Specification Example #1

Acorns are to be fresh, in packaging sacks of burlap or poly or both which can’t exceed 50 lbs. They have to be refrigerated as soon as collected and refrigerated the whole time until delivery to the nursery, which is to be approximately 36° F. “Small”, “medium”, or “large” tags should be on the bags which should also show species, weight, and county and state of harvest.
A. Acorns **must** be packaged in burlap and/or poly sacks.

B. The weight of each sack **must not** exceed fifty (50) pounds.

C. Contractor **shall** ensure acorns are fresh.

D. Contractor **shall** refrigerate acorns immediately after collection and until delivery to the Nursery.

E. Contractor **shall** keep the acorns at approximately 36º Fahrenheit.

F. Contractor **shall** tag the sacks to indicate:
   1. Acorn size: Small, Medium, or Large
   2. Species
   3. Sack weight
   4. County and state of harvest.
Specification Example #2

Off-line captioning will not be needed often, and it will all be from English. It may be needed in English, delivered by FTP, or from DVCam, HDCam, XDCam, VHS, or DVD, or in Spanish, delivered in the same way, and proxy files will be given with a timecode burned in, or a DVD copy with a second tape to encode on. These are all to be sent within five days. Scc, vtt, aaf, or srt are acceptable. The captions are to be 3 line roll-up at the bottom, unless requested otherwise depending on the program.
C. Off-line Captioning

1. Off-line Captioning **must** be on an occasional basis, approximately monthly.

2. Off-line Captioning **must** include:

   a. English language program material captioned in English via files delivered by FTP to the contractor.

   b. English language program material via DVCam, HDCam, XDCam, VHS, or DVD captioned in English.

   c. English language program material via DVCam, HDCam, XDCam, VHS, or DVD captioned in Spanish.

3. For Off-line Captioning, the agency will provide a DVCam, HDCam, XDCam, low resolution proxy files with timecode burned in, or a DVD copy of the program with a second tape for encoding.

4. The contractor **shall** return the master files or master tapes back to AETN within five (5) business days of receipt in one of the following formats:

   .scc .vtt .aaf .srt

5. Unless otherwise required for a particular program, such as a program containing pre-existing texts, contractor **shall** provide captions in three (3) line roll-up, placed at the frame bottom.
HANDOUT #3
SAMPLE SPECIFICATIONS

The original specification began with one sentence: Contractor will give a presentation of the results.

After consideration of questions that address Who, What, When, Where, How and pertaining to our specific RFP we end up with the following sample specifications for Training/Presentations:

2.1 ONGOING PRESENTATIONS

A. The Contractor shall conduct monthly, in-person presentations to Arkansas State Employees regarding the results of eating too many cookies at work and shall have online tutorials available for viewing by State Employees on demand. (ADDRESSES WHAT, WHO, WHEN, & HOW)

B. The Contractor shall provide manuals for use during the presentations. The Contractor shall include information in the manuals applicable to the results of eating too many cookies at work. At a minimum, the Contractor shall include information on the following topics in the manuals: (ADDRESSES WHAT & HOW)

- The caloric value of the top ten best-selling cookies
- The effects eating cookies has on blood sugar
- Current diabetes statistics
- The chemical additives and preservatives contained in most mass manufactured cookies

C. The Contractor shall conduct the initial presentation fourteen (14) calendar days after contract award and shall conduct monthly presentations on the first business day of each month thereafter throughout the life of the contract. (ADDRESSES WHEN)

D. The Contractor shall provide the Director of each State agency with a two (2) week advance notice via email stating the date, time, and location of the upcoming presentation. The State will provide contact information for agency Directors upon contract award. (ADDRESSES WHEN)

E. For each presentation conducted by the Contractor, the State anticipates approximately 250 State employees will be in attendance. (ADDRESSES WHO)

1. Currently, there is legislation in development focused on allowing State Employees to bring any one person they know that may have an issue with eating too many cookies to a presentation. Should this legislation become effective in the future, the Contractor shall conduct the presentation and provide the informative manuals to those additional people.

F. For each presentation conducted, the Contractor shall utilize the Holiday Inn Express, Meeting Room A, located at 123 Oreo Blvd, Little Rock, AR, 72000. (ADDRESSES WHERE)

G. The Contractor shall conduct each presentation session for a duration not to exceed three (3) consecutive business days. (ADDRESSES WHEN and HOW)
1. Based on the Contractor’s professional experience, the Contractor may determine the State employee participants could benefit from a duration lasting less than three (3) consecutive business days. For each presentation session lasting less than three (3) consecutive business days the Contractor **shall**:

   a. Provide a certification document to each State employee participant for the purposes of certifying the State employee participant will no longer eat cookies at work.

   b. Obtain the signed certification from each State employee participant

   c. Provide the State Employee Participant’s signed certifications to the appropriate State Agency Director via email within seven (7) business days after the conclusion date of any shortened presentation session for inclusion of the certifications into the employee’s personnel file.

**H.** The Contractor **shall** be responsible for all costs associated with providing the presentations specified in this RFP, including but not limited to the following: *(ADRESSES HOW)*

1. Costs for the development, production, printing, and distribution of informative manuals.

2. Costs for all Contractor’s travel related expenses such as meals, lodging, and airfare.

3. Costs for all fees associated with Holiday Inn Express venue rental or reservations.

4. Costs for presentation equipment and supplies including any fees associated with set up and tear down.
2.2 PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS
A. Prospective Contractor shall be a Member of American Alliance of Museums (AAM) and must be AAM Certified in Delicate Artifacts Transportation.

B. Prospective Contractor shall have ten (10) years’ experience in museum artifact transportation.

C. Prospective Contractor shall have previously provided museum transportation services to a minimum of three (3) clients whose artifacts for a single transportation totaled over $5,000,000.

D. Prospective Contractor employees shall be certified stunt drivers who are skilled in:
   1. Spotting potential thieves.
   2. Losing a tail, including outrunning and/or physically deterring artifact bandits.
      a. Martial arts experience is preferable, but not required.

2.3 PACKING
A. Packing materials must be, at a minimum, acid-free, and preferably of archival quality.

B. Prospective Contractor shall use AAM-approved packing and wrapping methods, or other methods of the same caliber as approved by DAH.

C. Prospective Contractor shall use moving equipment suited to museum grade artifacts.

D. Prospective Contractor shall provide a packing team large enough to wrap all artifacts for transport within a 4-hour timeframe.
   1. It is preferable that packing team has extensive experience with packing fundamentals such as duct tape crafting and bow-making.

2.4 TRANSPORTATION VEHICLE REQUIREMENTS
A. Prospective Contractor shall use an “astro-air suspension” cargo vehicle, or other approved vehicle meeting AAM standards.

B. Cargo area must be locked with three levels of security devices/locks, all with “Level 9” security ratings according to Locksmiths of America standards. Standards can be found at www.LoA.com.

C. Cargo area must be temperature and humidity controlled and must be calibrated to no more than 1 degree variance of required DAH settings.

D. Vehicle must have a GPS tracking device and must be monitored for the entire length of the route by the transportation company.

E. Vehicle must be disguised as a Walmart van or comparable as approved by DAH.
# Handout #5
## Sample Information for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum RAW Score Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.1 Prospective Contractor Qualifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. How many years’ experience does your company have in providing transportation services for museum artifacts? Describe your general experience.</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B. Provide a list of three (3) clients for whom you have previously provided a single transport with a value of at least $5,000,000. Give a description of the work for each to include:  
- Job description.  
- Monetary value of the transportation.  
- Problems encountered and their resolution.  
- Overall performance results. | 5 points |
| 1. Client 1 | 5 points |
| 2. Client 2 | 5 points |
| 3. Client 3 | 5 points |
| C. For the driver(s) you will assign to this project, describe their experience as a stunt driver. Include the following:  
1. Ability to spot plunderers and thieves.  
2. Ability to thwart the efforts of artifact bandits.  
3. Level of expertise, if any, in the martial arts arena. | 5 points |
<p>| <strong>E.2 Packing</strong> |                           |
| A. Provide a description of the packing materials and methods you will use for this service. | 5 points |
| B. List all equipment that will be used while transporting DAH artifacts. How is each piece of equipment suited to transporting museum grade artifacts? | 5 points |
| C. Provide a list of all team members that will be involved with DAH artifact transportation. Describe any experience each has in duct tape crafting and bow-making. | 5 points |
| <strong>E.3 Transportation Vehicle</strong> |                           |
| A. Give a description of the cargo vehicle that will be used to transport DAH artifacts. Describe how it meets MAAM standards. | 5 points |
| B. Describe the GPS tracking system utilized by your company and how artifacts will be monitored during transportation. | 5 points |
| C. How will your vehicle be disguised to ensure the safety of the transport? | 5 points |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information for Evaluation Sub-Sections</th>
<th>Maximum Raw Points Possible</th>
<th>Sub-Section’s Weighted Percentage</th>
<th>* Maximum Weighted Score Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Score Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OSP Policies

**EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

When multiple proposals are received in response to a solicitation, a determination must be made as to which of the proposal(s) may lead to a contract that is the most advantageous to the State. This determination is based on consideration of price and the evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation, as well any discussions or negotiations conducted with responsible offerors who submit proposals determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award. Although evaluation of competing proposals inherently involves a certain degree of subjective judgment and discretion, proposals should be evaluated ethically, fairly, lawfully, and reasonably.

The standard approach to evaluating proposals is to utilize an evaluation committee comprised of individuals who have no conflict of interest and who have knowledge or experience that will allow them to contribute meaningfully to the evaluation process. This approach allows an agency to select members of an evaluation committee that will review the proposals and make a recommendation regarding the relative merits of the proposals when considered against the evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation.

This statement of policy applies to solicitations which utilize an evaluation committee to make a recommendation and which are issued by any of the following entities: The Office of State Procurement (OSP), State Agencies, State Boards and Commissions, and State Colleges and Universities. It is intended to help safeguard the integrity of the evaluation process.

In order to help facilitate the evaluation process, a procurement official/representative of OSP, the State Agency, the Board or Commission, or College or University must be available to offer guidance and assistance to the evaluation committee as needed throughout the evaluation process. At the first meeting of the evaluation committee, a procurement official should provide an overview of the evaluation process to the committee members. Although the procurement official should be available to help guide the evaluation committee through the evaluation process, he or she should not serve as an evaluator on the evaluation committee.

- **EVALUATION COMMITTEE TRAINING**

Prior to receiving copies of the offerors’ proposals, all evaluation committee members shall participate in evaluation committee training sponsored either by OSP or an Agency Procurement Official (APO). All evaluation committee members should receive a copy of a confidentiality agreement and have it explained to them as part of the evaluation committee training. They should submit their signed confidentiality agreements before any proposals or information derived from the proposals is released to them. A scoring/rating sheet that has been approved by the OSP representative or the APO should be distributed to the evaluation committee members along with the proposals. Its proper use and the applicable rating method must be explained as part of the evaluation training.

- **EVALUATION COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

  1. Evaluation committee members should be selected based on their ability to make meaningful contributions to the evaluation of the competing proposals. Individuals with knowledge or expertise with regard to the commodity or service being evaluated should be included to the extent practicable. The number of people included may vary and there is no upward limit, but OSP strongly encourages a minimum of three members whenever possible. An agency may request employees of other State Agencies, State Boards and Commissions, or Colleges and Universities to serve as evaluators. If an agency wants to use qualified
evaluators from non-State governmental entities or the private sector, prior written approval must be obtained from the OSP Director or the agency’s APO.

2. Evaluation committee members must not have a financial interest, ownership interest, employee interest, or personal interest with any of the respondents or related parties, including identified subcontractors, who have submitted proposals in response to the solicitation. If a committee member discloses such an interest, or the chairperson of the commission and/or the procurement official learn that a member has such an interest, that member shall be removed from the committee.

3. In addition to actual disqualifying financial interests, ownership interests, employee interests, or personal interests, efforts should be made to avoid the appearance of the loss of impartiality based on recent or pending relationships, such as where one or more of the offerors is: (a) a person with whom the evaluator recently had or seeks a business relationship or transaction (not including routine and minor purchase of consumer goods or services from a major retailer or supplier in the ordinary course, such as, for example, the evaluator’s purchase of groceries from a major food vendor); (b) a person for whom the evaluator has, within the twelve months preceding the evaluation, served as officer, director, trustee, general partner, owner, agent, contractor or employee; or (c) a person who enjoys or has recently enjoyed, within the twelve months preceding the evaluation, a special relationship or position of trust with the evaluators, such as a clergyman, superior officer, teacher, attorney, consultant, or fiduciary. Persons seeking employment or a business opportunity with one or more offerors are not to serve as evaluators.

4. Supervisors and their subordinates shall not serve jointly on the same evaluation committee without prior written approval from the OSP Director or the agency’s APO.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

1. Evaluation committee members shall sign a Confidentiality Agreement and Disclosure Statement prior to participating in the evaluation process. It is imperative that evaluation committee members strive to maintain and document the integrity of the evaluation process. Until a contract has been awarded, members of the evaluation committee should not disclose any information derived from any offeror’s proposal to any person not officially participating in the procurement/evaluation unless otherwise required by lawful authority. This confidentiality helps maintain the integrity of the evaluation process.

2. After evaluation training, and after signing the required Confidentiality Agreement and Disclosure Statement, evaluation committee members should individually review all of the proposals before scoring or assigning any rating according to the rating method being utilized for the evaluation. Regardless of the rating method employed, evaluations must be based solely on the evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation. Evaluation committee members are expected to evaluate the proposals fairly and rationally based on the information presented in the proposals. They must not allow sympathy, prejudice, or like or dislike of any contractor or subcontractor being considered to influence their decision.

3. When conducting their initial review of the proposals, evaluation committee members should consider whether each proposal is “responsive.” A “responsive” proposal conforms in all material respects to the solicitation, including the specifications set forth in the solicitation. After evaluation committee members have conducted their initial individual review of the proposals, they should review the proposals again and assign scores or ratings as explained in evaluation training.

4. After initial individual evaluations are complete, the committee members shall meet to discuss their ratings. If any of the individual evaluation committee members initially considered any of the proposals not to be responsive, the committee should notify the procurement official. The procurement official, after consulting with the committee, should determine whether to eliminate the proposal from further evaluation as non-responsive, or whether the committee should proceed with the evaluation of that proposal as being arguably or potentially responsive. If the procurement officials determines that the proposal is clearly not responsive and should be eliminated from further evaluation, he or she must record that determination in writing along with the justification for the determination.

5. The committee will proceed to review all remaining proposals as a group. Each member will be afforded an opportunity to discuss his or her rating for each evaluation criteria. Ideally this will allow the committee members a chance to discuss their individual perspectives as well as potentially remedy any confusion or misunderstandings. If any committee members express a desire to receive clarification regarding some aspect
of a proposal, the chairperson of the committee should notify the procurement official, who will proceed to ask
the offeror any clarifying questions deemed necessary.

6. After committee members have had an opportunity to discuss their individual scores and consider any
clarifications that they may have received, they must be given the opportunity to change their initial evaluations
if they feel that is appropriate. If individual proposals were evaluated by assignment of numerical scores by
individual evaluators, the final individual scores of the evaluators will be averaged after they have made any
adjustment they may have felt it was appropriate to make. On behalf of the evaluation committee, the
evaluation chairperson shall provide a written outcome of the final scores/ranking to the procurement
official/representative.

7. After the final scoring session, each evaluator should return all evaluation documents in his or her possession
to the chairperson of the evaluation committee, who will send them to the procurement official for inclusion in
the procurement file. The evaluation documents should be retained so that they can be examined if there is a
question regarding whether the evaluation committee was properly organized and properly fulfilled its
evaluative and advisory function.

- EXCEPTION SPECIFIC TO DBA
  Generally, this policy does not include RFQ's for design professionals which are reviewed by the Division of
  Building Authority (DBA). Agencies under DBA review authority may utilize OSP procedures if not in conflict with
  DBA Minimum Standards and Criteria.
CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Bid #: __________________________________________

I confirm and SHALL comply with the following:

- I have no financial interest, ownership interest, employee interest, or personal interest with any of the prospective contractors who have submitted a proposal for this bid solicitation or identified subcontractors.

- I am not seeking employment with any of the prospective contractors who have submitted proposals for this bid solicitation or identified subcontractors.

- If at any time during the evaluation process, I discover a prospective contractor’s proposal contains a sub-contractor or related party with which I do have financial interest, ownership interest, personal interest, employee interest, or employment interest, I shall immediately recuse myself from evaluator duties.

- I shall treat all information as confidential. I shall not discuss nor disclose any information relevant to a prospective contractor’s proposal to any person not officially participating in the evaluation process.

- I shall not use any information relevant to a prospective contractor’s proposal in any manner other than for the proper discharge of my obligations as an evaluator.

- I shall not communicate with, nor shall I have any other social or non-work related contact with any respondent or related party regarding this procurement until a contract is awarded.

- I shall not respond to any request for information relevant to this procurement/evaluation process (i.e., FOIA requests, status updates, etc.). I shall forward all requests for such information to the committee chairperson or to the appropriate procurement representative.

- I shall protect the integrity of the evaluation.

Printed Name: __________________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________
Evaluation Process and Guidelines for Evaluators

STEP 1: INDIVIDUAL SCORING

• Before beginning the review of the proposals, read the solicitation, and all related solicitation documents such as Q&A, Addenda, etc. It is critical that evaluators are very familiar with the procurement and its requirements.

• Read through all proposals for an initial “first pass” review. The purpose of the first pass review is to familiarize yourself generally with the proposals before you begin assigning point values to specific responses.

• Using the evaluation criteria established in the request for proposals, go back through each proposal and complete the Individual Score Worksheet for each.
  
  o When assigning point values to the different responses, you should be free from any irrational bias and assign the number that you reasonably believe most fairly corresponds to the technical value of the response.
  
  o You must use only the whole numbers in the scoring key at the top of the Individual Score Worksheet.
  
  o Fill in a score for every question field. Do not leave any blanks. To indicate that a response does not appear acceptable, use a one (1) or a zero (0).
  
  o Consider the quality and adequacy of each response as it directly addresses the specific criteria and assign the score that best corresponds to the quality description in the scoring key.
  
  o The comment column is provided so that you can note your thoughts regarding the relative strengths and/or weaknesses of a proposal response, but it is not mandatory to make a written comment.

• Be prepared to discuss your initial reasoning for your individual scores at the Consensus Meeting.

• If you have a question regarding the evaluation process or the Individual Score Worksheet, please notify the chairperson, who will inform the OSP Buyer and seek clarification as needed.

• When the Individual Score Worksheets are completed for each proposal, the Chairperson will collect these from each evaluator and give them (or copies of them) to the OSP buyer.

• The chairperson and OSP buyer will coordinate a time for the Consensus Meeting.

STEP 2: CONSENSUS MEETING

• All evaluators are required to attend the Consensus Meeting in person. This meeting will be held at the OSP offices.

• Bring all proposals and documents you received in Evaluation training with you to the Consensus Meeting.

• At the Consensus Meeting, be prepared to discuss your individual scores from the Individual Score Worksheet. You will have the opportunity to adjust your individual score after consensus discussion.
Reminders:

- Score only on the content of the proposal as it directly responds to the specific criteria set forth in the solicitation.
  - Do not refer to outside sources or knowledge as a basis for your score.
  - Do not assign point values based on non-substantive elements of a proposal, such as type size, font style, paper color, etc.

- Score consistently among prospective contractors as to any areas where the responses are substantially the same.

- If you find information in a proposal that appears to conflict with the solicitation requirements or does not meet them, notify the chairperson immediately. The chairperson will contact the OSP buyer for resolution.

- If you find information for which you need clarification from the prospective contractor, notify the chairperson immediately. The chairperson will contact the OSP buyer for resolution. The OSP buyer will provide clarification information to the evaluators.

- Keep all proposals and scoring documents in a secure location, as they are confidential documents.

- If you load any proposal information onto your work or personal computer, or you send email regarding the evaluation, bear in mind that electronic or computer-based information, or data compilations in any medium that are kept and that constitute a record of the performance or lack of performance of official functions that are or should be carried out by a public official or employee, or a governmental agency may meet the definition of a public record, and therefore, you will be considered a custodian of official procurement documents.
  - All records maintained in public offices or by public employees within the scope of their employment are presumed to be public records.
  - Except as otherwise specifically provided by the Freedom of Information Act or by laws specifically enacted to provide otherwise, all public records are open to inspection and copying by any citizen of the State of Arkansas during the regular business hours of the custodian of the records.

- Do not discuss the proposals, scoring, or any part of the evaluation with anyone outside the evaluation committee or the OSP buyer or representative. If you are approached for information from anyone, including from within your agency, refer them to the OSP buyer.