


Request for Proposals Evaluation Policy

	Louisiana Department of Health (LDH)	
	Policy Number	124.2
	Content	To Implement best practices to the Request for Proposals Evaluation and Scoring Process
	Last Revision Date	August 29, 2024
	Inquiries to	Office of the Secretary P.O. Box 629 Baton Rouge, LA 70821-0629 (225) 342-6763

LDH is committed to fostering, cultivating and preserving a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion. Our human capital is the most valuable asset we have. The collective sum of the individual differences, life experiences, knowledge, inventiveness, innovation, self-expression, unique capabilities and talent that our employees invest in their work represents a significant part of not only our culture, but our Department's reputation and achievement as well.

If there is a discrepancy between an LDH Policy and a Program Office or facility policy, the LDH policy shall govern/override/supersede the conflicting section within the Program Office or facility policy.

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the evaluation and scoring process for Request for Proposals (RFP) is consistent, unbiased, and conducted in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

II. APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all Louisiana Department of Health (LDH) employees, contractors, and subcontractors.

A Contractor who is an individual contracting directly with the State may serve on an Evaluation Team, but may not serve as a Project Lead. A Contractor that is contracting with the State through a company/entity, regardless of type, may only serve on the Evaluation Team as a Subject Matter Expert (SME). This type of Contractor will not be allowed access to the ARIBA (LESA) portal, and the entity for which the Contractor works shall be precluded from submitting a response to the

advertised RFP. For the purposes of this policy, University of New Orleans (UNO) and University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM) Contractors will be treated as LDH employees.

III. EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of this policy June 21, 2021.

IV. POLICY STATEMENT

The Evaluation Process Guidelines (Attachment 1) set forth procedures to be followed when evaluating and scoring proposals submitted in response to an RFP issued by LDH, the Office of Technology Services (OTS) or Office of State Procurement (OSP) on behalf of OSP. Variations from these guidelines may be allowed when approved in writing by the Bureau of Legal Services.

V. RESPONSIBILITIES

LDH employees shall follow the Evaluation Process Guidelines (Attachment 1) and comply with the Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement (Exhibit A), Guidelines for On-Site Presentations/Demonstrations (Exhibit C), and Best and Final Offer Guidelines (Exhibit E) when evaluating and scoring proposals in response to an RFP. All LDH employees, Evaluation Team members and any individual/team allowed access to RFP information of any kind shall comply with the confidentiality and conflict of interest statements of both OSP and LDH prior to the sharing of information with those individuals.

- 1) Throughout the procurement process, LDH employees issuing any email or other written correspondence related to an RFP shall include the tag designated for that procurement in the subject line. The tag shall be an abbreviation of the RFP name and the year the RFP will be issued. (Example: MCO RFP_2021). The Louisiana eProcurement System by Ariba (LESA) Message Board for the corresponding Sourcing Project should be copied at all times.
- 2) The LDH *RFP Project Lead*, or designee, shall:
 - a) Submit the Sourcing Request in LESA to initiate the RFP process.
 - b) Attend the OSP Project Kickoff meeting, and all subsequent meetings initiated by OSP.
 - c) Consult with the Bureau of Legal Services and/or the Division of Safety/ Security & Administrative Services (*DSSAS*) *Program Manager for Contracts* (DPM) when in doubt or as otherwise required by this policy.
 - d) Coordinate all communications between the Evaluation Team and authorized Subject Matter Experts (SMEs).
 - e) Prior to any communications, ensure that the LDH Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement has been signed by the SME. OSP will request that OSP-required documentation be submitted through LESA.
 - f) Respond timely to any requests or tasks from the DPM or OSP, adhering to any LESA deadlines. In the event a deadline cannot be met, the Project Lead should communicate these issues and discuss an appropriate revised deadline.
- 3) The *Bureau of Legal Services* shall:
 - a) Serve as legal advisors to the agency for the requirements and legality of the RFP content, ensure the scoring criteria is defensible, and that the award documents are complete.
 - b) Serve as legal advisors to the LDH RFP Project Lead, DPM and the Evaluation Team throughout the solicitation, evaluation, award, negotiation, and contract development process.

- c) Review and provide written approval of the Evaluation Methodology. Review all changes, requests, including, but not limited to: amendments and addendums, changes to the scoring criteria, methodology and requests for clarification. This provision shall not apply to administrative addenda (i.e. schedule of event changes, etc.).
 - d) Review composition of the Evaluation Team and requests for a SME to confirm that there aren't any conflict of interest concerns.
 - e) For RFPs that do not utilize Medicaid funds, assist the RFP Project Lead and DPM with LDH's response to any and all questions received from OSP after the RFP Award Recommendation has been submitted for review and concurrence.
- 4) For RFPs utilizing Medicaid funds,¹ the *Medicaid Procurement Attorney*, or designee, shall:
- a) Serve as a legal advisor to the LDH RFP Project Lead and the Evaluation Team throughout the solicitation, evaluation, award, negotiation, and contract development process.
 - b) Coordinate the review and provide written approval of the Evaluation Methodology review all changes, requests, correspondence, and communications with regards to the RFP process, including, but not limited to: amendments and addendums, changes to the scoring criteria and methodology, and requests for clarification.
 - c) Review composition of the Evaluation Team and requests for a SME to confirm no conflict of interest concerns.
 - d) Attend the pre-proposal conference, RFP evaluation kickoff meeting, Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting(s), and on-site presentations/demonstrations as needed.
 - e) Assist the RFP Coordinator with LDH's response(s) to any and all questions received from OSP after the RFP Award Recommendation has been submitted for review and concurrence.
- 5) The *DSSAS Program Manager for Contracts* (DPM), or designee, shall:
- a) Cooperate and provide assistance to the RFP Coordinator, Evaluation Team Leader, Bureau of Legal Services, Medicaid Procurement Attorney, OSP, and the agency leadership to ensure a timely and effective solicitation, evaluation, and award process.
 - b) Be assigned as a secondary Project Lead in LESA to ensure policy compliance.
 - c) Monitor the consensus evaluation and scoring process.
 - d) Attend the pre-proposal conference, RFP evaluation kickoff meeting, Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting(s), and on-site presentations/demonstrations.
 - e) The RFP Coordinator or the DPM may request assistance and support from OSP, where applicable.
- 6) The *OSP representative(s)* shall serve as the RFP Coordinator for all RFP's. After the Sourcing Request has been sent to OSP, the Evaluation Team should not meet regarding the RFP without the OSP representative present.

¹ Any procurements for which federal financial participation (FFP) will be claimed.

VI. REFERENCES

Attachment 1: Evaluation Process Guidelines

EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A: Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement

Exhibit B: [Removed]

Exhibit C: Guidelines for On-site Presentations / Demonstrations
Exhibit D: Individual or Group Evaluation Notes form Exhibit
E: Best and Final Offer Guidelines

VII. REVISION HISTORY

Date	Revision
January 29, 2019	Policy created
June 21, 2021	Policy Revised
August 16, 2021	Attachment 1 – Section 7 (a)
August 18, 2023	Policy Revised
March 7, 2024	Policy Revised – Applicability
August 29, 2024	Policy Revised – Clarification regarding Zoom usage
August 22, 2025	Policy Reviewed

Evaluation Process Guidelines

The guidelines set forth below are to be followed when evaluating and scoring proposals submitted in response to any Request for Proposals (RFP) issued by or on behalf of the Louisiana Department of Health (LDH). Variations from these guidelines may be allowed when approved in writing by the Bureau of Legal Services (LDH Legal).

The goals of the evaluation process are to: 1) ensure fairness and objectivity in the evaluation and scoring of proposals; and 2) ensure the contract is awarded to the proposer submitting the proposal most advantageous to the State, taking into consideration price and the other evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

1) Evaluation Team Formation and Initial Activities

- a)** The members of the Evaluation Team should be selected at the same time the RFP is being drafted to allow their input in defining the needs and evaluation criteria. While each evaluator should have some knowledge of the RFP's subject matter, they do not need to be knowledgeable in every aspect of the RFP. The number of individuals on the Evaluation Team should be limited to the minimum required to accomplish its purpose. The recommended size is 3-5 members, but for some projects, the agency may determine that a larger Evaluation Team is necessary. The Evaluation Team may be composed of subset teams, with each subset team assigned a section of the RFP to review and evaluate.
- b)** After it is formed, the Evaluation Team should promptly select an Evaluation Team Leader. For an Evaluation Team composed of subset teams, each subset team may select an Evaluation Team Leader.
- c)** Each member of the Evaluation Team shall sign the Evaluation Process Guidelines (Attachment 1), and Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement (Exhibit A). All signed documents must be provided to the RFP Project Lead and OSP before the technical proposals will be released in LESA to be evaluated.

2) Subject Matter Expert (SME) is a non-scoring participant that serves in an advisory capacity to provide clarification and subject matter expertise during the evaluation process in support of the Evaluation Team making their determination. Such input may include, but not be limited to, analysis of Proposer financial statements or review of technical requirements.

- a)** The Evaluation Team may engage a SME to provide clarification or understanding of any section of the RFP. Consult with LDH Legal with any questions.
- b)** SMEs shall have no personal, financial, or economic interest in the RFP or other conflict of interest and shall sign a Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement (Exhibit A) prior to participating in the evaluation process.
- c)** SMEs shall not advise on any decision of the Evaluation Team to arrive at a specific score, but may provide advice on the merits of the technical aspect of proposals. SMEs shall not compare Proposals.

- d) SMEs shall not communicate with an evaluator regarding the RFP except during Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings with ALL members of the Evaluation Team and OSP representative present.
 - e) A non-State employee who is contracted to serve as a SME shall limit their advice to the content of the RFP only. Non-State employees shall not participate in the Evaluation process or be allowed access into the LESA system without prior written approval both from the Bureau of Legal Services and the LDH Executive Management team.
 - f) SMEs shall respond to questions asked by the Evaluation Team.
- 3) **Evaluation Monitor** is an impartial, independent third party who oversees the conduct of the evaluation process and provides an opinion at the conclusion of the evaluation on the extent to which the process was fairly conducted, consistent with the process detailed within the RFP, and in keeping with LDH's procurement policies and requirements.
- a) An evaluation monitor may be engaged for high profile, high risk, or complex procurement requirements or when LDH seeks additional assurance that the evaluation process is conducted appropriately.
 - b) The DSSAS Program Manager for Contracts (DPM) or designee may serve as an evaluation monitor.
 - c) The Evaluation Monitor shall halt any proceedings and consult with LDH Legal and/or OSP at any time during the evaluation process.
- 4) **Conflict of Interest**
- a) Any other LDH employee, including but not limited to the RFP Coordinator, LDH Legal, the DPM, or observer shall sign a Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement (Exhibit A) prior to participating in the evaluation process.
 - b) OSP is responsible for ensuring that OSP staff assigned to assist LDH has no conflict of interest or personal, financial, or economic interest in the RFP.
- 5) **Preparation for the Evaluation and Scoring Process**
- a) Project Kickoff Meeting
 - i) Held by OSP at the beginning of the RFP drafting process in LESA.
 - ii) Will include discussion of project needs, timelines, and roles/responsibilities.
 - iii) Attendance should include DPM, LDH Project Lead and LDH Evaluation Team. If unusual circumstances arise necessitating attendance of LDH Legal and Medicaid Legal, attendance will be limited as needed.
 - b) **RFP Drafting**
 - i) State Furnished Resources
 - (1) No LDH agency shall guarantee office working space on any contract/procurement at a LDH location without the written approval from the LDH Undersecretary, or their designee.
 - c) Evaluation Kickoff Meeting
 - i) Usually held by OSP after the receipt of proposals.
 - ii) OSP will provide guidance to the Evaluation Team regarding the evaluation and scoring process. Attendees should include: OSP RFP Coordinator, Evaluation Team, LDH Legal, DPM, and any SME(s). NOTE: Separate indoctrination may be required for SME(s) identified once the evaluation process begins.

- iii) Prior to receiving the Evaluation task in LESA, which includes the proposals to be evaluated, the evaluators shall familiarize themselves with the released RFP and **all** issued addendums, including the “Questions and Answers” addendum, if applicable. The Evaluation Team will be required to log into LESA to access the RFP Event and any proposals. Evaluators should also review the LESA Help Script for “Evaluating Proposals”. This is accessible as a live document in LESA in the Sourcing Library.
- d) OSP will open the proposals at the established date, time and location and document this information. Then, the OSP RFP Coordinator shall review each proposal received to determine whether it meets the minimum administrative and mandatory requirements set forth in the RFP.
- e) Thereafter, the OSP RFP Coordinator will initiate the “RFP Event Review by Evaluation Committee” task. **OSP will complete the steps required to ensure the Evaluation Team does not have access to the cost proposals.**
- f) The Evaluation Team members shall complete an independent and impartial review of every proposal prior to the first Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting and be prepared to discuss strengths and weaknesses of each proposal during the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting(s). Proposals shall be evaluated against RFP requirements only.
- g) An evaluator may take notes, if necessary. **(Notes taken become an official record of the RFP) i)** If notes are taken, the evaluator must:
 - (1) Use the Individual or Group Evaluation Notes form (Exhibit D) and include the RFP number, RFP Title, Proposer’s name, date reviewed, and the evaluator’s name at the top of each page; or Evaluators may utilize the Comments feature in LESA Evaluation.
 - (2) Save the notes and turn them in to the DPM at the end of the next Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting. Any and all notes become part of the RFP file and are subject to public record requests. All notes must be professional and based on facts presented in the written Proposals. References to sections and/or page numbers are highly encouraged whenever possible.
 - (3) Type or write legibly.
 - (4) Use only appropriate wording (for example, no slang or unclear abbreviations/acronyms).
 - (5) Highlight significant points in the proposals (for example, strengths/weaknesses) and note any questions they would like to discuss in the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting(s).
 - (6) “Sticky notes” or any other type of similar removable paper shall not be used to take notes.
- ii) One method of individual note taking that has been successfully utilized is the P/M/Q/I method. Using this method, evaluators mark their individual comments with one of the four letters, which represent the following:
 - (1) P (Positive): Indicates what the evaluator sees as a strength.
 - (2) M (Minus): Indicates what the evaluator sees as a weakness.
 - (3) Q (Question): Indicates what the evaluator is uncertain about the information presented.
 - (4) I (Interesting): Indicates what the evaluator finds in the information to be interesting (i.e. when proposal provides an innovative approach or solution – “outside the box”).
- iii) The evaluators will be required in LESA to provide a tentative, unofficial score for proposals in their individual LESA Evaluation task. Official scoring must be done in the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting(s) held by OSP. All tentative scoring is subject to discussion and change during the group Consensus Evaluation.

6) Consensus Evaluation and Scoring Meetings

- a) The OSP RFP Coordinator shall organize the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting(s) and give sufficient notice to allow the Evaluation Team members and other LDH attendees to make necessary arrangements to attend. The agenda should include the date, time, and location of the meetings.
- b) A virtual meeting tool may be used to conduct the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings.
 - i) The virtual meeting tool must allow the host to control who is present in the meeting and allow for “locking” the meeting to prevent unauthorized entry to the meeting.
 - ii) For virtual Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings, attendees shall meet via video conference.
 - iii) The OSP RFP Coordinator and DPM should be responsible for monitoring the attendees during the entire meeting. Monitoring is needed to ensure, to the extent reasonably possible, there are no others listening in on the meeting, everyone is present and paying attention, and distractions are limited (No driving, TV, children, family members and/or pets). Attendees shall not schedule deliveries or other appointments during this time.

If using Zoom:

- o Cameras must be on for the duration of any evaluation-based meetings.
- o Once the meeting has started and all evaluators and observers are present, the OSP RFP Coordinator shall lock the meeting. If anyone disconnects for any reason, the meeting must be unlocked to allow that individual back in. Once everyone is present again, the meeting must be re-locked.
- o If there are any uninvited attendees present, the host must immediately remove them from the meeting. This includes unidentified phone numbers.
- o **Ensure the following settings are turned off (this requires logging into your account on Zoom.com):**
 - Private chat (everyone must be present for all discussions)
 - Virtual background (to ensure no one else is present)
- c) Attendance at Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings shall be limited to the members of the Evaluation Team, LDH Project Lead, LDH Legal, OSP, and DPM, and authorized SME(s).
- d) Each evaluator and SME must certify in writing that the virtual evaluation meeting(s) was conducted confidentially.
- e) The Evaluation Team shall discuss the results of their independent and impartial review, review and evaluate the proposals as a group, and score the proposals during Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings. Evaluation Team members shall be present for the duration of all Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings.
- f) The OSP RFP Coordinator, with support from the LDH Project Lead(s), shall facilitate the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings and document attendance, methodology of review, and evaluation and scoring results for each proposal reviewed.
- g) During in person Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings:
 - i) The Evaluation Team Leader or OSP RFP Coordinator should have access to only the equipment and/or electronic devices necessary to facilitate the meeting and document attendance, methodology of review, and evaluation and scoring results for each proposal reviewed. ii) The Evaluation Team members should not have access to cell phones, tablets, or other electronic devices that are not necessary for review, evaluation, and/or scoring of each proposal.

7) Consensus Evaluation and Scoring Methodology

- a)** The Evaluation Team shall use the evaluation tool/Evaluation Methodology approved by LDH Legal and OSP, and strictly follow the evaluation methodology and criteria published within the RFP. Any subsequent modifications to the evaluation tool must be reviewed and approved in writing by LDH Legal and OSP prior to the release of proposals to the Evaluation Team. If at any time during the evaluation process, a concern arises relative to the approved evaluation tool, the process shall be halted and the concern be brought to the attention of LDH Legal. Evaluation shall not proceed until all approvals are received.
- b)** All proposals must be evaluated in the same manner, by the same people, utilizing the same process. Once the first Consensus Evaluation and scoring meeting begins, there should be no change to the membership of the Evaluation Team. If the absence of an Evaluation Team member is unavoidable, the Evaluation Team Leader must consult with LDH Legal for guidance before proceeding.
- c)** During the Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings, the Evaluation Team must identify the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal; evaluate each proposal for responsiveness to the RFP and associated risks, if any; and identify clarifications and deficiencies of each proposal, if any.
- d)** The Evaluation Team must evaluate each proposal against the criteria in the RFP, and must not compare a proposer's response to any response submitted by another proposer.
- e)** The Evaluation Team should evaluate on a section-by-section basis across all proposals.

For example, the Evaluation Team evaluates Proposal A against the first item in the evaluation tool. After the evaluation of Proposal A against the first item in the evaluation tool is complete, the Evaluation Team evaluates Proposal B against the first item in the evaluation tool. After the evaluation of Proposal B against the first item in the evaluation tool is complete, the Evaluation Team repeats the process until all proposals have been evaluated against the first item in the evaluation tool. Then, starting the process over, the Evaluation Team evaluates all proposals against the second item in the evaluation tool and so on. It is recommended that the order of the evaluation of proposals be randomized to reduce bias in the evaluation process.

- f)** The Evaluation Team Leader should encourage open discussions and questions among members of the Evaluation Team. Open debate about a proposer's statement or response is encouraged to help ensure nothing proposed in response to a requirement is overlooked. The most important factor in assigning a final consensus score to any item is that the score accurately reflects the merits and value of the proposal for that item.
- g)** Once the Evaluation Team has arrived at an initial consensus score for an item in the evaluation tool, the OSP RFP Coordinator shall capture the consensus score on the evaluation tool along with any strengths and weaknesses identified for the item. A narrative explanation is required for proposals that either exceed an RFP requirement, meet or exceed a desirable specification, do not meet the RFP requirement, do not answer the RFP requirement, or provide insufficient detail.
- i)** Financial statements submitted by proposers in response to an RFP should be reviewed by LDH's designated staff member(s), as available. Contact the DPM for information about the current process.
 - (1)** The financial statement reviewer(s) shall sign a Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement (Exhibit A) prior to receiving a copy of the proposer's financial statements.

- (2) The financial statement reviewer(s) shall receive a copy of each proposer's financial statements and a copy of the RFP.
- (3) The financial statement reviewer(s) shall provide a detailed summary report to the Evaluation Team regarding each proposer's financial stability as it relates to the RFP.
- (4) For proposers recommended for award that have a prior or existing contract with LDH, the relevant Contractor Monitor shall respond to the following questions:
 - (1) Are there any deficiencies under the current contracts that we have with the current Contractor;
 - (2) Are there any improvement plans or corrective action plans that have been implemented for the bidder's current contracts;

- (3) Have there been any fines/penalties/sanctions issued against the bidder by LDH for any current contracts; if so, how much, were they paid on time, any issues with payments; and
- (4) Any performance issues with the bidder's current contract

(5) The Evaluation Team shall consider the detailed summary report when determining each proposer's strengths and weaknesses.

- h)** After the technical evaluations, financial statement review, and determination of responsibility in accordance with LAC 34:V.2536 has been conducted and initial scoring is complete, the Evaluation Team may conduct an on-site presentation/demonstration, if it is indicated in the RFP's schedule of events. An on-site presentation/demonstration is a means for proposers to clarify or explain one or more areas of their proposals, to view a demonstration of the proposers' system or solution, or to obtain information that may differentiate between competitive proposals with similar scores. See Guidelines for On-site Presentations/Demonstrations (Exhibit C)
- i)** Proposers must receive a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the total available points in the technical categories to be considered responsive to the RFP. Proposals not meeting the minimum score shall not proceed further to the evaluations for Louisiana Hudson/Veteran Initiative and cost.
- j)** **Louisiana Hudson/Veteran Initiative Evaluations –**
 - i)** The Evaluation Team shall evaluate each proposal and determine the total value of scope overlap/duplication among the certified Hudson/Veteran Initiative small entrepreneurship subcontractors identified in each proposal. This determination should be based upon the detailed description of the subcontracted work to be performed and the anticipated dollar value of the subcontracts. **ii)** The OSP RFP Coordinator, with verification from the Evaluation Team, shall document the certified Hudson/Veteran Initiative small entrepreneurship information for the proposer and subcontractor(s) and the total value of scope overlap/duplication, as determined by the Evaluation Team, on the Hudson/Veteran RFP Points Worksheet.
 - iii)** The OSP RFP Coordinator shall document the proposed cost on the Hudson/Veteran RFP Points Worksheet only after the certified Hudson/Veteran Initiative small entrepreneurship information for the proposer and subcontractor(s) and the total value of scope overlap/duplication, as determined by the Evaluation Team, have been documented.
- k)** The OSP RFP Coordinator, if it is not specified in the RFP, shall compute the cost scores using the evaluation tool approved by LDH Legal and OSP.
- l)** **Clarifications**
 - i)** The Evaluation Team or the person responsible for computing the cost scores may request clarification regarding any specific aspect of a proposal via the RFP Coordinator.
 - ii)** Clarifications are used for the sole purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, or apparent clerical mistakes in a proposal. **iii)** A request for clarification must be in writing and must be reviewed by LDH Legal before it is provided to the proposer(s) by OSP.
 - iv)** The OSP RFP Coordinator must send the approved request for clarification to the proposer(s). Individual members of the Evaluation Team are prohibited from communicating with the proposers during the evaluation process, with the exception of correspondence in direct relation to existing contract(s) only.
 - v)** The approved request for clarification must be provided to all proposers, if the clarification is applicable to all proposers.

vi) A request for clarification may not be used as an opportunity for the proposer to submit supplemental information or to change a response unless the submission or change is specifically requested as part of a request for clarification made available to all proposers.

vii) Responses to the request for clarification must be retained as part of the official project file. **m) Best and Final Offer (BAFO)**

The State reserves the right to conduct a BAFO with one or more Proposers identified by the evaluation committee to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for an award.

8) Communication: The Evaluation Team shall not engage in any communication with proposers and/or discuss the proposals with anyone outside of the Evaluation Team. Evaluators shall not confer with other members of the Evaluation Team outside of Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meetings.

Prior to the start of the evaluation process, each Evaluation Team member shall sign below and submit to the LDH Project Lead and DPM.

By signing below, you are acknowledging your acceptance and adherence to the evaluation policy. You also acknowledge that it is your responsibility as a member to this evaluation team to ensure policy and procedure are followed.

Date	Print	Signature

EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A: Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Statement Exhibit

B: [Removed]

Exhibit C: Guidelines for On-site Presentations / Demonstrations

Exhibit D: Individual or Group Evaluation Notes form

Exhibit E: Best and Final Offer Process

CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

I, _____, having been appointed as an evaluator, called upon for subject matter expertise, or designated to monitor or some other role for the _____ Request for Proposals (RFP), will assist in the development and drafting of the RFP and/or review, evaluation, and scoring of proposals submitted in response to the RFP, and do hereby make the following declarations:

1. I have been informed of the confidential nature of the development and drafting of the RFP as well as the review, evaluation, and scoring of proposals submitted in response to the RFP.
2. I have been advised of the real or potential sensitivity and financial significance of the RFP and the evaluation and scoring of proposals submitted in response to the RFP.
3. I shall not disclose the contents of the RFP, any proposal, other documentation, or proceeding unless specifically authorized by the Bureau of Legal Services.
4. I understand that failure to comply with these confidentiality requirements may result in disciplinary action including: letter of reprimand, temporary suspension from my job without pay, or dismissal from my job.
5. To the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, NONE of the following persons² has any personal, financial, or economic interest in this RFP or in the potential award of a contract issued as a result of this RFP:
 - Myself.
 - Any member of my immediate family.³
 - Any member of my current household.⁴
 - Any entity in which I, a member of my immediate family, or a member of my current household exercises control or holds an ownership interest of twenty-five percent or greater.
 - Any person or entity in which I, a member of my immediate family, or a member of my current household have a substantial economic interest.⁵

² "Person" is hereby defined as an individual or legal entity other than a governmental entity, or an agency thereof. ³

"Immediate family" is hereby defined as your spouse, your children, the spouses of your children, your brothers and their spouses, your sisters and their spouses, your parents, and the parents of your spouse.

⁴ "Household" is hereby defined as two or more individuals living in the same house, apartment, or other place of residence. ⁵

"Substantial economic interest" is hereby defined as an economic interest which is of greater benefit to the public servant or other person than to a general class or group of persons, except:

(a) The interest that the public servant has in his position, office, rank, salary, per diem, or other matter arising solely from his public employment or office.

(b) The interest that an elected official who is elected to a house, body, or authority has in a position or office of such house, body, or authority which is required to be filled by a member of such house, body, or authority by law, legislative rule, or home rule charter.

(c) The interest that a person has as a member of the general public.

- Any person or entity who owes anything of economic value to me, a member of my immediate family, or a member of my current household.
- Any entity in which I, a member of my immediate family, or a member of my current household hold the position of officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee.
- Any person or entity who is a party to an existing contract with me, a member of my immediate family, a member of my current household, or an entity in which I exercise control or own an interest of twenty-five percent or greater.

6. No potential contractor has given, paid, loaned, transferred, or delivered or offered to give, pay, loan, transfer, or deliver, directly or indirectly, to me anything of economic value as a gift or gratuity.
7. I shall disqualify myself from further participation if any of the aforementioned circumstances arise in the future.
8. I understand that I must comply with the Louisiana Code of Governmental Ethics (La. R.S. 42:1101 *et seq.*).
9. I shall immediately notify my supervisor if I become aware of any potential or actual conflict of interest, any potential or actual breach of confidentiality, or with any question(s).

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read and understand the confidentiality and conflict of interest requirements set forth herein.

Signature:_____ Print:_____

Date: _____

Exhibit C

Guidelines for On-site Presentations / Demonstrations

- 1) The Evaluation Team shall identify the topics to be discussed during the on-site presentation/demonstration, which may include the proposers' capabilities, plans and approaches, staffing resources, transition plans and sample tasks, and other non-cost information.
- 2) Invitations to participate in the on-site presentation/demonstration must be provided to each proposer that receives at least 50% of the total technical points and should include the following information:
 - a) Date, time, and location of the proposer's on-site presentation/demonstration.

- b) The topics that the proposer should address and the technical and management factors that should be covered.
 - c) The topics that must not be discussed during the presentation/demonstration.
 - d) The total amount of time that will be available for the presentation/demonstration.
 - e) Restrictions on communication/interaction between the State and the proposer before, during, and after the presentation/demonstration.
 - f) Statement that the presentation/demonstration will constitute clarification only and that changes to the written proposals are not allowed.
 - g) Description and characteristics of the presentation/demonstration site.
 - h) Rules governing the use of presentation media.
 - i) The anticipated number of State attendees for handouts.
 - j) Participation of proposed “key personnel” in the presentation/demonstration is encouraged.
 - k) Statement that the presentations/demonstrations will be recorded, if applicable.
- 3) Attendance at on-site presentations/demonstrations shall be limited to the proposer’s representatives, the Evaluation Team, the RFP Coordinator, the Statewide Program Manager for Contracts, Bureau of Legal Services staff, and Office of State Procurement staff and, when applicable, SMEs. Attendance should be documented for each presentation/demonstration conducted.
- 4) All members of the Evaluation Team shall be present for the duration of all on-site presentations/demonstrations.
- 5) Discussions during on-site presentations/demonstrations must be limited to the Evaluation Team and the proposer.
- 6) Before each on-site presentation/demonstration, the Evaluation Team Leader should explain the ground rules – time allotments, restrictions on communication/interaction with the Evaluation Team, etc., and lead the discussions.
- 7) A written list of questions may be presented to the proposer at the time of the invitation to participate in the on-site presentation/demonstration or questions can be asked during the on-site presentation/demonstration. Whether the questions are made available at the time of the invitation or asked during the presentation/demonstration, the questions must be limited to the proposer’s

proposal and documented for the file. Require responses to all the questions as a follow up to the presentation.

- 8) Cost, uncertainties about the contents of the RFP, and past performance must not be discussed during on-site presentations/demonstrations. Additionally, the Evaluation Team must not disclose any information derived from proposals submitted by competing proposers.
- 9) Changes or contradictions to the written proposals are not allowed.
- 10) The Evaluation Team must evaluate the on-site presentation/demonstration and may adjust the proposers' original scores based upon information received in the on-site presentation/demonstration, using the original evaluation criteria. A Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting should be held as soon as practicable after all proposers' presentations/demonstrations are completed and written responses to all questions are reviewed.
- 11) The OSP RFP Coordinator shall document the evaluation and scoring results on the evaluation tool for each proposer that participated in the on-site presentation/demonstration.
- 12) The Evaluation Team must verify the accuracy of the revised evaluation tool after evaluation of the on-site presentation/demonstration is complete. This may be completed in LESA during the Award Recommendation task.

Exhibit E – Best and Final Offer Process

- a. After the initial evaluations and scoring are complete, the Evaluation Team may request a Best and Final Offer (BAFO), if the agency reserved its right to conduct a BAFO in the RFP.
- b. The invitation to participate in the BAFO should include:
 - i. The specific items to be addressed.
 - ii. Instructions and deadline for the receipt of BAFO responses.
 - iii. The evaluation criteria and weights.
- c. The BAFO negotiation may be used to assist the State in clarifying the scope of work or to obtain the most cost effective pricing available. Alternative uses may include obtaining lower costs (i.e. all above budget), or if technical scores are extremely close post-evaluation.
- d. A BAFO must be in writing and must be reviewed by the Bureau of Legal Services before it is sent to the proposer(s) by OSP.
- e. The OSP RFP Coordinator will send the approved invitation to participate in the BAFO to the selected proposer(s). Individual members of the Evaluation Team are prohibited from communicating with the proposers during the evaluation process, with the exception of correspondence in direct relation to existing contract(s) only.
- f. If a response to the technical section of the RFP is requested, then the Evaluation Team must evaluate and score the responses using the evaluation criteria and weights set forth in the RFP or the evaluation criteria and weights set forth in the invitation to participate in the BAFO, if different from the RFP. A Consensus Evaluation and Scoring meeting should be held as soon as practicable after the deadline for receipt of BAFO responses.
- g. The OSP RFP Coordinator will document the evaluation and scoring results on the evaluation tool for each BAFO response reviewed. The Evaluation Team must verify the revised evaluation tool after the evaluation is complete.
- h. If cost is requested, the person identified in the RFP or the person identified in the invitation to participate in the BAFO, if different from the RFP, shall compute the cost scores using the evaluation criteria and weights set forth in the RFP or the evaluation criteria and weights set forth in the invitation to participate in the BAFO, if different from the RFP. The RFP Coordinator shall be responsible for computing the cost scores if it is not specified in the RFP or the invitation to participate in the BAFO.

