



Solicitation No.: 18-DC-4126-01a  
 Solicitation Title: IDEP RFP 2018-2019 for 2018/2019  
 Evaluation Period: 08/22/2018 to 09/11/2018  
 Bid Vendor: 177-00000

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria (Refer to Scoring Guide)	Weight	Charter Communications Operating, LLC (Total Average)
	Vendor's proposed price of E-Rate eligible products and/or services from Attachment K - Proposed Pricing <b>(TOTAL MAX 26 POINTS)</b> <b>NO OFFER, NO BID</b> <b>Weighted Cost (MAX 26 POINTS)</b> Evaluators will assess competitiveness, reasonableness, and alignment with project requirements. Proposals that clearly separate eligible and ineligible costs and demonstrate clear efficiency will receive higher scores. The following formula will be used to determine cost points for scoring when applicable: <b>WEIGHTED POINTS CALCULATED BY E-RATE CENTRAL™</b> <b>Formula:</b> <b>Lowest Proposed Price / Proposed Price x Assigned Points</b> <b>Example:</b> This Proposal and scoring results based on a 10-point scale: Proposee A: \$100,000.00 → (\$100,000.00 / \$100,000.00) x 10 = 10 pts Proposee B: \$150,000.00 → (\$150,000.00 / \$100,000.00) x 10 = 7.5 pts Proposee C: \$250,000.00 → (\$250,000.00 / \$100,000.00) x 10 = 2.5 pts This scoring method ensures a fair assessment of proposals based on their pricing relative to the lowest bid.	26%	26.00
Evaluation Criteria Cost of E-Rate Eligible Products and/or Services			
Evaluation Criteria Technical & Functional Suitability	<b>Technical &amp; Functional Suitability (MAX 20 POINTS)</b> Evaluators will assess how well the proposed goods and/or services meet the district's needs. This includes, but is not limited to technical specifications, functional requirements, and service expectations as outlined in the RFP. Emphasis will be placed on the vendor's ability to fulfill core needs, offer value-added features, and integrate effectively within the district's existing infrastructure or operations. Proposals that demonstrate a strong fit with the district's requirements and clearly address key performance expectations will score higher. Vendors that fail to meet the minimum mandatory requirements may receive reduced points under this criterion and will not be eligible for the full 20 points. <b>Criteria to Consider:</b> - Alignment with technical specifications and functional requirements outlined in the RFP - Ability to meet or exceed mandatory and performance-based requirements - Robustness of value-added features that enhance functionality or efficiency - Compatibility with existing systems, infrastructure, and operational workflows <b>Scoring Guidelines:</b> <b>18-20 points:</b> Proposal fully meets or exceeds technical specifications, functional requirements, and service expectations; clearly defines core needs; integrates seamlessly with existing systems, and provides meaningful value-added features. <b>15-17 points:</b> Proposal meets most technical specifications, functional requirements, and service expectations with only minor gaps; demonstrates strong alignment with core needs and overall compatibility with existing systems. <b>12-14 points:</b> Proposal addresses baseline requirements but shows gaps in meeting functional or performance expectations; provides limited added value or uncertain compatibility with existing infrastructure. <b>9-11 points:</b> Proposal does not meet key technical specifications or functional requirements; fails to demonstrate compatibility with existing systems or lacks alignment with the district's core needs.	20%	13.60
Evaluation Criteria Reputation & Reliability	<b>Reputation &amp; Reliability (MAX 12 POINTS)</b> Evaluators will consider the vendor's demonstrated reliability, professional standing, and history of delivering similar solutions successfully. This may include, but is not limited to, references provided to other projects, third-party benchmarks, independent analyst reports, documented performance, and overall reputation in the marketplace. The evaluation will also reflect the vendor's proven track record in delivering high-quality goods and/or services relevant to the scope of this RFP, as demonstrated through past performance, references, testimonials, and relevant experience. <b>Criteria to Consider:</b> - Proven track record of success in delivering similar solutions or contracts of comparable scope and complexity - Evidence of performance from past projects (e.g., references, testimonials, case studies, documented outcomes) - General reputation in the industry for service quality, responsiveness, and integrity - Independent verification of reliability (e.g., analyst reviews, security certifications, awards) <b>Scoring Guidelines:</b> <b>10-12 points:</b> Vendor has a strong, well-documented reputation with extensive experience delivering similar solutions, excellent references/testimonials, and independent recognition for performance and reliability. <b>12-15 points:</b> Vendor has a positive reputation with solid experience in similar engagement, good references, and some third-party validation; minor gaps may exist in documentation or breadth of recognition. <b>7-11 points:</b> Vendor has a generally acceptable reputation but shows limited experience in similar solutions, less frequent references, or lacks third-party recognition. <b>6-8 points:</b> Vendor has little to no demonstrated experience, insufficient references, or documented issues related to reliability or performance.	12%	17.00
Evaluation Criteria Total Cost of Ownership	<b>Total Cost of Ownership (MAX 10 POINTS)</b> Total long-term cost to acquire the vendor's goods and/or services. Evaluators will assess the total <b>ineligible</b> cost to the district over the full term of the agreement, including but not limited to applicable fees, implementation, training, support, maintenance, and renewal costs. Vendor must provide a complete and transparent cost breakdown of eligible versus ineligible costs in their RFP responses. Proposals with incomplete, unclear, or inconsistent pricing may receive reduced scores, as evaluators may be able to accurately determine the full financial impact to the district. <b>Criteria to Consider:</b> - Total ineligible cost over the full three-year term - Inclusion of all relevant costs (e.g., training, implementation, support, maintenance, materials) - Transparency and completeness of cost breakdowns - Pricing flexibility and cost-effectiveness relative to other proposals. <b>Scoring Guidelines:</b> <b>7-10 points:</b> Proposal includes all required costs in a clear and detailed manner, offers competitive pricing, and provides flexible licensing or cost-saving options. <b>10-12 points:</b> Proposal is generally complete and competitively priced, with only minor issues in clarity or transparency. <b>4-6 points:</b> Proposal has moderate pricing or structure issues, such as incomplete cost elements or less competitive rates. <b>6-8 points:</b> Proposal is unclear, lacks key cost components, or reflects significantly higher costs without justification.	10%	8.00
Evaluation Criteria Quality of Proposed Goods and/or Services	<b>Quality of Proposed Goods and/or Services (MAX 10 POINTS)</b> Evaluators will assess the overall quality, functionality, and suitability of the proposed goods and/or services in relation to the district's specified needs. <b>Criteria to Consider:</b> - Overall quality and suitability of the proposed goods and/or services - Suitability and alignment with the district's functional and technical requirements. <b>Scoring Guidelines:</b> <b>7-10 points:</b> Proposal demonstrates high-quality goods and/or services that fully align with the district's needs. <b>7-8 points:</b> Proposal reflects generally high quality and suitability, with minor gaps. <b>6-7 points:</b> Proposal meets minimum quality expectations but may show moderate gaps in alignment, functionality. <b>6-8 points:</b> Proposal lacks sufficient quality or contains significant shortcomings in suitability.	10%	8.20
Evaluation Criteria Terms & Conditions	<b>Terms &amp; Conditions (MAX 10 POINTS)</b> Vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions. When evaluating the vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions, several key criteria will be considered: the initial commencement date and renewal options, service availability, bandwidth increase terms, early termination clause, and price stability. Each of these elements is essential in ensuring the overall suitability of the vendor's proposal. A well-structured contract that effectively addresses these criteria can offer the necessary stability and flexibility while ensuring service continuity. The offeror agrees to IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions and provides, in writing, any exceptions to any of the terms. <b>Criteria to Consider:</b> - Alignment of contract commencement date and renewal options with district needs - Clarity and stability of service availability commitments - Flexibility and fairness of bandwidth increase terms - Reasonableness of early termination provisions - Stability of pricing and structure against anticipated cost increases - Vendor's acceptance of IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions, with minimal or no exceptions provided in writing. <b>Scoring Guidelines:</b> <b>7-10 points:</b> Proposal fully aligns with IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions, with no or minimal exceptions; contract terms clearly support stability, flexibility, and service continuity. <b>7-8 points:</b> Proposal aligns with IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions with minor exceptions; overall contract terms are reasonable and adequately address key criteria. <b>6-7 points:</b> Proposal contains several exceptions or limitations to IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions; some contract terms are unclear, restrictive, or provide limited stability. <b>6-8 points:</b> Proposal includes significant exceptions to IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions; contract terms fail to address key criteria or do not support the district's service continuity and stability needs.	10%	8.40
Evaluation Criteria Completeness of Proposal	<b>Completeness of Proposal (MAX 5 POINTS)</b> Proposals will be evaluated on the inclusion of all required elements in accordance with the submission guidelines. The criterion assesses whether the offeror has followed all instructions, provided full and responsive answers to every section of the RFP, and demonstrated the ability to meet all stated requirements. <b>Criteria to Consider:</b> - Robustness of all required forms, documents, and attachments as outlined in the RFP - Responsiveness to every section of the RFP, with clear and complete answers - Adherence to submission instructions, formatting requirements, and deadlines - Overall organization and clarity of the proposal submission. <b>Scoring Guidelines:</b> <b>4 points:</b> Proposal is fully complete, follows all submission guidelines, includes all required documents, and provides clear and comprehensive responses. <b>4 points:</b> Proposal is substantially complete with only minor omissions or inconsistencies; responses are generally clear and aligned with requirements. <b>3-5 points:</b> Proposal contains noticeable omissions, incomplete responses, or deviations from submission guidelines; overall responsiveness is limited. <b>0-1 point:</b> Proposal is incomplete, missing key required documents or sections, and fails to follow submission guidelines.	5%	4.80
		100%	85.40
<b>Grand Total Score</b>			<b>85.40</b>