

SCORING / EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation Committee

Proposals will be evaluated by a Committee whose members are selected by the HTA and include representatives of the HCF, HTA as well as community and business representatives throughout the state. All committee members may participate in decision-making on award recommendations provided they have no direct personal interest in the proposal in question. Evaluators sign an affidavit declaring that they will drop out of any evaluation that violates this requirement. Evaluators will then be assigned an alternate applicant to evaluate.

Evaluation / Award Process

There is no minimum or maximum number of awards to be granted for this RFP. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Committee will rank the proposals based on which ones they determine are most advantageous to the State, to the Island where the project is to take place, to the surrounding community, and to the HTA's mission. The Evaluation Committee will then make recommendations to the HTA regarding who should be awarded and how much they should be awarded (within the parameters of the program). The HTA will make the final determination. The evaluation committee reserves the right, at any time prior to award recommendation, to request selected applicants to provide an oral presentation in support of their application.

Once the recommendation to award is approved by the HTA, a final agreement will be executed by HCF with the appropriate parties.

Online Written Submission

The HTA anticipates awarding based on online written submission only. However, HTA reserves the right to request additional information or materials, conduct oral interviews, conduct reference checks, negotiate key provisions of the statement of work, and/or ask for a best and final offer (BAFO), upon request from the evaluation committee or from HTA management.

Scoring Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following scoring criteria:

- 40% - Project Components
- 30% - Project Impact
- 10% - Organizational Capacity
- 20% - Project Budget

A facsimile of the scoring worksheet to be used by the evaluators follows on the next page.

Scoring Worksheet

Evaluator Scoring WorksheetRFP
Aloha 'Āina Program 2021

Applicant's Name: _____

Evaluator's Name: _____

EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL	Scoring Range	Evaluator Score
<p>Project Components (Form B)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets Aloha 'Āina goals and objectives, • Increases efforts toward Native Resource preservation, restoration, and management. • Increases opportunities for natural resource education, and/or • Providing opportunities for continued mitigation efforts. Enhancement of Existing Project – demonstrates enhancement and/or innovation of existing project • Work Plan and Time – work plan and timeline appears reasonable to execute the event/program • Community Support and Involvement – evidence of partnerships with outside organizations and visitor industry partners. Project has broad based community support and is in line with community value and community resources. 	1-40	
<p>Project Impact (Form B)</p> <p>Reasonable and significant measures identified demonstrating positive impact on the preservation, protection, and respect of the native plants and animals of Hawai'i . Plan to acquire the required measures and targets listed above is clear, resource needs are adequately addressed, use of information will lead to sustainable projects.</p>	1-30	
<p>Organization Capacity (Form B)</p> <p>Ability to produce, implement, and execute the project. Has established network. Demonstrated success and expertise necessary to perform the project described. Past performance with HTA.</p>	1-10	
<p>Project Budget (Form C & D)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates organizational financial capability • An accurate and feasible budget for the project • Valid sources of revenue. • Reasonableness of estimated expenses comparable to similar event/activity. • A minimum of 1:1 match or better on requested funds, with at least 20% of the match in other cash. 	1-20	
TOTAL SCORE	4-100	

Scoring Worksheet

Evaluator Scoring WorksheetRFP
Kūkulu Ola Program 2021

Applicant's Name: _____

Evaluator's Name: _____

EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL	Scoring Range	Evaluator Score
<p>Project Components</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets Kūkulu Ola goals and objectives, • Increases the number of cultural practitioners, • Increases their skill level or proficiency in a practice, and/or • Providing opportunities for continued practice. Enhancement of Existing Project – demonstrates enhancement and/or innovation of existing project • Work Plan and Timeline – work plan and timeline appears reasonable to execute the event/program • Community Support and Involvement – evidence of partnerships with outside organizations and visitor industry partners. Project has broad based community support and is in line with community value and community resources. 	1-40	
<p>Project Impact</p> <p>Reasonable and significant measures identified demonstrating positive impact on the Hawaiian culture and community. Sound methodology and plan to acquire the required measures and targets listed above is clear, and resource needs are adequately addressed.</p>	1-30	
<p>Organization Capacity</p> <p>Ability to produce, implement, and execute the project. Has established network. Demonstrated success and expertise necessary to perform the project described. Past performance with HTA.</p>	1-10	
<p>Project Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates organizational financial capability • An accurate and feasible budget for the project • Valid sources of revenue. • Reasonableness of estimated expenses comparable to similar event/activity. • A minimum of 1:1 match or better on requested funds, with at least 50% of the match in other cash. 	1-20	
TOTAL SCORE	4-100	

Scoring Guidelines

Assessment	Scoring Guidelines	Evaluator Score (Total)
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is inadequate in many basic aspects for the scored category (team, expertise, approach or price) • Evaluator has very low confidence in the applicant's ability to perform as promised or as required 	1-20
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal minimally addresses the requirements, but one or more major considerations of the category are not addressed, or lacking in some essential aspects for the specific criteria • Evaluator has low confidence in the applicant's ability to perform as promised or as required 	21-40
Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal adequately meets the minimum requirements for the category and is generally capable of meeting the state's needs for specific criteria • Evaluator has confidence in the applicant's ability to perform as promised or as required 	41-60
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal more than adequately meets the minimum requirements of the specific criteria, and exceeds those requirements in some aspects • Evaluator has high confidence in the applicant's ability to perform as promised or as required 	61-80
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal fully meets all requirements and exceeds most requirements • Evaluator has extremely high confidence in the applicant's ability to perform as promised or as required 	81-100

SCORING NOTES

1. Preparation. Evaluators will read the RFP requirements and then review the applicant's Proposal response and assess how well it meets the needs of the HTA as defined by the RFP.
2. Worksheet Mandatory. The Evaluator Worksheet will be used by the evaluators. Evaluators will record their score on the Evaluator Worksheet. Scores will be based on the number of

points for each evaluation component, which is provided in the Scoring Range column of the worksheet.

3. Independent and Individual Review. The committee will review the received Responses and independently score each Proposal. Scores will be in accordance with the Scoring Rating System and will represent each evaluator's best subjective judgment.
4. Scoring Rating System. Each scored item will receive a score based on the rating descriptions. Use whole numbers only. A zero score is not allowed.
5. Convening Committee Meetings. The committee meeting(s) will be convened by the HTA/HCF on the date and time designated. The members will discuss the individual scores and, as a result of the discussion, each member may adjust the member's individual scoring up or down as appropriate. There is no requirement that members reach agreement on the score for a particular question/requirement. In the event the members do not reach agreement on a score for a particular question/requirement, the HCF will average the individual scores to determine the Proposer's score for that particular question/requirement.
6. Award Amounts. Award amounts are determined based on the applicant's request, the average evaluator score, the overall score ranking, and the collective agreement of the evaluators regarding what is in the best interests of the State.
7. Maintaining Records. All evaluation/negotiation documents/forms completed by each evaluator and by the committee will be collected and maintained by HCF.

By submitting a proposal, applicant agrees to accept and abide by the terms of this RFP. The HTA reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, to waive any informality or irregularity, and to accept any proposals which it may deem to be in the best interest of the State of Hawai'i.