



Center for Procurement Excellence

# FORM-SSP1<sup>©</sup>

Source Selection Plan

**<<INSERT ORGANIZATION NAME>>**

**<<INSERT PROJECT NAME>>**

For Reference

*This document is copyrighted by the Center for Procurement Excellence, and cannot be copied or reproduced without the written approval of the Center for Procurement Excellence.*

<<INSERT ORGANIZATION NAME>>

# Source Selection Plan

<< Insert Project Name >>

<<Insert RFP/Project Number>>

RFP Release Date: <<Date>>

For Reference Only Full Draft Review Recommended

This document provides a guide regarding procedures, requirements, and instructions that are applicable to this evaluation process.

**BUYER'S ROLE**

The Buyer has the overall responsibility for all matters involving this procurement. The Buyer functions as the chair of the Proposal Evaluation Committee (PEC) and as such will schedule the location and time for all PEC deliberations will coordinate any needed interviews or oral presentations and will guide the PEC members through their duties. Neither the Buyer nor the PEC members are allowed to deviate from the established procurement process and evaluation requirements of the RFP.

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PEC) ROLE**

The Proposal Evaluation Committee (PEC) will have at least three members who are employees of <<OWNER>>. PEC members must abide by all ethical considerations as outlined in Part 2 of this document. There are no restrictions on the total number of members that can participate (as long as none of them have a conflict of interest as outlined in Section 2 of this document). For most procurements, a 3-5 member PEC is adequate.

The PEC members will serve as evaluators and will apply judgment in awarding points to proposals received in response to a solicitation for the purpose of ranking them. PEC members are limited to, and shall not deviate from, the process and evaluation criteria published in the solicitation. The PEC's combined evaluation points, taken together with the procurement preferences and cost, will determine the final rankings that the Buyer will use to complete the award process.

**IMPORTANCE OF TIMELINESS**

PEC work is short-term, highly focused, highly scheduled, and may also involve out-of-town travel. It is important that PEC members make the necessary time commitments to ensure completion of proposal evaluations and scoring that is compatible with the procurement schedule. They should be on time for every meeting and arrange to avoid interruptions during the PEC work sessions. The duration of the PEC's work will depend on the number of proposals received, the completeness and quality of each proposal, any unanticipated legal issues, and the extent of technical, cost, or legal negotiations needed to arrive at an acceptable contract.

**REPLACING PEC MEMBERS**

The Buyer should be immediately notified if, after careful consideration of this PEC Guide, a PEC member determines they either cannot make the time commitment necessary to fairly evaluate proposals or believe they may have a potential conflict of interest. Any PEC member may request to be replaced at any time, which can be granted or denied by the Buyer.

**PROTESTS, APPEALS, AND LAWSUITS**

Protests, appeals, and lawsuits are a part of the procurement process. Many protest actions are related to procedural issues and may involve only the decision of the Buyer. However, it is not uncommon for a protester to review the scoring of individual evaluators or challenge the selection process. It is essential that proposals be scored in a consistent and explainable manner.

**COMMUNICATING WITH PROPOSERS**

Discussions or any direct communication with proposers outside of the formal in-session communications arranged by the Buyer are strictly prohibited. Any attempt by one of the proposers to have direct or indirect communication with a PEC member must be avoided and shall be immediately reported to the Buyer.

**ETHICS, CONFLICT OF INTEREST, AND NON-DISCRIMINATION**

This Source Selection Guide is not intended to provide advice with regard to statutory ethics considerations. The Buyer should be notified immediately if a PEC member is in doubt about their ability to act ethically because of a potential conflict of interest or an ethical concern.

Each member of the PEC will be provided with both an Individual Conflict of Interest (COI) and the PEC Confidentiality Statement (CS) by the Buyer. The COI form contains information explaining what would constitute a potential conflict of interest and that certain documents received as part of an RFP may be protected from public view. The Buyer will collect the signed COI and Confidentiality Forms for inclusion in the official procurement file.

The awareness of a potentially ethical conflict may not arise until the PEC is well into the evaluation process. The Buyer should be notified immediately when a PEC team member becomes aware of a potential ethical conflict. The Buyer must safeguard the evaluation process to keep the process fair to all competitors and to minimize any harm to the <<Owner>> through possible court action or adverse publicity.

Each PEC member must send their signed Confidentiality and Individual Conflict of Interest Certificates to the Buyer by the due date identified in Part 3.

For Reference Only Full Legal Review Recommended

## SECTION 3

### EVALUATION PROCESS

#### CRITICAL DATES

Each PEC member must review the schedule below and consider if they have any scheduling conflicts that may impact their ability to meet the requirements listed below.

Date	Activity
xx/xx	PEC Members sign and submit the COI and CS forms to the Buyer
xx/xx	Buyer sends Proposal Documents to each PEC Member
xx/xx	PEC MEMBERS submit scores to Buyer (Evaluations Due by 10am)

#### DETERMINING RESPONSIVE PROPOSALS

The Buyer will make an initial determination as to whether each proposal is “responsive” or “non-responsive.” A “responsive” proposal conforms in all material respects to the solicitation. A proposal may be deemed “non-responsive” if any of the required information is not provided. Extreme care should be used when making this decision because of the time and cost that a proposer has put into submitting a proposal. If a proposal is determined to be “non-responsive,” it will not be considered further. The Buyer will make the final determination of responsiveness. If a determination of non-responsiveness is made, written justification must be provided for this conclusion.

#### INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENTS

Evaluations must be performed individually amongst the PEC Members. The scoring must not be rated based on a group consensus or discussion. This is to avoid any unintentional influence or bias of the PEC Members. The PEC Members must not discuss the documents or their ratings with any individual besides the Buyer (including other PEC Members). The PEC Members must not seek additional information or clarification of any document on their own. If any clarification or advice from other experts in the field is necessary, the PEC Member shall contact the Buyer. The Buyer will then determine if any additional information will be provided to all of the PEC Members.

#### INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT

Procurement best practices require that each PEC Member exercise independent judgment. PEC Members shall resist influence from others as to how a specific proposal should be rated or ranked. Attempts by anyone, including colleagues, subordinates, and superiors, to influence a PEC Member to improperly favor or disfavor a particular proposer, such as arbitrarily awarding or withholding points in a manner that might affect the outcome of the PEC results, must be reported to the Buyer immediately.

#### NUMERICAL SCORING

Evaluations are to be performed on 1-10 scale (as described below). The PEC Member should score the proposals in a consistent manner across all documents.

- A “10” represents ‘extremely satisfied’. The vendor/document has shown significant dominant differential. The evaluator would not hesitate to hire them on a future project/service.
- A “5” represents ‘average or neutral’. The vendor/document is about average, or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision
- A “1” represents ‘extremely dissatisfied’. The vendor/document is significantly weak, or lacking any evidence that they have experience in this type of project or service. The evaluator would not be comfortable hiring them on a future project.

The Buyer will review all ratings. If any rating/score appears to be unusual, the Buyer may ask the PEC Member to explain their scores in further detail (and to assure that no errors have been made).

## SCORE SHEET COMMENTS

PEC Members should briefly describe strengths, weaknesses, or deficiencies with each document (that provide insight as to why the PEC Member assigned the particular score/rating). The comments should be brief but adequately reflect how the conclusions and rankings of each proposal were made. The explanations must be rational and consistently applied from proposal to proposal.

The Buyer will not tell an evaluator how to exercise independent judgment, but will make sure the written description of how the proposals were ranked is rational, understandable, consistent with the individual ratings, and is not in conflict with the terms or requirements of the solicitation. The Buyer will not write or re-write any evaluator's explanation.

## EVALUATION PROCESS

Each PEC Member shall individually read and score the coded proposals/documents. PEC Members should individually score the proposals based on the criteria established in the solicitation. Proposals must be evaluated solely on the stated criteria listed in the solicitation. Only material presented in the written proposals can be considered in the evaluation. Evaluators should use logic and/or verifiable performance documentation (provided by the vendor in the proposal document) to assist in determining the rating. An approved scoring sheet/evaluation matrix will be provided to assist in the prioritization process. PEC Members MAY NOT meet to discuss their scores.

## DOCUMENTS TO BE EVALUATED

The PEC will evaluate the following documents:

### A) EVALUATING THE <<Insert Document Name>>

<<Insert the information that was requested in the RFP>>

<<Insert how the evaluators should score this document / What things they should be looking out for>>

*Copy & Paste structure above for all other elements being evaluated*

# Project Evaluation Forms

Conflict of Interest Form

Project Evaluation Form **XX**

<<Insert Document Name>>

Project Evaluation Form **YY**

<<Insert Document Name>>

Project Evaluation Form **ZZ**

<<Insert Document Name>>

For Reference Only Full Legal Review Recommended

# CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

<<INSERT COI STATEMENT>>

For Reference Only Full Legal Review Recommended



**PROJECT EVALUATION FORM XX**

**<<INSERT DOCUMENT NAME>>**

**<<INSERT EVALUATION SCORE SHEET>>**

For Reference Only Full Legal Review Recommended

**PROJECT EVALUATION FORM YY**

**<<INSERT DOCUMENT NAME>>**

**<<INSERT EVALUATION SCORE SHEET>>**

For Reference Only Full Legal Review Recommended

**PROJECT EVALUATION FORM ZZ**

**<<INSERT DOCUMENT NAME>>**

**<<INSERT EVALUATION SCORE SHEET>>**

For Reference Only Full Legal Review Recommended