**Evaluation of Proposals**

The proposal rating instructions below and a spreadsheet are provided to track your ratings and to help you prepare for our Wednesday meeting. The purpose of our Wednesday meeting is to select a short-list of consultants for Task Force interview.  The original scope of work that was provided to prospective bidders is also included. **Please have your rating information ready for entry into the group template at the beginning of the meeting on Wednesday.**

It is expected that everyone will have read each of the proposals and the ranking protocol so the work group can begin scoring and vetting the proposals right away.  Given the schedule that resulted from the fact the full TF will be voting on our selection, we have only this meeting to determine a short-list.  We will also need to discuss how we will integrate reference checks and cost into the process.

**Proposal Ranking Instructions**

**Rating System**

In order to have a common and consistent rating system the following definitions should be used:

* Exceptional – Far Exceeds Expectation – Rate at 5
* Exceeds – Exceeds Expectation – Rate at 4
* Acceptable – Meets Expectation – Rate at 3
* Marginal – Below Expectation – Rate at 2
* Deficient – Far Below Expectation – Rate at 1

**Criteria and Weighting**

In the Request for Proposal Package that was sent out, a Criteria and Weighting document was provided. This outlined what any proposal needed to tell us about in order to be considered and would become the basis for ranking proposals received relative to what we believe is our specific situation. The criteria contained four elements. Below is a listing of the elements and some things to consider in the evaluation and rating process.

* Experience with Similar Projects
	+ Facilitation Services
		- Discuss experience working with multi-stakeholder groups
			* What experience does the proposed facilitator have with groups that are made up of members such as ours?
			* Do they have experience working with a multi-stakeholder process directed by a committee rather than one point of contact?
		- Discuss experience with communicating complex technical issues
			* What experience does the proposed facilitator have in facilitating groups where complex technical issues are involved and they have been able to grasp the content sufficiently to keep the process on track relative to the goals of the group?
			* What technical content knowledge does the proposed facilitator have and what experience do they have in translating technical information into language that policy makers and the public can understand for purposes of discussion and decision making?
		- Discuss experience with website management
			* What experience do they have with managing the types and volumes of information that we generate?
	+ Project Management Services
		- Discuss experience with coordinating or managing the work of others
			* What experience have they had with in assisting in the development of scopes and budgets for projects and report preparation?
			* What types of technical and non-technical projects have they been a part of?
			* Do they have experience tracking and /or managing projects that are part of a larger, multi-party process and directed by a committee rather than one point of contact?
* Project Team Element
	+ Experience and Qualifications of Team
		- Overall experience and qualifications of the entire team that is proposed to be involved directly the SRRTTF?
		- Any areas of weakness in experience or qualifications that are critical to our needs?
		- If the facilitator and project manager are two separate people or are represented by two different firms, how coordinated is their approach?
		- Does their proposal indicate clear and frequent communication to ensure SRRTTF meetings are fully integrated with implementation activities?
* Project Approach Element
	+ Approach for Supporting Our Efforts
		- Will the overall approach that is proposed “work” for us and our goals?
* Responsiveness of Submittal Element
	+ Submittal Complete and Concise
		- Did the proposal provide what we needed in order to make a proper evaluation?
		- Did the response indicate that they understood what information we requested?

**Cost Information**

With respect to cost information:

* Is the information provided sufficient enough so that it can be compared with other proposals?
* Is the cost information provided clear enough so it can be determined if it tracks with the basis of the request?

**References**

Review references provided and determine if you have knowledge of the reference provided and would be in a position to check with that reference?