Date:	February 7, 2012
То:	Board of Deferred Compensation Administration
From:	Staff
Subject:	Consulting Services Request for Proposal Update

<u>Board of Deferred</u> <u>Compensation Administration</u> Eugene, Canzano, Chairperson John Mumma, Vice- Chairperson Cliff Cannon, First Provisional Chair Tom Moutes, Second Provisional Chair Sangeeta Bhatia, Third Provisional Chair Michael Amerian Michael Perez Robert Schoonover Maggie Whelan

Recommendation:

That the Board of Deferred Compensation Administration receive and file information regarding the status of the Request for Proposal for consulting services.

Discussion:

On August 9, 2012, the Board released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for consulting services for the Deferred Compensation Plan. Responses were due September 30, 2011.

The RFP addressed consulting services in three broad areas: **Investment Consulting**, **Plan Administration Consulting**, and **Communications Consulting**. These categories were "unbundled" within the RFP, meaning that prospective vendors were eligible to submit proposals for single or multiple categories, with each category being evaluated independent of the other categories. This was done to provide opportunities for more competitive outcomes and identifying more "best-of-class" providers within each field. Viable responses were received from the following firms (in alphabetical order) within the following categories:

RFP Submitted	Plan Administration Consulting	Investment Consulting	Communications Consulting
Buck Consultants	х	х	х
Cafaro Greenleaf	Х	Х	х
Mercer Investment Consulting	х	x	x
NEPC	No	×	No
			NO
Speaking Essentials	No	No	Х

Two additional firms, Segal Advisors and Sageview Advisory Group, submitted responses for Plan Administration and Investment consulting. However, the former neglected to provide any of the documentation associated with the City's General Contracting Requirements, and the latter did not conduct any outreach in connection with the City's Business Inclusion Program (BIP). According to the City's procurement rules, both responses were required to be deemed non-responsive and were not evaluated.

The RFP provides for performance exams for each of the three consulting categories. However, to be eligible for a performance exam, a firm must have scored well enough on the written portion of the RFP to be viable to receive a contract award. Staff is in the process of finalizing scoring for the written responses. Performance exams will be scheduled for late February/early March.

Submitted by:

Steven Montagna

Approved by:

Alejandrina Basquez