Attachment C
RFP EVALUATION PLAN

This evaluation plan outlines the stages and steps that the Lead Entity and Sourcing Team will follow. The Lead Entity reserves the right to clarify with the Offeror(s) and provide an opportunity for additional and supplemental materials to be submitted after the RFP close date in accordance with MT statute, rule, and policy. If an Offeror has any questions about this process, the RFP requirements, scoring criteria, or other aspects of the RFP, a question should be submitted to the Q&A Board.

Stage 1: Initial Responsiveness Evaluation including agreement to Mandatory Minimum Requirements validation. Proposals will be reviewed for completeness, initial responsiveness, and compliance with all mandatory requirements including all requirements found in eMACS. Proposals omitting required documents or responses or failing to meet all Mandatory Requirements may be rejected in accordance with Attachment A – RFP Terms and Conditions and the Lead Entity's applicable laws.

Mandatory Minimum Requirements. Mandatory minimum requirement statements are found in Attachment G, Offeror Response Worksheet. Offerors need to acknowledge and attest to satisfying the mandatory minimum requirements by checking the box of the appropriate statement. Failure to acknowledge and attest may result in the proposal being rejected in accordance with Attachment A – RFP Terms and Conditions and the Lead Entity's applicable laws.

Stage 2: Technical Criteria Evaluation. Proposals that pass Stage 1 will be evaluated against the following Technical Criteria:

Criteria	Technical Points Possible
Scope of Work	150
Security Plan	150
Customer Service	150
Cooperative Contracting Ability	100
Scenario Based Approach	150
Stage 2 Total:	**700**

Responses submitted by the Offeror on Attachment G, Offeror Response Worksheet, will be evaluated by the Lead Entity and Sourcing Team. Scores of (1-10) will be applied to each criterion section (table above). The scores will then be weighted according to the amount of technical points possible for each criterion section. Then each criterion weighted score will be totaled together and this number will represent the total amount of points out of a possible 700.

The Lead Entity and Multi-Entity Sourcing Team will then determine which proposals will proceed to Stage 3: Cost Evaluation. This will be determined by a threshold of a minimum of 500 points. The proposals that meet or exceed 500 points total will be able to advance to stage 3.

Stage 3: Cost Evaluation. Proposals that met the minimum technical score threshold of 500 in Stage 2, will be evaluated for cost per based on the scoring criteria below.

Minimum Discount Schedule:

On Tab 2 in Attachment H, Cost Proposal, the Offeror shall submit minimum discounts for the product categories outlined and described in Attachment B, Scope of Work.

Criteria	Cost Points Possible
Hardware: Networking Routers	35
Hardware: Networking Switches	35
Hardware: Networking Storage	30
Hardware: Optical Networking	35
Hardware: Security Hardware	30
Software: Networking Software Solutions	35
Software: Security Solutions	35
Software: Unified Communications	30
Software: Facilities Management, Monitoring, and Control	35
Stage 3 Total:	**300**

The Lead Entity and Sourcing Team will review this discount schedule to validate each Offerors proposed offerings and discount percentage for reasonableness. Offerings should consist of the requested products and services found in the Scope of Work.

Points for the offerings will be normalized as follows: The Offeror with the highest proposed average minimum discount for each product category, will receive all available Cost Points outlined in the above table. The remaining Proposals will be assigned a proportional amount of the available Cost Points using the formula:

$$\text{Cost Points Available} \times \frac{\text{Overall Highest Average Minimum Discount}}{\text{Offeror's Average Minimum Discount}}$$

The Lead Entity reserves the right to modify this formula and/or assign a nominal value to “0” cost values if application of the formula results in an error, negative numbers, or an unreasonably skewed distribution of points.

Cost Proposals may also be subject to an independent review for reasonableness and best value by the Lead Entity. The minimum discounts will be cross-referenced with the catalog submitted to ensure accuracy and validation of the discounts provided. Costs determined not to be reasonable or best-value by the Lead Entity, including any cost to which Offeror’s proposed markup or discount is to be applied, may result in all or part of Offeror’s proposal being rejected, notwithstanding the results of the Cost Proposal evaluation.

Evaluation Summary

Stage	Total Points Possible
Technical Criteria Evaluation	700
Cost Evaluation	300
Total:	**1000**

Award Selection

The Lead Entity and Multi-Entity Sourcing Team will determine which proposals are most advantageous to the Lead Entity and potential Participating Entities and Purchasing Entities. Methods used to make this determination may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- Identification of a natural break in total scores
- Consideration of the optimal number of Contractors required to successfully supply Deliverables to Participating Entities and Purchasing Entities

Prior to the announcement of awards and execution of Master Agreements, the Lead Entity will present an award recommendation to RFxPremier for approval of the proposed awards.

Following approval of RFxPremier and the approvals required by the Lead Entity, the Lead Entity will post a public notice of intent to award and begin negotiations with successful Offerors.