Issued by the State of Alaska Solicitation Number 2023-0200-5173



Attachment C RFP EVALUATION PLAN

<u>Stage 1: Initial Responsiveness.</u> Proposals will be reviewed for completeness and initial responsiveness. Proposals omitting required documents found in section IV of the RFP Summary attachment may be rejected in accordance with Attachment A, RFP Terms and Conditions.

<u>Stage 2: Mandatory Minimum Requirements.</u> Complete and responsive proposals will be reviewed for compliance with mandatory minimum requirement per Attachment G – Offeror Response Worksheet, Section 1. Offeror's proposal may be deemed non-responsive and receive no further consideration if Offeror does not acknowledge and agree to the mandatory minimums in Attachment G.

<u>Stage 3: Technical Criteria.</u> 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	50	
Scope of Work	150	
Customer Service & Product Support	150	
National Cooperative Contracting Ability	50	
Stage 3 Total:	400	

A Proposal Evaluation Committee (PEC) will evaluate responses as detailed in Attachment G Offeror Response Worksheet and assign a single score for each section.

Stage 4: Cost. The contents of Attachment H, Cost Proposal will be worth 600 points and be scored as follows:

The distribution of points based on cost will be determined as set out in Alaska Administrative Code 2 AAC 12.260(c). The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost for Categories 1 and 2, each treated separately. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined using the formula in each category accordingly:

[(Price of Lowest Cost Proposal) x (Maximum Points for Cost)] ÷ (Cost of Each Higher Priced Proposal)

EXAMPLES: CONVERTING COST TO POINTS

STEP 1: List all proposal prices:

Offeror #1	\$10,000
Offeror #2	\$15,000
Offeror #3	\$20,000

STEP 2

In this example, the RFP allotted 60% of the available 1000 points to cost. This means that the lowest cost will receive the maximum number of points.





Offeror #1 receives 600 points.

The reason they receive that amount is because the lowest cost proposal, in this case \$10,000, receives the maximum number of points allocated to cost, 600 points.

Offeror #2 receives 400 points.

10,000 (lowest cost) x 600 (max. points for cost) = $6,000,000 \div 15,000$ (Offeror #2 proposed price) = 400 points

Offeror #3 receives 300 points.

\$10,000 (lowest cost) x 600 (max. points for cost) = 6,000,000 ÷ \$20,000 (Offeror #3 proposed price) = 300 points

Offeror	Lowest Cost x	Maximum Points Possible	÷ Offeror's Proposed Price	= Offeror's Points Earned
#1	\$10,000	600	\$10,000	600
#2	\$10,000	600	\$15,000	400
#3	\$10,000	600	\$20,000	300

In addition to the Category pricing for their offered devices and market basket items, Offerors must include in their cost proposal a blanket discount off their catalogue price for items in their catalogue which are not otherwise included in their cost proposal. Pricing information should be included in Attachment H – Cost Proposal

Cost Proposals may also be subject to an independent review for reasonableness and best value by the Lead State. Costs determined not to be reasonable or best-value by the Lead State may result in all or part of Offeror's proposal being rejected, notwithstanding the results of the Cost Proposal evaluation.

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Stage	Points Possible	Offeror's Points Earned
Technical Criteria Evaluation	400	
Cost Evaluation	600	
Total:	1.000	

AWARD SELECTION

The Lead State and Multistate Sourcing Team will determine which proposals are most advantageous to the Lead State and potential Participating and Purchasing Entities by determining the natural break.

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 a Notice of Intent to Award.

Issued by the State of Alaska Solicitation Number 2023-0200-5173



Application of Alaska Preferences

Following the identification of the NASPO ValuePoint apparent successful Offeror(s), the State of Alaska will apply it's 5% Alaska Bidder preference, 5% Alaska Veteran Preference, 10% Alaskan Offeror preference and all other statutory and regulatory preferences that are claimed by eligible vendors.

If it is determined after the application of preferences that the apparent successful Offeror(s) are the same, a Notice of Intent to Award will be issued and a Master Agreement (MA) will be negotiated and executed with the Offeror(s) and the State of Alaska may execute a participating addendum to enable purchases from the MA.

If it is determined after the application of preferences the ranking is different, a Notice of Intent to Award will be issued and a National MA will be negotiated and executed with vendors not claiming State of Alaska preferences. This MA will be available for use nationwide by all participating states and entities.

A State of Alaska-specific MA will then be negotiated and executed with all vendors that did claim State of Alaska preferences for use by the State of Alaska governmental entities and federally recognized tribes of Alaska. The State of Alaska must participate in the State specific MA(s) but may also choose to participate in the National MA(s).

