: Conflict of Interest</b> (See Section VI.B.9 page 18 of the RFP. <i>Potential Disqualifier</i> )	<b>Pass/ No Pass</b>		

**Phase III: Oral Presentation Evaluation Worksheet**  
**RFP for Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program**  
**Specification No. 416117**

**RFP for Information Technology Infrastructure Services – Target Market Program**  
**Specification No. 416117**  
**CONFIDENTIAL REFERENCE CHECK QUESTIONNAIRE**

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

**Reference Check Questionnaire Instructions: The Respondent named above has submitted a proposal in response to a Request for Proposal (RFP) issued by the City of Chicago. The Respondent listed your company organization as a client reference in their proposal response. Your assistance in answering these reference check questions will help determine their experience, technical competence and ability to perform similar services for the City of Chicago.**

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Contact Name/Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

1. What Services did they provide for you?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Describe the quality of their overall performance.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What was the contract period? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What was the original contract price? \_\_\_\_\_
5. What was the final contract price? \_\_\_\_\_  
If the price increased, please explain  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Were there any staffing issues relative to this contract? \_\_\_\_\_  
If so, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_
7. Were there any problems relative to this contract? \_\_\_\_\_  
If so, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_
8. Was their contract ever considered for termination due to non-performance? If so, please explain why.  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. Would you recommend contracting with them in the future?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
If not, please explain. \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACTOR SELECTION CERTIFICATION**

City Specification Number: **416117**

Contractor Name: **TBD**

Procurement: RFP **X**

User Department: **INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY**

*Political reasons or factors shall not play a role in the selection and retention of contractors. Political reasons or factors include any of the following:*

1. Recommendations from specific office holders (and/or their staffs) or political party officials for selection or retention of contractors that are not based on actual knowledge of the contractor’s capabilities, capacity, experience or other work-related qualifications.
2. Recommendations for selection based on the fact that the recommended contractor or its employee(s) were involved or worked for a political campaign or political organization or political party; or the recommended contractor chose not to be involved or work for a political campaign, political organization or political party. The mere fact of such involvement or work does not prohibit consideration of a recommendation so long as the basis for that recommendation relates to the contractor’s relevant work experience.
3. Recommendations for selection based on the fact that the recommended contractor or its employee(s) contributed money, raised money or provided something else of value to a candidate for public office or a political organization; or the fact that the recommended contractor or its employee(s) chose not to contribute or raise money for a candidate for public office or a political organization.
4. Recommendations for selection based on the fact that the recommended contractor or its employee(s) are Democrats or Republicans or members of any other political party or group; or the fact that they are not members.
5. Recommendations for selection based on the fact that the recommended contractor or its employee(s) expressed views or beliefs on political matters such as what candidates or elected officials they favored or opposed, what public policy issues they favored or opposed, or what views on government actions or failures to act they expressed.

**CERTIFICATION:** I certify that I am aware of, and in full compliance with, the above-stated prohibitions regarding contracting decisions by the City of Chicago. I certify, under penalty of perjury, as provided by law, that, to the best of my knowledge and after due inquiry, political reasons or factors or other improper considerations did not enter into any City contracting actions taken with respect to the contractors in the procurement process for the above-referenced contract. I understand that failure to comply with the above prohibitions and/or failure to submit an accurate Contractor Selection Certification may result in disciplinary action up to and including immediate termination and ineligibility for future hire and may subject me to prosecution for perjury under Illinois law.

Signature	Print Name	Date
-----------	------------	------

Initial the role in the procurement/contracting process that you participated in:

\_\_\_\_\_ Commissioner of the User Department

\_\_\_\_\_ Contract Signatory

\_\_\_X\_\_\_ City employee directly participating in final selection of the contractor

