

SCORING GUIDE FOR EVALUATION TEAM

Each member of the proposal evaluation team shall independently evaluate each proposal based on the evaluation criteria provided. For each criterion, a brief narrative shall be provided as well as a numerical score. In addition, the evaluation shall include a list of Strengths, Weaknesses, Deficiencies and issues to be questioned. Following the independent review, the review team will discuss the results and develop a mutually agreed upon numerical scoring as well as a combined evaluation package for each bidder.

Definitions: For the purpose of the proposal evaluations, the following definitions apply.

Strength: Any part of the proposal that exceeds the requirements of the RFP or represents a superior approach.

Weakness: Any part of the proposal that meets the minimum requirements of the RFP, but represents an inferior or excessively risky approach.

Deficiency: Any part of the Proposal that fails to satisfy the requirements of the RFP.

Numerical Scoring: Numerical scoring of the evaluation criteria shall be performed on the following basis:

100-80 The proposal significantly exceeds the requirements and represents a clearly superior and desirable approach with a high probability of success.

80-60 The proposal meets or exceeds the requirements and represents a somewhat superior approach with a good probability of success.

60-40 The proposal meets the requirements and represents an acceptable approach with reasonable probability of success.

40-20 The proposal meets most of the requirements but represents a somewhat inferior approach.

20-0 The proposal has several deficiencies and represents a poor approach or has low probability of success.

0 The proposal has failed to address the requirements and represents an unacceptable approach.

SCORING

Bidder: _____

Evaluator: _____

1) Understanding of the Problem:

10%

- Does the Bidder's proposal exhibit a complete understanding of the technical and logistical issues associated with performing the specified work?
- Is the understanding comprehensive with regard to the full range of tasks and requirements?
- Does the Bidder understand the programmatic constraints associated with Phases A and B in completing of the work?

Comments:

2) Qualifications:

20%

- Is the Bidder's experience and expertise relevant to the required tasks and design requirements?
- Are the individuals proposed for key roles in the project qualified and available?
- Are sufficient personnel of appropriate skills identified and available to perform the proposed effort?
- Does the Bidder have adequate facilities and resources to fabricate and assemble the TMA as proposed?
- Did the Bidder respond fully to all bid instructions?
- Are the Bidder's subcontractors qualified, if included?

Comments:

3) Schedule:**10%**

- Are the phases of work clearly defined and pragmatic in scope and organization?
- Does the Bidder's schedule include adequate contingency to address unplanned schedule delays?
- Is the Bidder capable of performing the specified work within the given time frame and as proposed?
- Does the Bidder's schedule of work, reviews, and delivery follow a logical sequence meeting the requirements of the Statement of Work and the technical maturity of the proposed technical approach?

Comments:**4) Technical Approach:****30%**

- Is the technical approach clearly conveyed and does it have a high probability of meeting the requirements including performance, reliability, functionality, and maintainability?
- Does the technical approach include adequate design and analysis activities and include risk mitigation?
- Does the technical approach meet all the requirements with limited impact on other system interfaces?
- Are the activities in the Bidder compliance matrix clearly defined and include sufficient demonstration tasks well integrated in the overall requirements verification process?
- Does the Bidder adequately address risk of nonperformance by suppliers and sub contractors?
- Does the approach include adequate safety and quality assurance policies and procedures to provide oversight to the program plan?
- Does the Bidder's approach and investment in Factory Acceptance Testing provide sufficient timely demonstration to mitigate overall system performance risk?

Comments:

5) Value:

30%

- Is the price fair and reasonable and consistent with the proposed effort?
- How does the value, considering both cost and benefits associated with the proposed approach for Phase A and Phase B, compare with other proposals?
- Does the Bidder's approach represent the optimum value to the objectives, established requirements, and the LSST Project?
- Is the cost and payment rate appropriate to the completed work and within acceptable scope and rate for the required schedule?

Comments:

Bidder: _____

Evaluator: _____

Proposal Strengths:

Proposal Weaknesses:

Proposal Deficiencies:

Evaluation Questions: