A “debriefing” is simply a formal procurement process where vendors or suppliers are informed about the reasons why they were not selected for award. This can include reasons for low scores or ratings, and areas of weaknesses or opportunities of improvement. Many debriefings, however, lack even the most basic information to actually help (or entice a proposal from...) suppliers on future projects. An effective debriefing provides the following:

- **Help the vendors understand what they could to improve.** This doesn’t need to be an extended discussion but providing some very specific comments about where a vendor fell short can go a long way. A great place to get this is information is from the evaluator’s comments on their rating sheets. These could include evaluator concerns, confusion about the proposals, feasibility of a solution, or other similar comments.

- **Be as transparent as possible.** Let’s not mince words here: provide as much information as possible on the vendor’s proposal! The feedback should include the scores for each evaluation criterion, and the vendor’s overall ranking for each criterion.

- **Openly and actively offer a debriefing to all unsuccessful vendors.** Vendors may not take you up on the offer but being clearly willing to meet with vendors demonstrates your organization’s commitment to being a “Client of Choice.”

- **Provide the evaluation results to the Vendors.** CPE recommends that owners provide the vendors with a summary of the evaluation scores for every procurement. The information could include differences in scores between the vendor being debriefed and the average scores. The summary can be communicated through email, an in-person meeting, posted online, or some combination thereof.

- **Get feedback from the vendor.** Simply ask the vendor, “Do you have any recommendations about our procurement process?” While the comments may not always be helpful, some feedback can provide great insights how to streamline, speed up, or otherwise enhance the evaluation process.

And don’t forget... adhering to CPE’s “Three S’s to a Great Debriefing” makes sure nothing is missed in the debriefing.

**Summarize evaluation process**
- Review the evaluation criteria
- Explain how proposals were evaluated
- Discuss shortlisting process
- Explain selection determination

**Synthesize comments**
- Looking at evaluator comments, summarize the "strengths" and "areas for improvement"
- Try to be as specific as possible
- Avoid superlatives!

**State evaluation scores**
- Calculate the overall average scores (raw scores and points)
- Calculate the firm's % difference from the average
- Determine the vendor's rank in each evaluation criterion
PROPOSAL DEBRIEFINIG

Date: Date
Project Description: Project Title – Owner’s Organization
Vendor: Vendor’s Name

SELECTION PROCESS REVIEW

As outlined in the RFP, the purpose of the debriefing is to provide general feedback on the proposal, discussing strengths and weaknesses with the objective being to assist the firm in preparation of future proposals.

Selection & Evaluation Process:

1. Owner received a total of number of proposals (#) compliant submissions for this RFP
   - The following proposal forms were reviewed by Owner’s Procurement Agent to ensure all formatting and other proposal requirements were met:
   - Proposal Form 1 Name (Form A)
   - Proposal Form 2 Name (Form B)
   - Proposal Form 3 Name (Form C)

2. Proposal Evaluations
   - From each vendor, sections above were sent to the Evaluation Committee to be reviewed individually.
   - The Evaluation Committee members then submitted their evaluations back to Owner’s Procurement Agent. The compiled scores for each Proposal Form used to calculate evaluation points.
   - Cost Proposals were entered into the Evaluation Matrix numerically by Owner’s Procurement Agent.
   - Describe anything else about how proposal evaluations were conducted.

3. Short List Determination
   - After completing the above evaluations, the top number or shortlisted (#) ranked proposals were short-listed and proceeded to the interview process.
   - Note: The Evaluation Committee was not given access to scoring or ranking information until after all interview evaluations were completed.

4. Interviews
   - The same Evaluation Committee was present for Interviews with the short-listed vendors.
   - Describe anything else about how the interviews were conducted.

5. Selection Determination
   - Total evaluation scores were calculated in order to identify the highest ranked vendor. The firm with the highest score was invited to Contract Negotiations.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE RFP SUBMISSIONS

Highlighted feedback related to the vendor’s proposal submission:

1. Evaluation Criteria 1
   o Strengths:
     ▪ A
   o Areas for improvement:
     ▪ B

2. Evaluation Criteria 2
   o Strengths:
     ▪ A
   o Areas for improvement:
     ▪ B

3. Evaluation Criteria 3
   o Strengths:
     ▪ A
   o Areas for improvement:
     ▪ B

4. Evaluation Criteria 4
   o Strengths:
     ▪ A
   o Areas for improvement:
     ▪ B

5. Evaluation Criteria 5
   o Strengths:
     ▪ A
   o Areas for improvement:
     ▪ B

COMMENTS FROM THE VENDOR

• Summarize any feedback or other comments received from the Vendor (if applicable).
### Detailed Review of the Vendor’s Proposal:

A detailed view of **Raw Evaluation scores** is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Evaluation Scale</th>
<th>Vendor Name’s Points Received</th>
<th>Vendor’s Overall Rank</th>
<th>Average Score of all Proposals</th>
<th>Vendor’s Percentage from Average Score</th>
<th>Vendor’s Distance from Average Score</th>
<th>Average Score of Short List</th>
<th>Vendor’s Percentage from Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 1</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 2</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 3</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 4</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 5</td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detailed Review of the Vendor’s Proposal:

A detailed view of **Evaluation Points** received in each weighted category is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Vendor Name’s Points Received</th>
<th>Vendor’s Overall Rank</th>
<th>Average Points of all Proposals</th>
<th>Vendor’s Distance from Average</th>
<th>Average Points for Short List</th>
<th>Vendor’s Distance from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>