



## INTRODUCTION

---

This document outlines the CSI RFP Evaluation Plan developed and agreed upon by the CSI Evaluation Committee and Procurement Officer and will guide the process for evaluating proposals for RFP 154:10-020.

The CSI RFP was issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles on February 19, 2010 to solicit proposals and establish a contract for goods and services, through competitive negotiation, using best value acquisition procedures, to design, develop, implement, and optionally support a comprehensive automated solution to address the business and technical needs of the DMV CSI Systems Redesign project.

## EVALUATION SUMMARY

---

DMV will use best value acquisition procedures to evaluate proposals for this procurement. A best value award is based on evaluation criteria as stated in the solicitation with consideration of price of the goods and nonprofessional services that offer the greatest benefit(s) in meeting the needs of the public body.

DMV will review each proposal received by the due date and time to determine whether it satisfies the proposal protocol and preparation requirements identified in Section 3 of the RFP. These requirements are evaluated on a met-or-not-met basis. Any proposal that does not meet the proposal protocol and preparation requirements identified in RFP Section 3 may be set aside and receive no further consideration.

Proposals that meet the proposal protocol and preparation requirements of RFP Section 3 will be distributed to the evaluation team members who will evaluate each Offeror's response to Sections 5, 6, and 8 of the RFP based on a review of the submitted materials.

DMV may elect to continue the evaluation of the most qualified proposal(s) and may request that Offerors clarify or explain certain aspects of its proposals.

At any point in the evaluation process DMV may employ any or all of the following means of evaluation:

- Reviewing industry research
- Contacting Offeror's customers and/or references on previous experience
- Detailed scripted demonstrations
- Interviewing key personnel
- Requesting Offerors elaborate on or clarify specific portions of its proposal

DMV may limit any or all of the above to the most qualified proposals. No Offeror is guaranteed an opportunity to explain, clarify, supplement or amend its initial proposal. Offerors are strongly encouraged to submit a proposal that contains and represents its best offering and not assume there will be an opportunity to negotiate, amend, clarify, supplement, or explain any aspect of its initial submitted proposal.

During the evaluation process, Offerors will be short-listed until two or more finalists are identified. For those Offerors who have been identified as finalists during the evaluation process, DMV will require participation in a detailed scripted demonstration of functional and technical components (including a technical review) of the proposed CSI Solution. These scripted demonstrations should significantly represent how well the Offeror's solution will satisfy the business and technical needs and requirements. Offeror should be prepared to conduct the scripted demonstration over a number of consecutive days (approximately 4) at the time, dates, and location of DMV's choice. DMV will provide the detailed demonstration script to finalists approximately 3 weeks prior to its scheduled demonstration dates.

DMV will then negotiate with Offerors whose proposals represent the most advantageous and best solutions. After negotiations, DMV may select the proposal which, in its opinion, is the best value proposal as determined by DMV.



If any Offeror fails to provide the necessary information for negotiations in a timely manner, or fails to negotiate in good faith, DMV may terminate negotiations with that Offeror at any time.

DMV may cancel this RFP or reject proposals at any time prior to an award, and is not required to furnish a statement of the reasons why a particular proposal was not deemed to be the most advantageous (*Code of Virginia, § 2.2-4359 D*). The award document will be a contract incorporating by reference all the requirements, terms and conditions of the RFP and the proposal as negotiated.

DMV reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to reject any proposal at any time or cancel and re-issue the RFP. In addition, DMV reserves the right to accept or reject, in whole or in part, any proposal submitted, and to waive minor informalities when in the best interest of the Commonwealth.

**DMV SHALL NOT BE CONTRACTUALLY BOUND TO ANY OFFEROR PRIOR TO THE EXECUTION OF A DEFINITIVE WRITTEN CONTRACT.**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Proposals will be evaluated on a best value basis using the following criteria in order of decreasing importance:

Evaluation Criteria
1. The extent to which Offeror's proposal satisfies the business and technical needs and requirements identified in the following components of Section 5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall CSI Scope and Approach</li> <li>• CSI Objectives and Characteristics</li> <li>• CSI Future State Business Process Model</li> <li>• CSI Conceptual Architecture</li> <li>• Data Conversion and Mapping Requirements</li> </ul>
2. The extent to which Offeror's proposal satisfies the support needs and requirements identified in the following components of Section 5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Management Requirements</li> <li>• Testing Requirements</li> <li>• Training and Transition Requirements</li> <li>• Service and Support Management Requirements</li> </ul>
3. Offeror's qualifications, viability, and past performance as outlined in Section 6.
4. Pricing as identified in Section 7.
5. The level of Offeror responsiveness to the contract terms and conditions as identified in Section 8.
6. Incentives



**RATING METHOD**

Using the best value acquisition methodology, proposals will be rated using the methodology documented in the following table. During the evaluation process, the rating type being used may change as necessary (for example, from color to numerical) to further clarify and differentiate proposal rating results.

Rating Type			Relation to Defined Need	Description
Numerical	Color	Adjectival		
10 9	Green	Exceptional	Superior attainment	Offeror's proposal exceeds requirements and demonstrates an exceptional understanding of goals and objectives of the procurement. Major strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist. No deficiencies exist.
8 7	Blue	Exceeds	Meets and somewhat exceeds	Offeror's proposal exceeds some requirements and demonstrates a good understanding of goals and objectives of the procurement. Strengths exist in key areas. Weaknesses are minor but are outweighed by strengths. No deficiencies exist.
6 5 4	Yellow	Acceptable	Meets needs	Offeror's proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of goals and objectives of the procurement. There may be strengths and weaknesses. Strengths outnumber any weaknesses that exist. Any deficiencies are minor, but are outweighed by strengths.
3 2	Orange	Marginal	Concern over ability to meet needs	Offeror's proposal demonstrates a marginal understanding of the goals and objectives of the procurement. Weaknesses have been found that outnumber any strengths that exist. Weaknesses will be difficult to correct. Deficiencies exist in key areas, not outweighed by strengths.
1 0	Red	Unacceptable	Needs cannot be met	Offeror's proposal does not demonstrate an acceptable understanding of the goals and objectives of the procurement. The proposal has significant weaknesses that will be very difficult to correct or are not correctable. Deficiencies exist and are significant and numerous.



## EVALUATION PROCESS

---

### STAGE 1: RECEIVE AND DISTRIBUTE PROPOSALS

#### Input

1. Vendor proposals

#### Steps

1. Receive until 3:00 pm on April 19, 2010
2. Review for completeness and compliance with proposal protocol and preparation requirements (RFP Section 3).
3. Distribute valid proposals to Evaluation Committee.

#### Output

1. Valid proposals

### STAGE 2: INITIAL CONSENSUS EVALUATION AND IDENTIFY FINALISTS

#### Input

1. Valid proposals, Parts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8

#### Steps

#### Round 1 – Evaluate CSI Solution Proposal (Parts 3 and 4) and Rate Evaluation Criteria #1

1. Individually review parts 3 and 4 of each proposal and document findings. Findings include proposal strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, necessary corrections, areas of non-compliance, areas needing clarification, etc.
2. Discuss individual findings and assessments to rate Evaluation Criteria #1 for each proposal being evaluated.
3. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, clarification questions, and rationale.
4. Proposals that are found to be deficient, incomplete, lacks key information, or do not meet mandatory requirements may be eliminated from further consideration
5. As appropriate, select proposals (short list) to proceed with the evaluation process.
6. Document decision and rationale for eliminating a proposal from further consideration.

#### Round 2 – Evaluate Support Proposals (Parts 5, 6, 7, and 8) and Rate Evaluation Criteria #2

1. Individually review parts 5, 6, 7, and 8 of each proposal and document findings. Findings include proposal strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, necessary corrections, areas of non-compliance, areas needing clarification, etc.
2. Discuss individual findings and assessments to rate Evaluation Criteria #2 for each proposal being evaluated.
3. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, clarification questions, and rationale.
4. Proposals that are found to be deficient, incomplete, lacks key information, or do not meet mandatory requirements may be eliminated from further consideration
5. As appropriate, select proposals (short list) to proceed with the evaluation process.



6. Document decision and rationale for eliminating a proposal from further consideration.

Round 3 – Request Clarifications (if necessary)

1. Request a prompt written clarification response from each Offeror as necessary.
2. Review and discuss clarification responses.
3. Update group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.

Round 4 – Identify Finalists

1. Select proposals (short list) to proceed with the evaluation process.
2. Document decision and rationale for eliminating a proposal from further consideration.

**Output**

1. Consensus Rating Form for each proposal
2. Rating Summary Sheet
3. Finalist proposals identified

**STAGE 3: SCRIPTED DEMONSTRATIONS, GATHER ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**Input**

1. Valid proposals, Parts 9 and 11
2. Demonstration Scripts

**Steps**

Round 1 – Evaluate Offeror Profile and Customer Reference Response (Part 9) and Rate Evaluation Criteria #3

1. For each finalist identified, schedule scripted demonstration. Notify Offerors and allow demo preparation time (notification is staggered, allowing each finalist 3 weeks to prepare).
2. Individually review part 9 of each proposal and document findings. Findings include proposal strengths, weaknesses, areas needing clarification, etc.
3. Conduct reference check questionnaires.
4. Discuss individual findings and assessments, small business participation, and reference check questionnaire results to rate Evaluation Criteria #3 for each proposal being evaluated.
5. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.

Round 1a – Evaluate CSI Contract Response (Part 11) and Rate Evaluation Criteria #5

1. Individually review part 11 of each proposal and document findings. Findings include proposal strengths, weaknesses, areas needing clarification, etc.
2. Discuss individual findings and assessments to rate Evaluation Criteria #5 for each proposal being evaluated.
3. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.
4. Identify contract areas that require negotiation and prepare negotiation plan.
5. Begin initial negotiations with each Offeror.

Round 2 – Conduct Scripted Demonstration Process and Update Ratings for Evaluation Criteria #1

1. Attend scripted demonstration sessions and individually document findings during the day. Findings include demonstration strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, areas of non-compliance, etc.
2. At end of each day, discuss individual findings and document group summary of findings and assessments.



3. At end of full demonstration, update ratings for Evaluation Criteria #1.
4. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.

Round 3 – Request Clarifications (if necessary)

1. Request a prompt written clarification response from each Offeror as necessary.
2. Review and discuss clarification responses.
3. Update group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.

**Output**

1. Updated Consensus Rating Form for each proposal
2. Rating Summary Sheet
3. Initial contract negotiation results

**STAGE 4: FINAL BEST VALUE EVALUATION AND AWARD**

**Input**

1. Valid proposals
2. Initial contract negotiation results

**Steps**

Round 1 – Evaluate Pricing, Incentives and Payment Response (Part 10) and Rate Evaluation Criteria #4 and #6

1. As a group, review and discuss part 10 of each proposal and document findings. Findings include proposal strengths, weaknesses, areas needing clarification, etc.
2. Request clarification responses as necessary.
3. Rate Evaluation Criteria #4 and #6 for each proposal being evaluated.
4. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.

Round 2 – Negotiations

1. Identify and document all items that require negotiation and prepare negotiation plan.
2. Negotiate with each finalist Offeror.
3. Review and discuss results of negotiations.
4. Update ratings as necessary based on results of negotiations.
5. Document group consensus ratings and summary of findings, assessments, and rationale.

Round 3 – Approvals and Award

1. Identify selected proposal.
2. Present findings for DMV Oversight Committee approval.
3. Prepare final contract document.
4. Prepare VITA documentation.
5. Submit documentation and contract to VITA for review and approval.
6. Post notice of intent to award.
7. Award contract.

**Output**

1. Final Consensus Rating Form for each proposal
2. Final Rating Summary Sheet



3. Final negotiation results
4. Final contract document
5. VITA project documentation
6. DMV Oversight Committee approval
7. VITA approval
8. Award notice

#### GENERAL NOTES

---

1. Proposals must be treated as confidential and proprietary, locked and secure when they are not in the possession of Purchasing or an evaluation committee or advisory member.
2. No DMV employee or contractor, other than the designated Procurement Officer, shall have any communication with any Offeror, unless it is in the presence of the designated Procurement Officer.
3. All questions from Offerors must be directed to the Procurement Officer who will coordinate responses.
4. All correspondence related to RFP 10-020 generated or received any individual participating in the procurement process should be saved and copied to CD at the time of award. This information may be used to respond to FOIA requests and/or during the discovery process in the event of a protest.

#### Evaluation Committee:

---

Dave Burhop

---

Tully Welborn (Evaluation Committee Chairperson)

---

Tim Rose

---

Michael Farnsworth

---

Chuck Wandling

---

Nancy Burke

#### Procurement Officer:

---

Nancy Davis, CPPB, CPPO, VCO