Evaluation Committee Guidelines

The Evaluation Committee (EC) has the authority to review and evaluate suppliers' technical responses in response to a specific Request for Proposals (RFP) or a scored Request for Qualified Contractors (RFQC).

General guidelines:

1. Identifying Evaluation Committee Members. Ideally, the members of the EC should be identified prior to the solicitation issuance. Members of the EC should have professional interest and expertise to evaluate proposals and make recommendations that could lead to the selection of one or more suppliers. The Issuing Officer (IO) of the solicitation shall serve on the EC as an ex-officio member and will facilitate all Evaluation and Negotiation Meetings. The IO may not score suppliers' responses.

2. EC Member Participation Form. Prior to beginning the evaluation process, the IO will send an Evaluation Committee Member Participation Form (SPD-SP039) to the individual EC members and each member shall return an executed copy to the IO.

3. Initial Review of Suppliers' Responses. After the official closing of the solicitation, the IO will review received responses for compliance with the submittal criteria and content requirements utilizing the Administrative Review Requirements Summary Sheet (SPD-EP001). Responses that fail the administrative review will be rejected from any further consideration by the State.

4. Submitting Responses to the EC. The EC members who have executed the Evaluation Committee Member Participation Form will be provided with all suppliers' responses that passed the administrative review as well as the appropriate evaluation forms to capture scoring. The IO must instruct the EC to comply with the scoring guidelines identified below.

5. Independent and Individual Review. Each EC member will individually and independently review each supplier's response. The EC member must assign a written assessment to each question. In addition, the EC member must include a written comment justifying any assessment other than "adequate." During the initial review, the EC member should note any clarification questions the EC member suggests asking the supplier. After completing the initial evaluation, the EC member will submit the evaluation documentation and any identified clarification questions to the IO.

6. Scoring Rating System. Each question's possible score will be multiplied by its assigned weight to obtain the applicable score for that supplier's response to the question. The following rating system applies:

Scoring Guidelines for Scored Requirements with Narrative Response Required

Assessment	Scoring Guidelines	Evaluator Score
No Response (Only Applies to Mandatory	• The narrative response provided constitutes a material deviation from the requirement • No narrative response provided • When the response does not meet a mandatory	Fail or Disqualified

Assessment	Scoring Guidelines	Evaluator Score
Scored)	requirement or deviates from the requirement, the proposal is disqualified	
Poor	• Fails to address the component or the supplier does not describe any experience related to the component • Proposal is inadequate in most basic requirements, specifications, or provisions for the specific criteria	0
Marginal	• Proposal minimally addresses the requirements, but one or more major considerations of the component are not addressed, or so limited that it results in a low degree of confidence in the bidder's response or proposed solution. • Proposal meets many of the basic requirements specifications, or provision of the specific items, but is lacking in some essential aspects for the specific criteria	0.25
Adequate	• Proposal adequately meets the minimum requirements, specification, or provision of the specific item, and is generally capable of meeting the state's needs for specific criteria	0.50
Good	• Proposal more than adequately meets the minimum requirements, specification or provision of the specific criteria, and exceeds those requirements in some aspects for the specific criteria	0.75
Excellent	• Fully meets all requirements and exceeds several requirements • Proposal exceeds minimum requirements, specification and provision in most aspects for the specific criteria	100

7. Convening EC Committee Meetings. After the IO has consolidated each individual EC member's scores into the master evaluation spreadsheet, the IO will schedule a meeting for all EC members to meet and discuss initial scores. The EC members will discuss the individual scores and, as a result of the discussion, each member may adjust the member's individual scoring up or down as appropriate. There is no requirement that all EC members reach agreement on the score for a particular question/requirement. In the event the EC members do not reach agreement on a score for a particular question/requirement, the IO will average the individual scores to determine the supplier's score for that particular question/requirement.

8. Analyzing Cost Proposals (RFPs Only). For RFPs, the IO will analyze the cost proposals independently, but may perform the analysis concurrently with the EC's evaluation of the suppliers' technical responses. The IO will not disclose the cost proposals or the cost analysis to the EC until after the Technical Proposals have been scored. The EC may elect to conduct oral presentations or request additional material prior to receiving the Cost Proposals and cost analysis.

   When applicable, the State may utilize lowest cost, lowest total cost, Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) or greatest savings to determine the most advantageous proposal; provided, however, the State must abide by any statements within the RFP regarding cost evaluation.

9. Overall Scores Preceding Negotiations (RFPs Only). Each supplier meeting all mandatory requirements will receive a total combined score by adding the supplier's technical score to the supplier's cost score. The Master Technical Evaluation Template (SPD-EP013) or such other appropriate document should be utilized to show the overall total score.

10. Convening a Negotiation Team (RFPs Only). If the EC elects to initiate negotiations, then a Negotiation Team (NT) will convene. The IO must follow the guidelines found in the RFP and the *Georgia Procurement Manual* with respect to conducting negotiations.

11. Capturing Negotiation Results & Award Recommendation (RFPs Only). If the State elects to negotiate with identified suppliers, the supplier will each be asked to submit a Proposal Revision following each round of negotiations, which Proposal Revision will then augment the original RFP submission. Each Proposal Revision will be evaluated and re-scored by the EC utilizing the same evaluation criteria.

12. Public Notice of Solicitation Results. For RFPs, the IO will prepare and issue the Notice of Intent to Award and Notice of Award as applicable in accordance with the provisions of the *Georgia Procurement Manual*. For scored RFQCs, the IO will prepare and post the RFQC List of Qualified Contractors in accordance with the manual.

13. Maintaining Agency Records. All evaluation/negotiation documents/forms completed by each evaluator and by the EC and NT will be collected by the IO and become part of the official records and subject to the Georgia Open Records Act.