



EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05
Auditing Services

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 16, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Tuesday, June 4, 2024

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

| Criteria | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Firm's Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 30 (30% of Total) |

Description:

Proposer shall provide, by way of example but not limitation, demonstration of experience by:

a. The Proposer's Credentials: Details on the qualifications of the firm, including a brief history of the firm, documentation of the firm's experience providing services similar to those requested in this RFP and the number of years in business.

Qualifications for all sub-consultant(s) should also be included in this section;

b. Related experience shall be restricted to those assignments undertaken within five (5) years; please list experience with government agencies.

c. Similar Engagements with Government Entities.

d. For the firm's office that will be assigned responsibility for the audit, list the most significant engagements (maximum of 5) performed in the last five years that are similar to the engagement described in this request for proposal.

e. Indicate the scope of work, date, engagement partners and the name and telephone number of the principal client contact. The City reserves the right to contact the above-mentioned references and any other clients.

f. Managerial Capabilities: Provide evidence of the firm's ability to manage tasks simultaneously and expeditiously and describe firm's approach to problem/task resolution and teamwork.

g. Years, type (Government, private, county, city, special districts), comparable size, structure, function, IT Tech support, State and Federal Grant programs.

h. Current Contracts: The Proposer shall provide a list of all current audit contracts with a "public body", "body politic", or "political subdivision" as these phrases are defined in Florida Statute 1.01 (2021) to which it is a party.

i. Licenses: The Proposer shall provide licenses and any other documentation demonstrating current compliance with all provisions of Florida law required to satisfactorily complete the work required by this RFP.

j. The Proposer should also list and describe the firm's professional relationships involving the City or any of its component units for the past five (5) years, together with a statement explaining why such relationships do not constitute a conflict of interest relative to performing the proposed audit.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05

Auditing Services

| Criteria | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|-----------|----------------|-------------------|
| Personnel | Points Based | 20 (20% of Total) |

Description:

Proposer shall provide, by way of example but not limitation, demonstration of ability of personnel by:

Resume(s) of the Proposer's Senior Staff and audit team members to be assigned, demonstrating years of experience performing auditing services for government agencies, preferably at the municipal/local government level. If an IT Specialist is used as part of the audit approach, Proposer shall include them as an audit team member.

| Criteria | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Audit/Technical Approach | Points Based | 25 (25% of Total) |

Description:

Proposer shall provide, by way of example but not limitation, demonstration of ability to Furnish Required Services by:

- a. A detailed list of all services that the firm is able to provide and explain how these services will be accomplished.
- b. The proposal must set forth a work plan, including an explanation of the audit methodology to be followed, to perform the services required in the Scope, Specification, of this request for proposal. In developing the work plan, reference should be made to such sources of information as City's budget and related materials, organizational charts, manuals and programs, and financial and other management information systems.
- c. Proposers will be required to provide the following information on their audit approach:
 - Proposed segmentation of the engagement
 - Level of staff and number of hours to be assigned to each proposed segment of the engagement
 - Sample size and the extent to which statistical sampling is to be used in the engagement
 - Extent of use of Electronic Data Processing (EDP) or Artificial Intelligence (AI) software in the engagement
 - Type and extent of analytical procedures to be used in the engagement
- d. Submit example of completed quality control peer review within the past three (3) years of specific governmental audits.
- e. Provide a guaranteed response time and schedule of services;
- f. A description of the process and software that the Proposer uses to manage audit requests to the City.
- g. A list of any assistance the City may be requested to provide to the selected Auditor;
- h. Volume of work, IT capabilities and expertise, number of assignable staff and hours to be allocated.
- i. Other information the Proposer may deem advantageous to demonstrate understanding and approach to the work.

| Criteria | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Innovation and Additional Services | Points Based | 5 (5% of Total) |

Description:

a. Innovation in Audit Process:

- In line with GFOA's emphasis on technological advancements, the proposer should detail any cutting-edge tools, methodologies, or approaches they deploy in the auditing process. Highlight any unique utilization of machine learning,

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05

Auditing Services

artificial intelligence, or other innovative technologies beyond the specifications mentioned in the Audit/Technical Approach section.

- Describe the firm's strategy to stay abreast of emerging technologies and trends in the government auditing space, ensuring continuous improvement and adaptability.

b. Additional Services:

- Proposers should identify key additional services that would be available to the City under the hourly rates proposed in Additional Services section and cost proposal. This does not need to be an exhaustive list but should emphasize those services that resonate with the City's strategic objectives and provide added value.
- Offer insights on how these additional services have fostered improved financial management, transparency, and accountability in other government entities in the past.
- Demonstrate how these services dovetail with the primary audit services, emphasizing the overall value proposition for the City.

c. Value Proposition:

- Illustrate with examples of how the firm has provided value beyond the basics to other clients, especially those in local government.
- Highlight any specialized trainings, workshops, or educational initiatives the firm provides that align with GFOA and FGFOA's advocacy for continued professional development and financial literacy in the government sector.

| Criteria | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Past Performance – References | Points Based | 15 (15% of Total) |

Description:

Provide a listing of a minimum of 3 - maximum of 8, previous customers during the past five years for all work of similar size and scope. The services provided to these clients should have characteristics as similar as possible to those requested in this RFP.

Information provided for each client shall include the following:

- A. Client name, address, and current telephone number.
- B. Description of services provided.
- C. Time period of the project or contract.
- D. Client's contact reference name, email and current telephone number.

Failure to provide complete and accurate client information, as specified here, may result in the disqualification of your Proposal.

The City reserves the right to contact any and all references to obtain ratings for the performance indicators as indicated in the Evaluation Criteria. A uniform sample of references will be checked for each Proposer.

| Criteria | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Cost Proposal | Points Based | 5 (5% of Total) |

Description:

The cost proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Fee to Audit Tasks for the initial five (5) year period . The Cost Pricing Proposal must be utilized for the submission of your Firm's cost. Cost Proposal will be evaluated utilizing the equation seen in the example below:

Lowest cost proposed gets total points = 5 points

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05

Auditing Services

| EXAMPLE | PROPOSAL COST | LOWEST COST PROPOSED | % OF LOW | MULTIPLIER | TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED |
|------------|---------------|----------------------|----------|------------|-----------------------|
| Company #1 | \$100,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | 100.00% | 5 | 5.0 |
| Company #2 | \$120,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | 83.33% | 5 | 4.2 |
| Company #3 | \$150,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | 66.67% | 5 | 3.3 |
| Company #4 | \$160,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | 62.50% | 5 | 3.1 |

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

| Vendor | Evaluator 1 | Evaluator 2 | Evaluator 3 | Total Score (Max Score 100) |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| James Moore & Co. | 99.6 | 92.6 | 98.6 | 96.93 |
| Purvis, Gray and Company, LLP | 90 | 99 | 99 | 96 |

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

| Vendor | Firm's Qualifications and Experience Points Based 30 Points (30%) | Personnel Points Based 20 Points (20%) | Audit/Technical Approach Points Based 25 Points (25%) | Innovation and Additional Services Points Based 5 Points (5%) |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| James Moore & Co. | 29.7 | 20 | 24 | 4.3 |
| Purvis, Gray and Company, LLP | 28.3 | 20 | 23.3 | 4.7 |

| Vendor | Past Performance – References Points Based 15 Points (15%) | Cost Proposal Points Based 5 Points (5%) | Total Score (Max Score 100) |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| James Moore & Co. | 14.3 | 4.6 | 96.93 |
| Purvis, Gray and Company, LLP | 14.7 | 5 | 96 |

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

| James Moore & Co. |
|---|
| Firm's Qualifications and Experience Points Based 30 Points (30%) |
| Evaluator 1: 30 |
| The have a great deal of municipal experience. |
| Evaluator 2: 29 |
| Very qualified CPA firm, great experience |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05

Auditing Services

Evaluator 3: 30

Firm is qualified

Personnel | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: 20

Personnel are very qualified

Evaluator 2: 20

Very qualified staff.

Evaluator 3: 20

Personnel is qualified

Audit/Technical Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Good understanding of our internal control structure

Evaluator 2: 22

Required information is provided.

Evaluator 3: 25

Technically sufficient

Innovation and Additional Services | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: 5

Well equipped to offer any additional services

Evaluator 2: 4

Required information is provided.

Evaluator 3: 4

Okay

Past Performance – References | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 15

High ranking references provide

Evaluator 2: 13

Only reference is received back.

Evaluator 3: 15

Good past performance

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: 4.6

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05

Auditing Services

per cost proposal formula

Evaluator 2: 4.6

Highest proposal cost.

Evaluator 3: 4.6

Higher base cost

Purvis, Gray and Company, LLP

Firm's Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Doesn't appear to have as much experience with municipalities

Evaluator 2: 30

A long history. Very experienced CPA firm.

Evaluator 3: 30

Firm is qualified

Personnel | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: 20

Personnel is well qualified

Evaluator 2: 20

Qualified staff.

Evaluator 3: 20

Personnel qualified

Audit/Technical Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: 20

Technical approach is good

Evaluator 2: 25

A well-organized presentation of the audit/technical approach.

Evaluator 3: 25

Technical

Innovation and Additional Services | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: 5

Pleased with innovation and addition service capabilities

Evaluator 2: 5

A well-organized presentation and description of the Innovation services.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-FN-05

Auditing Services

Evaluator 3: 4

Okay

Past Performance – References | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 15

high ranking references returned

Evaluator 2: 14

Two references are received back.

Evaluator 3: 15

Always top performer

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: 5

per cost proposals formual

Evaluator 2: 5

Lowest proposal price.

Evaluator 3: 5

Lowest base price