**Attachment C**

**RFP EVALUATION PLAN**

**Stage 1: Initial Responsiveness.** Proposals will be reviewed for completeness and initial responsiveness. Proposals omitting required documents or responses may be rejected in accordance with Attachment A, RFP Terms and Conditions.

Proposals failing to meet or exceed all requirements may be rejected in accordance with Attachment A, RFP Terms and Conditions.

**Stage 2: Mandatory Minimum Requirements.** Complete and responsive proposals will be reviewed for compliance with the following Mandatory Minimum Requirements:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Evaluation** | **Result** |
| Original Equipment Manufacturer | Pass / Fail |  |
| Dealer Network | Pass / Fail |  |
| References | Pass / Fail |  |
| **Stage 2 Result:** | |  |

Proposals failing to meet or exceed all Mandatory Minimum Requirements may be rejected in accordance with Attachment A, RFP Terms and Conditions.

**Stage 3: Technical Criteria.** Proposals meeting or exceeding the Mandatory Minimum Requirements will be evaluated against the following Technical Criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Points Possible** | **Offeror’s Points Earned** |
| Experience and Qualifications | 200 |  |
| Ability to meet SOW | 300 |  |
| Warranties and Service | 200 |  |
| Promotion of the NASPO ValuePoint Master Agreement | 100 |  |
| Business Profile | 200 |  |
| Management and Leadership | 200 |  |
| References | 100 |  |
| Value Add Plan | 50 |  |
| Value Add Items Offered | 150 |  |
| **Stage 3 Total:** | **1500** |  |

Upon final technical evaluation, all vendors who scored at least 75% of available points will move on to the Stage 4 Cost evaluation.

**Stage 4: Cost Evaluation.** Cost Proposals not rejected following evaluation of Technical Criteria will be evaluated. Each category will be reviewed and scored.

**PROPOSED COSTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost Item** |  | **Offeror’s Proposal** | **Points Possible** | **Offeror’s Points Earned** |
| Number of Categories Proposed | 22 Categories |  | 100 |  |
| Market Basket Evaluation | [lowest cost] |  | 200 |  |
| Discount % Off Evaluation | [highest average discount %] |  | 200 |  |
|  |  | **Total:** | **500** |  |

1. Number of Categories Proposed

In this portion of the Cost Evaluation there are 100 points available. It has been determined that a vendor award offering more Categories presents more valuable use cases to an end user, versus a vendor proposing only one category. There are 22 Categories available. Points will be awarded according to the following scale based on the number of categories an Offeror is seeking an award in:

1 to 5 Categories à 22 points

6 to 10 Categories à 44 points

11 to 15 Categories à 66 points

16 to 20 Categories à 88 points

21 to 22 Categories à 100 points

The Lead State reserves the right to modify this formula and/or assign a nominal value to “0” cost values if application of the formula results in an error, negative numbers, or an unreasonably skewed distribution of points.

1. Market Basket Evaluation

In this portion of the Cost Evaluation there are 200 points available for each Category. The proposed “Extended Price” for the Category will be compared against the other Offerors’ Extended Price to the Category. Categories that include sub-categories (i.e., Category 5 – Compactors & Category 17 – Sweepers) will first have the Extended Price averaged to then arrive at an Extended Price for the Category, and then applied in the cost evaluation.

The formula for calculating cost points earned for this portion is **Lowest Extended Price / Offeror’s Extended Price x 200**. The Lead State reserves the right to modify this formula and/or assign a nominal value to “0” cost values if application of the formula results in an error, negative numbers, or an unreasonably skewed distribution of points.

1. Discount % Off Evaluation

In this portion of the Cost Evaluation there are 200 points available. The proposed discount percentages (%) will be averaged across each category to determine the highest average discount % off. The highest average discount % will be used as a baseline to assign the available cost points to the other vendors.

The formula for calculating cost points earned for this portion is **Offeror’s Average Discount / Highest Average Discount x 200**. The Lead State reserves the right to modify this formula and/or assign a nominal value to “0” cost values if application of the formula results in an error, negative numbers, or an unreasonably skewed distribution of points.

**EVALUATION SUMMARY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage 3 & 4** | **Points Possible** | **Offeror’s Points Earned** |
| Technical Criteria Evaluation (Stage 3)  Experience and Qualifications  Ability to Meet SOW  Warranties and Service  Promotion of the NASPO ValuePoint Master Agreement  Business Profile  Management and Leadership  References  Value Add Plan  Value Add Items Offered | 1,500 |  |
| Cost Evaluation (Stage 40  Number of Categories Proposed  Market Basket Evaluation  Discount % Off Evaluation | 500 |  |
| **Total:** | **2,000** |  |

**AWARD SELECTION**

The Lead State and Multistate Sourcing Team will then determine which proposals are most advantageous to the Lead State and potential Participating and Purchasing Entities. Awards will be made at the natural break of all scores. It is desired to have at least 90% of available score, however, the variance of responses could show a natural break in high and low scoring responses.

Prior to announcement of awards and execution of Master Agreements, the Lead State will present an award recommendation to the NASPO ValuePoint Executive Council for approval of the proposed awards.

Following approval of the NASPO ValuePoint Executive Council, the Lead State will issue an intent-to-award announcement on its electronic procurement system. Subsequent to posting of the Notice of Intent of Award, the Lead State will begin formalization of NASPO ValuePoint Master Agreements. The Lead State reserves the right during contract negotiation of the Master Agreement to adjust terms and conditions that would not (in the Lead State’s judgment) have a material effect on price, schedule, scope of work, or risk to the Lead State and Participating States, with materiality defined in terms of the effect on the evaluation and award. The Lead State reserves the right to accept contract or pricing changes that are more favorable to the Lead State.

If no Master Agreement is reached with the apparent awardee, the Lead State may negotiate with other Offerors or elect to make no award under this RFP.