



IRP Proposal Evaluation Process and Criteria

July 4, 2019

Evaluation Process

1. Phase I – Technical Review - The Technical Evaluation Team will evaluate proposals, taking into consideration the technical and organizational experience, competence and capacity of entities. Evaluation criteria are listed in the table below under Technical Review. The two bids receiving the highest scores will be eligible to proceed to Phase II.
2. Phase II – Business Review – The Business Evaluation Team will evaluate the top two proposals taking into consideration the business, legal, financial and administrative components of the proposals. Evaluation criteria are listed in the table below under Business Review.
3. Phase III – Bidder Selection – Engineers Canada determines the bidder receiving the highest total score and notifies the winning bidder and other proponents of its selection.
4. Engineers Canada will not be disclosing the evaluation scorecards or revealing the scores.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Guidelines for Criteria Scoring	Weighting (%)	Points (0-10)	Weighted Points
Phase I - Technical Review				
Organization Overview	<p>Provides legal description of the organization, vision and mission statement</p> <p>Explains corporate engagement in professional training over the past five years</p> <p>Provides number of employees, office locations</p> <p>Provides number of years in operation</p> <p>Provides information on partners and/or subcontractors (if applicable) including corporate details, number of employees, number of years in business, office locations</p>	5		
Understanding opportunities and challenges for the IRP Program and Courses	Level of understanding of the opportunities that the IRP Program and credential offers to engineers and other professionals in Canada	10		

	<p>Level of understanding of the challenges of maintaining and expanding the IRP Courses and the credential in Canada</p> <p>Level of understanding of the immediate and longer-term needs and gaps of the IRP courses and credentialing program</p> <p>Level of understanding of the needs of individuals who have partially completed the course requirements for the Program</p> <p>Level of understanding the need to complete the IRP Program development Including courses, program policies and administration and the challenges these may present</p> <p>Demonstrates a high level of awareness, knowledge and understanding of current and potential competitors</p>			
Relationships and engagement with external organizations and individual professionals in Canada	<p>Degree of engagement with engineers and other professionals in their continuing professional development</p> <p>Degree of engagement on climate change and infrastructure with all levels of government and the private sector in Canada</p> <p>Degree of engagement on climate change, infrastructure and related topics with engineering service providers and their professionals</p> <p>Degree of engagement with NGOs in Canada on climate change, infrastructure and related topics</p>	5		
Description of the transfer from Engineers Canada	<p>Demonstrates a logical and complete series of steps to transfer the IRP courses, administrative files and credentialing program</p> <p>Demonstrates how the IRP Program and credentialing be provided to users in the future</p>	10		

	<p>Proposes viable corporate strategies and steps to restore the IRP Program in the short term and scale up in the longer term</p> <p>Proposes a reasonable length and nature of support required from Engineers Canada during the transfer process</p>			
<p>Capacity to Provide Services</p> <p>Corporate Background and Experience</p>	<p>Provides information on the value and size of past and current training programs e.g. number of students and courses offered to demonstrate corporate capacity and competence</p> <p>Provides information on certification, credentialing or other forms of professional recognition that are offered by the organization to demonstrate corporate capacity and competence</p> <p>Provides evidence of corporate background and experience for training of professionals in the following subject areas:</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>Infrastructure planning, investment and asset management</p> <p>Definition and management of risk, including climate risk</p> <p>Infrastructure codes and standards</p> <p>Provision or use of climate services</p>	15		
<p>Capacity to Provide Services</p> <p>Program Leadership and Management</p>	<p>Demonstrates that senior leadership has extensive experience in developing, delivering and managing education and professional level training, education and or professional development program</p> <p>Proposes an individual with the demonstrated competencies and a track record to assume the leadership and vision to champion the IRP</p>	5		

	<p>Program and credential with engineers and other professionals.</p> <p>Lists the certifications and designations of leadership (project management, financial, education etc.) that help inspire confidence in the management of the program</p>			
<p>Capacity to Provide Services</p> <p>Program Delivery, Operations, Technical and Administrative Support</p>	<p>Demonstrates past and current experience in program and course administration and the operation of existing training programs, courses and certifications</p> <p>Demonstrates current and experience of instructors in the subject areas covered in the IRP Program</p> <p>Identifies certifications and designations of individuals that will provide these forms of support to the program.</p>	5		
Submission of a two-year business plan	<p>Provides information on current training, education and professional development revenues and costs without the IRP Program</p> <p>Provides realistic estimations of revenues and costs of IRP Program with assumptions, limitations and risks identified</p> <p>Explains the integration of IRP courses and the credentialing program into existing programs and services to meet strategic goals</p> <p>Provides a feasible work plan (with task definition, timelines, resources needed) to achieve transfer and integration into corporate structure</p> <p>Provides information on marketing, sales and promotional plans to promote the IRP courses and credential.</p> <p>Explains strategy and plans to update and improve the existing courses and develop the ones that are still to be developed</p>	10		

	Explains the priority of implementing this initiative within the corporate structure			
	Explains the timing and nature to re-launch the IRP Program with a credential			
Proposal Quality and Thoroughness	Proposal is well-organized, flows well and is clearly and concisely written Proposal addresses all the requirements for submission	5		
Subtotal – Technical Proposal		/70		
Proposals with the top two scores from the technical review will be evaluated in Phase II Business Review.				

Criteria	Guidelines for Criteria Scoring	Weighting (%)	Points (0-10)	Weighted Points
Phase II – Business Review				
Financial stability	Provides evidence of past financial stability and future financial viability with an operating IRP Program	5		
Investing financial and human resources	<p>Proposed degree of financial and human resource investment during the transfer process</p> <p>Proposed degree of financial and human resource investment for IRP Program development after transfer</p> <p>Proposed degree of financial and human resource investment for marketing and promotion of the Program during and after transfer</p> <p>Proposed degree of financial and human resource investment to update and upgrade the IRP courses including the ones that remain to be developed</p>	5		
Benefits to EC and regulators	<p>Benefits and value to Engineers Canada</p> <p>Describes benefits and value to engineering regulators</p> <p>Describes benefits and value to Individual practicing engineers</p> <p>Proposed timeline for transfer and anticipated needs for support during that period</p>	20		
	Subtotal Business Review	/30		

NOTE:

Technical and business review scores will be combined to find the highest value. The highest value will be declared the preferred bidder. **Engineers Canada will not be disclosing the evaluation scorecards or revealing the scores.**

SCORING GUIDE

Description	Numeric Score
Criteria is not met or is not acceptable or is not addressed.	0
Minimally addresses the criteria, but one or more major considerations in the criteria scoring guidelines are not addressed.	1 to 3
The response addresses some aspects of the criteria scoring guidelines, but minor considerations may not be addressed.	4 to 6
The response addresses the criteria and provides a reasonably good quality approach.	7

There is a high degree of confidence in the proponent's response as a proposed approach to address the criteria	8-9
The proposed approach goes above and beyond the requirements as well as provides a high degree of confidence in its effectiveness.	10