

LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS (LAWA)
Evaluation Guidelines for:
Requests for Proposals
Requests for Qualifications
Other Competitive Solicitations

Revised Date: October 31, 2014

Application and Objectives:

LAWA's Evaluation Guidelines ("Guidelines") apply to evaluation of responses to competitive processes involving Requests for Proposals (RFPs), Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) and similar competitive solicitation instruments issued by LAWA. Application of the Guidelines is designed to ensure fair evaluation processes and provide assistance in developing clear and transparent documentation of a selection process when seeking the selection of the responsible respondent(s) that is most advantageous to the City pursuant to the City Administrative Code (Sec.10.15) and when following the Code of Federal Regulations (14CFR 1273 et seq.).

The Guidelines must be considered in the context of applicable RFP, RFQ, other similar solicitation documents or amendments and addenda thereto ("Solicitation Documents"), which shall exclude any documents using a bid process. In any case where there may be a conflict between the Guidelines and Solicitation Documents, the terms of the Solicitation Documents provided to respondents shall govern the evaluation process.

1. Proposal Evaluation Procedures:

1. **Content of Solicitation Documents:** Solicitation Documents released by LAWA should include the scope of services and desired results for the project, evaluation criteria, criteria weights, other project requirements, and administrative requirements.

The Requesting Division managing the project is responsible for preparation of the scope of services, evaluation criteria, criteria weights, and other project requirements.

Procurement Services Division determines the administrative requirements for Solicitation Documents.

Solicitation Documents released for responses must contain weighted evaluation criteria within the document. Procurement Services Division will review all completed Solicitation Documents to ensure that weighted evaluation criteria are included in the documents prior to uploading them to the City of Los Angeles Business Assistance Virtual Network (LABAVN) internet website. Except as draft Solicitation Documents issued only for public comment, finalized Solicitation Documents that do not contain the weighted evaluation criteria cannot be released and will be returned to the Requesting Division for revision.

2. **Appointment of a Contract Administrator:** The Division Manager should appoint a Contract Administrator to be responsible for the following activities:
 - Prepare and release Solicitation Documents;
 - Manage receipt and pre-screening of responses;
 - Coordinate and schedule the Technical Review, if contemplated, the Evaluation Panel review, selection and documentation; and,
 - Records management, distribution and retention. See [LAWA's Records Retention Manual](#).

3. **Appointment of Evaluation Panel:** A panel to evaluate the responses should be recommended by the Division Manager and submitted to Executive management for approval. The Panel should consist of at least one Deputy Executive Director, unless otherwise approved by Executive management, and additional members as deemed appropriate. The size of the Panel should be based on such recommendation and depend on the nature of the work being proposed. The use of multidivisional panel members and other City employees is encouraged when appropriate. If there is a need for more technically qualified panelists, participation by other City Departments, other government agencies or private industry is permissible.

The Evaluation Panel will be responsible for reviewing responses, interviewing and evaluating the applicants and making a recommendation of award to the Executive Director by doing the following:

- Complying with LAWA's [Code of Ethics and Conflict Of Interest Policy](#);
- Understanding the scope of work requested and the desired results of the project;
- Reviewing the Solicitation Documents prior to evaluation;
- Reviewing and evaluating all eligible or short-listed responses and preparing rating sheets based on the weights and rating criteria as published in the Solicitation Documents; and
- If deemed warranted by the Evaluation Panel, conducting oral interviews of finalists and preparing rating sheets.

The Contract Administrator will be responsible for the following:

- Tabulating and preparing recommendation of award based on the ranking determined by scores from the evaluations of the written response and any oral interviews conducted;
- Documenting the evaluation process and preparing the master file;
- Preparing the draft report to the Board of Airport Commissioners (BOAC) for review by the Deputy Executive Director and the Executive Director, who then make a recommendation to award the contract, if appropriate;
- Issuing the Notice of Intent to Recommend Award to all respondents; and
- Overseeing the administration of the protest period. (With the exception of certain limited Administrative Code requirements, until the contract negotiations are completed and the Executive Director authorizes a recommendation to BOAC and the notification to all respondents, the selection process is treated by LAWA as

confidential. Once the Notice of Intent to Recommend Award is issued and the protest period commences, documents will be made public pursuant to the California Public Records Act.)

4. **Evaluation Process:** All response reviews and documentation should adhere to the following process or, to the extent not adhered to, record the rationale for deviations from the process:

- **ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE REVIEW - RESPONSIVENESS AND RESPONSIBILITY:** The Contract Administrator should perform a “pre-screening” of each response to assess whether or not all required information was received, which includes documentation to substantiate that the proposer satisfies any minimum qualifications listed in the Solicitation documents. The Contract Administrator should use a checklist to verify receipt of required information. All administrative documents must be forwarded to Procurement Services Division for review and preliminary determination of responsiveness and responsibility.
- **RESPONSE REVIEW AND SELECTION:** The Evaluation Panel will, at a minimum, review all responses deemed responsive (and may also review responses where a review for determination of non-responsiveness is not completed) and those that have satisfied any Technical Review (described below). Evaluation of the written responses should be completed before any oral interviews take place.
- **TECHNICAL REVIEW (OPTIONAL):** If desired, the Deputy Executive Director responsible for the solicitation may designate LAWA employee(s) with the requisite technical qualifications, skills and background, to review each response to determine if it meets the specified technical requirements of the Solicitation Documents including any minimum qualifications. In order to streamline the process, the Technical Review may take place at the same time as the Administrative Compliance Review. The results of the Technical Review may be used by the Evaluation Panel to eliminate respondents who do not satisfy the Solicitation Documents’ requirements, and are, therefore, determined by the Evaluation Panel as not eligible or to be excluded from any “short-list”. The Technical Review shall be based on pre-defined criteria as noted in the Solicitation Documents, such as minimum years of experience in the specialized field of service, certification or licensing, or other requirements that are of technical importance for the specific service being considered. The Technical Reviewer should prepare a summary of results for use by the Evaluation Panel. A copy of the summary should be retained in the master file.
- **VERIFICATION OF REFERENCES:** Evaluation Panel members and/or the Contract Administrator should check references, either those provided in the responses or secured by other means, at any time during the evaluation process. A set of standard reference questions should be used when checking references. Bank references should be verified by the Contract Administrator. After the references are verified, a summary of the responses should be prepared and presented to the full Evaluation Panel for review. This summary should be retained in the master file.
- **SHORT-LIST DETERMINATION:** The Evaluation Panel is free to develop a “short-list” of respondents to be interviewed if, in the judgment of the Evaluation Panel, short-listing is advantageous to the evaluation process specifically, or to LAWA in general. Unless specified otherwise in the Solicitation Documents, the short-list is determined by completion of an Evaluation Form by either each Evaluation Panel

member or the Contract Administrator on behalf of the Evaluation Panel using a subset of the weighted criteria from the published Solicitation Documents and the information from the Technical Review, if any. If the Contractor Administrator develops the short list, the Evaluation Panel has to concur with the Contract Administrator's short list. The short-list rating sheets must be retained to document the short-listing process. New Evaluation Forms will be required for the subsequent evaluation process. Scores from the short-listing process should not be carried over to the evaluation of the short-listed responses.

- **ORAL INTERVIEWS:** Oral interviews are optional and, if undertaken, should be used to have respondents address specific questions prepared by the Evaluation Panel following review of the written responses.

If an oral interview is used as part of the selection process, all eligible respondents or those on the short list, if one is used, should be asked questions based on the published evaluation criteria and the particular details of each respondent's submittal. Prior to the first interview the Evaluation Panel and the Contract Administrator should determine a list of questions to be asked of the interviewees. In addition, the Evaluation Panel may have individual questions for respondents based on the review of the written responses. Follow-up questions to particular answers are permitted.

If a majority of Evaluation Panel members believe it would be beneficial, they may request subsequent round(s) of interviews. Based on the results of the first round, the second round of interviews may be of all respondents from the first round, or a "short list" of those interviewed in the first round. Usually the original Evaluation Panel will conduct the second round of interviews. However, if there are valid reasons for using a different evaluation panel, any changes to the panel should be explained and documented in the Consensus Summary Sheet and the Board Report. The Executive Director may also require the Evaluation Panel to conduct a subsequent round of interviews if he or she believes that important questions were not sufficiently addressed, subject to documentation of the reasons for such additional interviews.

- **RATING THE RESPONSES:** Prior to rating the responses the Evaluation Panel should review the Solicitation Documents objectives and requirements and discuss the evaluations. Each Evaluation Panel member should review every eligible response and complete an Evaluation Form for each one.

The Evaluation Forms must include the criteria, weights, summary comments and scores. Evaluation Panel members will complete interview Evaluation Forms documenting the oral presentation process and results using the same weighted evaluation criteria used to evaluate the written responses. In completing his or her score sheet for the final stage of the process, each member of the Evaluation Panel should consider all information learned throughout the process, whether written or oral. The final single score on each Evaluation Form should collectively consider all aspects of the response review, both written and oral.

After the Evaluation Forms are fully completed, the Contract Administrator should tabulate the rankings for each Evaluation Panel member based on the final scores of the respondents. The scores/rankings will be placed on the Evaluation Panel Consensus Summary Sheet by the Contract Administrator. On the Consensus

Summary Sheet and Evaluation Forms, individual raters do not have to be named. A letter or numeric designation is sufficient. The Consensus Summary Sheet and Evaluation Forms will become part of the public record and made available to the public at the commencement of the protest period.

- **RECOMMENDATION FOR SELECTION:** The final scores/rankings and recommendations will be based on all information obtained by the Evaluation Panel in the evaluation of written responses and oral presentations, if any. Consistent with the selection criteria contained in the Solicitation Documents, and subject to the applicable City Charter requirements, price may be considered, but may not necessarily govern selection of the contractor/consultant(s).

5. **Procurement Services Division Review of Documents:** The Contract Administrator must submit the original evaluation documents (including the individual rating sheets, consensus summary sheet, and list of questions used during the interview process) to Procurement Services Division. The Contract Administrator shall retain a copy of all documents transmitted to Procurement Services Division in the master file.

LAWA's Procurement Services Division will review evaluation documents for sufficiency and accuracy, obtain any required supplementary information, and will retain the original documents. The documents will be available for review, appeals, and audits in accordance with approved records retention schedules.

6. **Negotiation of Contract:** The Contract Administrator facilitates the contract negotiations, but is not necessarily designated as the prime negotiator of the contract.
7. **Protest Period.** The protest period commences when the Contract Administrator issues the Notification of Intent to Award Contract to all respondents. Any protests should be assessed before the contract award is heard by BOAC.
8. **Records Management, Distribution and Retention.** The Contract Administrator will be responsible for preparing and maintaining a master file with complete documentation for the entire solicitation process. The master file will include documentation for Solicitation Document preparation and release; responses received; short-list determination (if applicable); reviews; evaluations; and selections; and approval process and reports, including appeals, if any.

After contract execution, an addendum to this master file should be made to include contract management information, and the location where all contract documentation, including contract evaluations and amendments, if any, will be kept. The master file will be accessibly maintained and will be available for reviews, appeals, and audits.

SAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

PROPOSER'S NAME: _____ RATER: _____ DATE: _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRITERIA POINTS	FINAL SCORE
Experience of the Proposer as a Firm, including past performance of the Firm on contracts of similar size and scope		
Experience and Qualifications of Personnel on the Proposer's Team		
Record of Performance on [the specific technical objective]		
Proposer's Financial Capability		
Demonstrated Understanding of the Scope of Work, including schedule and plan to accomplish the work		
Any Additional Criteria specific to the RFP		
Proposed Level of Fees – Best Overall Value to the City/ Financial Return to LAWA		
TOTAL POINTS	100	
Summary Comments (mandatory): 		

NOTE: If conducting interviews include the following questions on the final Evaluation Form:

Were all my questions answered? Yes _____ No _____

Is a second interview necessary? Yes _____ No _____

Instructions for Preparing the Consensus Summary Sheet

- The Contract Administrator is responsible for preparing the Consensus Summary Sheet.
- The Contract Administrator collects the completed Evaluation Forms from each Evaluation Panel member.
- The Contract Administrator tabulates the rankings of each response for each Evaluation Panel member based on the total evaluation points. (The response receiving the most points receives a ranking of 1, the second most points receives a ranking of 2, etc.)
- The Contract Administrator enters only the rankings on the Consensus Summary Sheet to determine the overall ranking of each response.
- The response with the lowest combined ranking total will be the consensus choice of the Evaluation Panel.
- Total points will be used to break any ranking ties.

Sample Evaluation Criteria and Weights

Evaluation Criteria Categories:	Max. Possible Points (per rater)
Experience of the Proposer as a Firm, including past performance of the Firm on contracts of similar size and scope	15
Experience and Qualifications of Personnel on the Proposer's Team	10
Record of Performance on [the specific technical objective]	15
Proposer's Financial Capability	15
Demonstrated Understanding of the Scope of Work, including schedule and plan to accomplish the work	20
Any Additional Criteria specific to the RFP	10
Proposed Level of Fees – Best Overall Value to the City/ Financial Return to LAWA	15
TOTAL POINTS	100

Sample Response Scoring

Rater/Response	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Rater A	95	80	75	85
Rater B	90	95	85	80
Rater C	95	90	80	85
Total Score	280	265	240	250

Sample Response Ranking

Rater/Response	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Rater A	1	3	4	2
Rater B	2	1	3	4
Rater C	1	2	4	3
Total Score	4	6	11	9
Ranking	I*	II	IV	III

* Response 1 is the Evaluation Panel's consensus selected response.