

Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0017037 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Executive Summary (5%)			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's approach to meeting the RFA's business needs and understanding of the goals and objectives of the RFA.	5%		
	Subtotal	5%		
2	Background and Organizational Capacity (10%)			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's described ability to manage and coordinate the type of activities required by this RFA.	5%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's organizational capacity.	5%		
	Subtotal	10%		
3	Experience (20%)			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's described experience providing programmatic management and operational oversight of subcontractors.	5%		
3.2	Evaluate the Applicant's described successes or outcomes coordinating and collaborating with community partners.	5%		
3.3	Evaluate the Applicant's described experience conducting subcontractor site visits to ensure adherence to program standards.	5%		
3.4	Evaluate the Applicant's described experience conducting clinical staff performance reviews.	5%		
	Subtotal	20%		
4	Workplan and Key Staffing (55%)			
4.1	Evaluate the Applicant's project implementation plan timelines for proposed activities.	15%		
4.2	Evaluate the Applicant's plan to establish relationships and create and maintain written agreements with the four (4) binational Tuberculosis (TB) programs in Mexico.	15%		
4.3	Evaluate the Applicant's plan for developing professional services contracts for the provision of direct clinical and outreach services in the Mexico border cities.	15%		
4.4	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed key staffing skills, knowledge, and abilities are relevant to satisfy all proposed activities.	10%		
	Subtotal	55%		
5	Budget(10%)			
5.1	Evaluate the reasonableness of the Applicant's proposed Requested Budget.	10%		
	Subtotal	10%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0017037		
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 F, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0017037		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Executive Summary (5%)	5%
2	Background and Organizational Capacity (10%)	10%
3	Experience (20%)	20%
4	Workplan and Key Staffing (55%)	55%
5	Budget(10%)	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%