

PROPOSAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES:

These guidelines offer assistance in the evaluation of proposals received in response to Request for Proposals (RFP). Evaluation Committee members' review of proposals must be conducted individually and professionally. Evaluation Committee members must follow meticulously the established evaluation format and be able to evaluate all proposals objectively and without bias. One of the most important elements in the evaluation process is the assurance that each offeror is treated fairly and equally.

Confidentiality: Evaluation Committee members must conduct themselves with complete confidentiality. Confidentiality is both a legal and ethical requirement and is vital to fair, equitable evaluation of the proposals. Members must not discuss the contents of the proposals with anyone. Please remember that the proposals (1) may contain proprietary information, (2) usually list names of the key personnel proposed for the project, and (3) outline a fee schedule that will be used to negotiate a final contract price. Any information discussed outside the Evaluation Committee before official award (either by Purchasing, the Manager's Office, or the Mayor & Commission) may undermine negotiations with other offerors if the initial recommendation for award is not approved. It may also damage the Unified Government's credibility in providing an equitable and fair evaluation process for vendors.

Non Conflict of Interest/Non-Disclosure Statement: Participants will be required to sign the attached Disclosure Statement that identifies you as an Evaluation Committee member. This statement outlines members' responsibilities during the evaluation process. Members also acknowledge that they will not have any contact with any of the vendors submitting proposals with regard to this specific RFP, or release information prior to an official award.

Acknowledgement: The evaluation process is time-consuming, difficult work that is recognized and appreciated. The Unified Government values committee members' judgement, professionalism, and integrity. Members make this process better by recognizing its importance to the Unified Government and the citizens it serves.

General Guidelines:

- Evaluators must provide a written narrative to support each score for each criterion.
- The term "non-responsive" is not a meaningful term and should not be used in the evaluation. Proposals are technically unacceptable if the offeror has failed to provide adequate information. If we have received a proposal, the offeror has responded, no matter how poorly.
- **Evaluators are not to compare one proposal against another.** Scoring is restricted to evaluation of the proposal against the criteria specified in the solicitation document.
- The Panel must state their position on the relative merits of proposals in addition to the scoring, and narrative statements must reflect these differences, e.g., "The proposals are judged to be technically equal", "this proposal is technically superior", etc.
- Evaluators must score each proposal **based only on the information contained in the**

offeror's submission.

- If the Panel requires clarifying information on a proposal, **specific questions must be provided to Purchasing for dissemination to vendors.**
- The panel's summary narrative must support the ranking given to each offeror's proposal.
- Technical proposals and evaluation results are considered confidential information. **Under no circumstances are technical proposals or their contents to be released or discussed outside the Panel membership.** Any correspondence relative to the technical review is to be transmitted to Purchasing in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential."
- The Individual Score Sheets should be submitted ONLY to the Evaluation Team Chairperson for initial ranking, and are NOT to be returned to Purchasing. Once all phases of the evaluation are completed, the **Evaluation Summary** sheet should be turned in to Purchasing, along with the Recommendation Form.