

The Special Meeting of Council was held on Monday, May 6th, 2013 at 7:00 in the Council Chambers.

- Present: Mayor Cassidy, Deputy Mayor Mapes, Councillors M^cKay, Candow, Dohey, Jameson, Maher, and Jungkind.
- Staff: May-Britt Hetesi – Interim Senior Administrative Officer, Keith Morrison – Director of Public Works & Planning, Ross Potter – Fire Chief, Stacey Barnes – Administrative Clerk, Jaimi Carter – Recording Secretary, Jordan Stackhouse – Economic Coordinator
- Absent: Councillor Coakwell
- Others: James Locke, Jean Locke, Pat and Ken Wray, Ross Stanley, Janet Marie Fizer and Gail Marshall

1. CALL TO ORDER:

This Meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm with Mayor Cassidy presiding.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

**#13-296 MOVED BY: CLLR JUNGKIND
 SECONDED BY: CLLR DOHEY**

That the Council of the Town of Hay River accepts the May 6th, 2013 Special Meeting of Council Agenda as presented.

CARRIED

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest for the Special Meeting of Council, Monday, May 6th, 2013.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a) IT Support Services RFP Evaluation – Proposal Rating Schedule

RECOMMENDATION:

**#13-292 MOVED BY: CLLR DOHEY
 SECONDED BY: CLLR M^cKAY**

THAT THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF HAY RIVER accepts the attached Proposal Rating Schedule for the IT Support Services RFP to be posted May 1, 2013.

REFERRED

Let it be noted that the Council of the Town of Hay River deferred this Report to a Special Meeting TBD.

**#13-297 MOVED BY: CLLR DOHEY
 SECONDED BY: CLLR M^CKAY**

THAT THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF HAY RIVER accepts the attached Proposal Rating Schedule for the IT Support Services RFP to be posted as soon as possible.

CARRIED

BACKGROUND:

In August 2012, Council chose the attached format for evaluation of an RFP Proposal Rating Schedule. It was the intent of Administration at the time to have Council select one template RFP evaluation method that can be modified as required to suit the specifics of the individual projects to which it is applied.

Typically, RFPs are used to select consultants, for complex material purchases (i.e., an computer network purchase where service and warranty are part of the procurement) and for Design Build (DB) projects

A properly written RFP will list the evaluation criteria in the document. Further, the RFP should detail what the proponent is expected to provide in their proposal document. These requirements will be directly related to the evaluation criteria, in order to ensure that proposals (a) provide enough information to be evaluated, and (b) provide information in a similar format to other proposers to facilitate evaluation.

As RFPs are used when the scope is not completely defined, selection of the successful proposer cannot be by price alone. RFPs are typically evaluated based on pre-defined criteria; The Town Procurement Bylaw states that "Every request for proposals shall express the criteria to be used in evaluating the proposal and no criteria shall be used in evaluating the proposal that are not expressed in the request for proposals or this Bylaw".

As per the above, RFP evaluation criteria are not pre-defined but rather can change from RFP to RFP, provided that the criteria are defined in the proposal call.

The Draft RFP for IT Support Services has been reviewed by Administration and in order to post this RFP by May 1, 2013, it is necessary to have Council review and approve the RFP Proposal Rating Schedule.

COUNCIL POLICY / STRATEGY OR GOAL:

N/A

APPLICABLE LEGISLATION, BYLAWS, STUDIES, PLANS:

Personal Property Bylaw No. 1574

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

N/A

ALTERNATIVES TO RECOMMENDATIONS:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

Proposal Rating Schedule for IT Support Services RFP

Prepared by:



May-Britt Hetesi
Interim Senior Administrative Officer

Date: April 26, 2013

Let it be noted that Councillor Jungkind requested to have administration remove item #5 "Northern" from the Proposed Rating Schedule. Administration confirmed that this change will be made.

5. ADJOURNMENT


#13-298 MOVED BY: CLLR CANDOW

That the Special Meeting of Council be adjourned at 7:08 pm.

CARRIED

Certified Correct as Recorded on the 6th day of May, 2013.

These minutes were accepted by motion #13-301.



Mayor

Senior Administrative Officer



Proposal Rating Schedule

Item	Rating Criteria	Assigned Weight (A)	Unit Points Awarded (B)	Total Points (A) x (B) = (C)
1	Team – Personnel to be assigned to or made available to the contract	25		
2	Methodology or approach proposed by the proponent	25		
3	Proponent's Past Relevant Experience	15		
4	Fees and Expenses	25		
5	Northern/Local Content	10		
Totals		100	N/A	

Legend:

Unless stated otherwise herein, Unit Points will be assigned as follows:

- Deficient 0 points
- Poor 1 – 3 points
- Fair 4 – 6 points
- Good 7 – 8 points
- Excellent 9 – 10 points