**SFA-FSMC Monitoring Form:**

**Procurement Requirements**

*The SFA must conduct performance management of the FSMC contract through periodic on-site monitoring of the contracted requirements, as per 7 CFR 210.16(a)(3).*

*Please note this Monitoring Form (Procurement Requirements) should be* completed *at the conclusion of the competitive procurement process, prior to signing a new base-year FSMC agreement. This form, along with all supporting documentation must be submitted to RIDE as part of the procurement approval process*.

Monitoring Date:Click here to enter text.

Name of Sponsor:Click here to enter text.

Name of SFA Official Conducting Monitoring:Click here to enter text.

Documents Needed to assess compliance:

1. A brief description of the procurement method utilized (i.e., sealed bids or competitive proposals)
2. The rationale for the method of procurement
3. A description of the evaluation factors and other criteria used in evaluating bids or proposals and their relative weight/importance
4. A list of the technical review committee members, including the confidentiality statement and the guidelines for the committee members
5. A description of the method of conducting the evaluation and the date of such evaluation
6. A brief description of the rationale for the rejection of any bid or proposal
7. A copy of the RFP (as submitted and approved by RIDE and subsequently advertised)
	1. Note: Agreements cannot be approved by RIDE unless sufficient financial and demographic information to enable potential bidders to prepare a competitive proposal has been included with the RFP and sufficient time has been provided for the preparation and submission of proposals.
8. A copy of all bids/proposals received (to be held for the period of RIDE review and returned to the district upon approval of the contract)
9. A timeline of the process
10. A copy of any request for clarifications and the clarifications provided
11. A copy of the documentation of the ranking of proposals received
12. A brief description of the rationale for the selection of the FSMC awarded the contract
13. A copy of the proposed agreement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Procurement Requirements** |  |  |
| 1. Did the SFA follow the appropriate procurement procedures when awarding the FSMC contract, including preparing all contract documents? (These documents include, but are not limited to, bid specifications, the RFP/IFB, contract, and any contract amendments.) *2 CFR 200.320(b)*

*Validation Activity:**Compare the SFA’s procurement procedures against the required elements of the procurement method (IFB or RFP). Verify that all appropriate documentation is on file.* | **Yes**: The appropriate procurement procedures were followed for the solicitation type utilized (either an RFP or IFB). All appropriate documents were included and are maintained.**Needs Improvement**: One or more of the required documents were not created, OR characteristics of the appropriate procurement method were not followed, OR documentation is not maintained. | **Yes** [ ] **Needs Improvement** [ ]  |
| 2. Were there an adequate number of qualified RFP/IFB responses to permit reasonable competition? *2 CFR 200.320(b)(2)(i)**Validation Activity:**Verify that two or more responses were received for the FSMC procurement and that the responses are kept on file.* | **Yes**: Two or more qualified vendor responses were solicited and received.**Needs Improvement**: Only one qualified vendor response was received. | **Yes** [ ] **Needs Improvement**[ ]  |
| 3. Was the RFP/IFB publicized and any reasonable requests by other sources to compete were honored to the maximum extent practicable?*2 CFR 200.320(b)(2)(i)*Example of reasonable request: Pre-bid in-person meeting being mandatory and vendor requesting to attend virtually.*Validation Activity:**Look at the advertising documentation for the FSMC procurement and verify that it was publicly advertised either in a newspaper or online. Also, look in the documentation on file to verify that any reasonable requests from vendors were accommodated.* | **Yes**: The RFP/IFB was publicly advertised in the widest circulation possible and any reasonable requests by other sources to compete were honored to the maximum extent possible. Generally, this would include advertising in major newspapers or an online portal. **Needs Improvement**: The RFP was not publicly advertised OR reasonable requests were not honored.  | **Yes** [ ] **Needs Improvement** [ ]  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Was the FSMC awarded the contract based on the SFA-provided mechanisms for technical evaluation of the proposals? (Technical Evaluation applies to RFP only. Answer N/A if an IFB was used.)*USDA FSMC Guidance for SFAs, May 2016**Validation Activity:**Compare the evaluation included in the proposal against the evaluation that was completed and used for awarding the vendor. Verify that those evaluations match.* | **Yes**: The contract was awarded based on the evaluation that was included in the solicitation (RFP) and documentation (e.g., evaluation sheets from each scorer) is maintained.**Needs Improvement**: The contract was awarded using evaluation criteria that was different than what was published in the original solicitation, OR evaluation criteria was not utilized, OR evaluation documentation was not maintained. **N/A:** Answer N/A if an IFB was used. | **Yes** [ ] **Needs Improvement** [ ] **N/A**[ ]  |
| 5. Was the contract awarded to the responsible offeror whose proposal was the most advantageous to the SFA with price and other factors considered (with price as the primary factor)? (“Other Factors” apply to RFP only. Answer N/A if an IFB was used.) *2 CFR 200.320(b)(2)(iii)**Validation Activity:**Look at the documentation of the evaluation and award for the selected vendor. Verify that price was the most heavily weighted criterion in the evaluation. Ensure that documentation is on file that clearly explains the reasoning for why the vendor was selected.* | **Yes**: The contract was awarded not solely upon the lowest cost but other factors as well; however, price was the primary factor/most heavily weighted in the scoring process. If an award was made to an offeror that was not the lowest price, documentation detailing the reason for award is available. A responsible offeror means an entity capable of performing successfully under the terms and conditions of the contract.**Needs Improvement**: Price was not the primary factor, OR a proposal was awarded who did not score the highest, OR documentation supporting the award to an offeror that was not the lowest price is reasonable and maintained, OR a contract was awarded to an offeror that was not advantageous to the SFA.**N/A**: Answer N/A if an IFB was used. | **Yes** [ ] **Needs Improvement** [ ] **N/A**[ ]  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **List Corrective Actions taken for all “Needs Improvement” items.**1. Click here to enter text.
2. Click here to enter text.
3. Click here to enter text.
4. Click here to enter text.
5. Click here to enter text.
 | **Date of Implementation**Click here to enter Date |

Other Comments:Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Signature of SFA Official:Click here to enter text. | Title:Click here to enter text. | Date:Click here to enter text. |