4627 21-0200-Proposal Evaluation Form RFP 20

questions set out in Sections 4.04 through 4.07 and assign representing the average 10 (with 10 representing highest score, The PEC will evaluate responses against the Single score for each section of 1, 5, 10 (wi score, and 1 representing the lowest score).

## MINIMUM EXPERIENCE/PRIOR PAST 4.04

PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS This portion of the offeror's proposal will be evaluated against the following

- of least one project, federal government entity? questions: the offeror demonstrated successful completions a local, state or With the State of Alaska? complexity performed for experience Experience: How well has similar in size, scope, and Was the one-year (e
- of successfully completing reserves the right project? Was contact number and name provided? NOTE: the state assurance that the offeror is capable Did letter of reference provide contact reference this 9
- using MS projects, at two large, How well has the offeror demonstrated that they have successfully completed least one of which preformed for a local, state of federal government entity? performance management focused projects complex workforce-related or 0
  - How well has the offeror demonstrated that they have met the minimum four-year experience work force management, performance management, or organization design and development activities? 0

S
0
tes
0
8
2
0
tors
a
3
O
Valua
H

Evaluators Score

# UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT

will be evaluated against the following questions: 's proposal offeror This portion of the

- ne purpose and scope How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of tl the project?
- How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project? 5
- deliverables the state To what degree has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the expects it to provide? 3

ule and can meet it? 4) Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the state's time sched

Evaluators Notes

how they will meet to 730 0 1000 Jan Evaluators Score Chear

# 4.06 METHODOLOGY USED FOR

he following questions: 4.06 METHODOLOGY USED FOR THE PROJECT
This portion of the offeror's proposal (Submittal Form D) will be evaluated against t

- How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP? 1)
- match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP? How well does the methodology
- with the time schedule in the RFP? Does the methodology interface 3)

Evaluators Notes

Centract ves mures alloca

Evaluators Score

## HE PROJECT 4.07 MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR T

This portion of the offeror's proposal will be evaluated against the following questions:

- How well does the management plan support all of the project requirements and logically lead to the deliverables required in the RFP?
- How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication and is accountability completely and clearly defined?
- Is the organization of the project team clear? 3)

Jahrden

Did the offeror provide a detailed list of key personnel, along with their titles

5) Were resumes acceptable, outstanding, etc.?

Does it appear that the offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP? (9

Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

8) To what degree is the proposal practical?

Evaluators Notes

exponsibilities ven dead Red In this area

Evaluators Score

Grudelnors &

Proposal Evaluation Form RFP 2021-0200-4627

out in Sections 4.04 through 4.07 and assign a single score for each section of 1, 5, 10 (with 10 representing highest score, 5 representing the average score, and 1 representing the lowest score). set questions The PEC will evaluate responses against the

#### REQUIRENTS PAST PERFORMANCE MINIMUM EXPERIENCE/PRIOR 4.04

evaluated against the following questions: This portion of the offeror's proposal will

- of least one project, a local, state or federal government entity? Experience: How well has the offeror demonstrated successful completions Was the one-year experience with the State of Alaska? similar in size, scope, and complexity performed for
- assurance that the offeror is capable of successfully completing reserves the right to project? Was contact number and name provided? NOTE: the state Did letter of reference provide contact reference. 9
- MS projects, at How well has the offeror demonstrated that they have successfully completed two large, using a local, state of federal government entity? complex workforce-related or performance management focused projec least one of which preformed for a local, state of federal government en 0
- -year experience in work force management, performance management, or organization design and How well has the offeror demonstrated that they have met the minimum four development activities? P

Evaluators Notes

| 10 AK WORD

Evaluators Score

# 4.05 UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT

evaluated against the following questions: ₩. This portion of the offeror's proposal

- How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project? 1
- related to the How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems
- To what degree has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the state expects it to provide?

Jule and can meet it? Has the offeror demonstrated a

U	ŋ
0	1
- 2	9
Notes	)
-	7
_	-
~	2
=	7
C	)
+	J
C	3
	ě
-	,
- 11	>
>	d
Evaluatore	1
Seeding	•

NO.		
2		
	2	
-		
- 1		
-1		
- 1		
_		
-1		
1		1
		1
1		
		1
		J. S.
		Sore
		Score
		Score
		's Score
		ors Score_
		Evaluators Score

### FOR THE PROJECT 4.06 METHODOLOGY USED

(Submittal Form D) will be evaluated against the following questions: This portion of the offeror's proposal

- How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical apprehents of the RFP? 1
- logy match and achieve the objectives set our How well does the methodo 7)
- Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the RFP? 3

**Evaluators Notes** 

	_
	STATE AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSONS
	COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.
	SECTION AND DESCRIPTION AND DE
	STREET, SQUARE,
	SCHOOL SECTION
	ORDER DESIGNATION
	ACCUSED MADE IN
	SCHOOL STREET
	2000000 000000
	CONTRACT OF STREET
	DESCRIPTION OF PERSONS
	STATE OF THE PERSON
	DESCRIPTION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO PERSONS NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TWO PERSONS NAMED IN COLUMN TR
	200000 1000
	Carried Street, Square, Square
	COLUMN BUILDING
	200000 0000
	TO COMPANY OF THE
	PROPERTY OF THE PARTY.
A STATE OF	ALCOHOLD BY CARD
-	
100 m	Marine Branch
No. of Street, or other Designation of the least of the l	
100	1
Tuesday.	
	SOURCE PARTY
- CONTROL OF THE PARTY OF THE P	CONTRACT PRINT
	Slootscan, and Sun
	CONTRACT BY
	ACCRECATE ACCRE
	COLUMN DESIGNATION OF THE PERSON OF THE PERS
	CONTRACT DESCRIPTION
	198000000000000000000000000000000000000
	STREET, STREET,
	COMMON DISTANCE
	800000 S(00)
	Contract Contract
	CONTROL BOOK
	HOUSE BOOK
	ACCRECATE VALUE OF
	11
	(1)
	0
	9
	9
	e e
	re
	ore
	ore
	ore
	core
	core
	core
	000
	000
	Sco
	stors Scol
	Sco
	stors Scol
	stors Scol
	Iluators Scol
	Iluators Scol
	Iluators Scol
	Iluators Scol
	Iluators Scol
	Iluators Scol
	Iluators Scol
	stors Scol

## THE PROJECT 4.07 MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR This portion of the offeror's proposal w

will be evaluated against the following questi

- ents and logically lead How well does the management plan support all of the project requirement to the deliverables required in the RFP? 1)
- communication and is How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and defined? accountability completely and clearly 2)
- ject team clear? Is the organization of the pro 3

Grudeline o

ailed list of key pe Did the offeror provide a det 4)

5) Were resumes acceptable, outstanding, etc.?

schedule set out in the RFP Does it appear that the offeror (9

tasks necessary to meet the Has the offeror gone beyond 7

8) To what degree is the proposal practical?

Evaluators Notes

will laid out aling the line

Evaluators Score

option comman