
SECTION VI: EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals determined by the Department to satisfy the submission requirements set forth in Section II and the Minimum Mandatory Requirements set forth in Section III of this RFP will be evaluated by an assigned evaluation team composed of staff of the Department, assisted by any person, other than one associated with a competing Offeror, designated by the Department. An Offeror's Proposal shall be removed from the evaluation process and not considered should it be determined that the Offeror did not satisfy any of the Minimum Mandatory Requirements as specified in Section III, despite any attestation made regarding the Minimum Mandatory Requirements.

During the evaluation process, the Department may require clarifying information from an Offeror for the purpose of assuring the Department's full understanding of the Offeror's responsiveness to the RFP requirements and the Project's duties and responsibilities. This clarifying information shall be submitted in writing in accordance with the formats set forth in Section II of this RFP and shall be included as a formal part of the Offeror's Proposal. Failure to provide the required information by the due date set forth in the Department's request for clarification may result in rejection of the Offeror's proposal. Nothing in the foregoing shall mean or imply that it is obligatory upon the Department to seek or allow clarifications provided for herein. The Department may, at its discretion, elect to have all Offerors provide oral presentations pertaining to their Technical Proposal or Cost Proposal. The Department also may at its discretion, elect to perform site visits with any or all Offerors. The Procurement Manager will coordinate the necessary scheduling arrangements with the Offerors.

The Department will consider for evaluation and selection purposes only those proposals determined to have met the minimum mandatory requirements specified in Section III of this RFP as well as the proposals determined to be responsive to the duties and responsibilities set forth in the RFP. The Department intends to select that responsive and responsible Offeror whose Proposal offers the best value to the Department and the State as specified in the following evaluation procedures for the purpose of entering into negotiations for the execution of a contract.

The evaluation will entail the review and scoring of both the Offeror's Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal. These components are evaluated separately and scored as described below.

A. Technical Evaluation

Each Offeror's ability and willingness to deliver the Project Services described in this RFP will be evaluated and scored based on a weighted point system. The evaluation of the Offeror's Technical Proposal will be based on that Offeror's written Technical Proposal, responses to clarifying questions, if any, and information obtained through reference checks.

1. Technical Score Ratings

Offeror's technical proposals will be evaluated based on the following ratings and criteria as applied to each evaluated response. A rating of "excellent" equates to a score of 5 for each evaluated question. Each reduction in the ratings results in a one point reduction in the score such that a rating of "poor" equates to a score of 1.

a. EXCELLENT (5)

The Offeror far exceeds the criteria. The services described indicate that the Offeror will provide very high quality services and is very pro-active and innovative.

b. GOOD (4)

The Offeror exceeds the criteria. The services described indicate that the Offeror will exceed the Project's needs. The Offeror demonstrates some innovative features not shown in typical proposals.

c. MEETS CRITERIA (3)

The Offeror meets but does not exceed the criteria. The services described indicate that the Offeror will meet the Project's needs.

d. FAIR (2)

The Offeror's answer is minimal; or the answer is very general and does not fully address the question; or the Offeror meets only some of the criteria.

e. POOR (1)

The Offeror misinterpreted or misunderstood the question; or the Offeror does not answer the question/criteria in a clear manner or the Offeror does not answer the question; or the Offeror does not meet the criteria.

The Offeror's commitment to meet the levels of standards it outlines in its proposal will be verified by reviewing responses to related Performance Guarantee questions and reviewing the Offeror's proposed credit to the administrative fee (credit amount) for its failure to meet each of its proposed performance guarantees.

2. Performance Guarantee Ratings

As described in (1) above, points awarded for each rating will be consistent with the ratings presented above. Offeror's may propose performance guarantees that exceed the Program's service level standards presented in this RFP. Proposed Performance Guarantees are contained within the respective technical areas and will be evaluated using the following criteria:

a. EXCELLENT

(1) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee exceeds the Project's service level standard contained within this RFP; and

(2) The Offeror's proposed credit amount is one hundred and twenty-five percent (125%) or more of the standard credit amount stated within this RFP.

b. GOOD

(1) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee equals the Project's service level standard contained within this RFP, and the Offeror's proposed credit amount is one hundred and twenty-five percent (125%) or more of the standard credit amount stated within this RFP; or

(2) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee exceeds the Project's service level standard contained within this RFP; and the Offeror's proposed credit amount is greater than one hundred percent (100%) but less than one hundred

and twenty-five percent (125%) of the standard credit amount stated within this RFP.

c. MEETS CRITERIA

- (1) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee equals the Project's service level standard contained within this RFP and the Offeror's proposed credit amount is equal to or greater than the standard credit amount and less than 125% of the standard credit amount stated within this RFP; or
- (2) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee is greater than the Project's service level standard contained within this RFP and the Offeror's proposed credit amount is equal to the standard credit amount stated within this RFP.

d. FAIR

- (1) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee equals or exceeds the Program's service level standard contained within this RFP; and
- (2) The Offeror's proposed credit amount is greater than fifty percent (50%) but less than one hundred percent (100%) of the standard credit amount stated within this RFP.

e. POOR

- (1) The Offeror's proposed performance guarantee is below the Program's service level standard contained within this RFP regardless of the credit amount proposed by the Offeror; or
- (2) The Offeror's proposed credit amount is fifty percent (50%) or less of the standard credit amount stated within this RFP regardless of the level of performance the Offeror pledges.

3. Allocation of Technical Score Points

The scores referenced above shall be applied to weighted point values associated with each evaluated response. The relative point value for each section of the Technical Proposal is as follows:

a. Project Administration - 10% of Total Technical Score

The Offeror will be rated on the completeness, reasonableness and appropriateness of its project administration, its willingness and ability to meet completion dates, and on the qualification and experience of its personnel responsibilities for the oversight and management of the DEAS.

The Offeror will be rated on its prior experience, and/or capabilities of administering a program similar in size and scope to the Project requirements of the RFP and the adequacy of its staffing to meet requirements of the RFP.

b. Administration of Amnesty Period and Dependent Eligibility Audit Services - 90% of Total Technical Score

The Offeror will be rated on its ability to effectively implement the DEAS and its system capabilities to perform the required DEAS tasks. The Offeror will be rated on its proposed Project Management Team and Project Plan, Electronic Data Transfer Capabilities, Administration of Amnesty Period, Eligibility Verification Process, Call Center Services, Communication Materials and Reporting capabilities.

4. Technical Scoring

Qualifying Proposals will be evaluated independently by multiple evaluators based on the Evaluation Criteria filed with the Office of the State Comptroller. The average score for each evaluated response shall be applied to the points associated with each question such that an average score of "Excellent" for each evaluated response will result in a maximum available score of 1,000. The awarded score will be calculated to the hundredth decimal place.

B. Cost Evaluation Component

1. The total DEAS cost will be evaluated based on the total of three separate single flat fees, quoted for (1) the administration of the Amnesty Period, (2) the audit of State and PE family contracts and (3) the audit of PA family contracts.
2. The Department may seek clarification of the Offeror's Cost Proposal in writing or through a management interview.
3. The evaluated proposal with the lowest Total Cost as calculated in accordance with Section VI.B.1 shall be awarded a Cost Score equal to the highest Technical Score awarded. All other Cost Proposals evaluated shall be awarded a Cost Score using a pre-established formula such that the Cost Scores awarded will be proportional to the evaluated costs of the proposals.

C. Total Combined Score

To arrive at a Total Combined Score, the Department will combine the Offerors Technical Score and Cost Score using the following formula:

Technical Score times fifty percent (50%)
Plus: Cost Score times fifty percent (50%)
Equals: Total Combined Score

D. Best Value Determination

The Department shall select and enter into negotiations for the purpose of executing a contract with the responsive and responsible Offeror that has accumulated the highest Total Combined Score. If an Offeror's Total Combined Score is equal to or less than 1 point below the highest Total Combined Score, the Offeror's proposal will be determined to be substantially equivalent to the Offeror holding the highest score. Among any Offeror proposals deemed substantially equivalent, the Department shall select the Offeror that has the lowest evaluated cost calculated pursuant to Section VI.B.3 of this RFP to enter into negotiations for the purpose of executing a contract. The Offeror selected to enter into negotiations with the Department must agree to execute a contract that substantially includes the terms set forth in Section VII of this RFP, Contract Provisions.

Please note that the terms in Appendix A, Standard Clauses for All New York State Contracts, Appendix B, Standard Clauses for all Department Contracts, and Appendix C, Third Party Connection and Data Exchange Agreement, are not subject to negotiation.

If the Department determines that contract negotiations between the Department and the selected Offeror are unsuccessful because of material differences in key provision(s) as determined by the Department, the Department may invite the Offeror with the next highest Total Combined Score to enter into negotiations for purposes of executing a contract. Prior to negotiating with the Offeror with the next highest Total Combined Score, the Department will notify the Offeror originally selected and provide the date when negotiations shall cease should an agreement not be reached. Scores will not be recalculated for any remaining Offerors should contract negotiations between the Department and the selected Offeror be unsuccessful because of material differences in key provision(s).