

Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool (Non-ESEC) RFA No. HHS0015545 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Narrative and Qualification (15%)			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Executive Summary and how it demonstrates an understanding of qualifications and goals set forth by this RFA.	5%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's experience providing information and referral services or a similar service.	5%		
1.3	Evaluate the Applicant's knowledge and experience in the proposed region against the requirements in the RFA.	5%		
Subtotal		15%		
2	Performance Requirements/Project Workplan (40%)			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Project Plan and how it demonstrates the ability to provide and meet the requirements in the RFA.	20%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's demonstrated capacity to develop and implement a plan for the five (5) core functions listed in the RFA.	10%		
2.3	Evaluate how the Applicant demonstrates capacity to fulfill the Transition Plan and Turnover Plan, ensuring the organization has strong operational infrastructure needed to implement this proposed project and contractual requirements.	10%		
Subtotal		40%		
3	Personnel and Organization (15%)			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Key Personnel and Organizational Requirements and how those demonstrate the qualifications, experience, and methodologies to meet the requirements and timelines of the Proposed Project.	15%		
Subtotal		15%		
4	Cost Proposal (30%)			
4.1	Evaluate the reasonableness of Total Initial Cost.	15%		
4.2	Evaluate the reasonableness of the Applicant's allowable proposed costs.	15%		
Subtotal		30%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool (Non-ESEC) RFA No. HHS0015545		
Evaluation Scoring Guide		
Score	Level	Description
Unacceptable	1	Response does not address requirement. Response is completely unacceptable.
Unacceptable	2	Response mentions requirement, but is not responsive to the elements of the requirement.
Unacceptable	3	Response addresses requirement, but response described does not allow the agency to fulfill mission.
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	4	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (would require both the agency and Respondent to make significant changes not currently anticipated).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	5	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require both the agency and Respondent to make minor changes not currently anticipated).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	6	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require changes to be made by Respondent only).
Acceptable	7	Response clearly satisfies requirement but has some minor weaknesses.
Acceptable	8	Response clearly satisfies requirement.
Acceptable	9	Response satisfies requirements and has some benefits above requirement.
Exceptional	10	Response far exceeds all aspects of requirement.

For the purposes of this exhibit, "the agency" means the contracting state agency as specified in the solicitation.

Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool (Non-ESEC) RFA No. HHS0015545		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Narrative and Qualification	15%
2	Performance Requirements/Project Workplan	40%
3	Personnel and Organization	15%
4	Cost Proposal	30%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%