

Work Plan Score Sheets

Work Plan Rating Sheet

The Work Plan is a tool to assist in identifying highly-experienced/highly-performing offerors. Each Plan should be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to visualize what they are going to do before they do it. The Work Plan should be developed around fulfilling the base requirements within the known project constraints of cost, time, and system expectations. The Plans should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the plans the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Plans the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Plan should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the plan provides significantly higher value than the average plan (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the plan is about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision)
- C. A "1" represents that the plan is significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work)

Offeror	Rating	Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "10" or "1" rating for debriefing purposes The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>
Blue	10 5 1	5 - no reference to experience or examples very technical + dry
Goldenrod	10 5 1	5 - 2yr schedule (aggressive) good overall approach
Purple	10 5 1	5 - not much on training and unclear if touched on all 5 work plan items Easy to read and understand.
Salmon	10 5 1	10 - Impressed with ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM). Good understanding of Challenges in AK. Go/No go
White	10 5 1	10 - like the Phases/Bands approach. Good examples of past experience + lessons learned

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Work Plan and that you have had no prior knowledge of any plan and whom they belong to. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Brook Larson

Printed Name

Brook Larson

Signature

10/22/10

Date

[Handwritten signature]

Work Plan Rating Sheet

The Work Plan is a tool to assist in identifying highly-experienced/highly-performing offerors. Each Plan should be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to visualize what they are going to do before they do it. The Work Plan should be developed around fulfilling the base requirements within the known project constraints of cost, time, and system expectations. The Plans should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the plans the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Plans the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Plan should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the plan provides significantly higher value than the average plan (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the plan is about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision)
- C. A "1" represents that the plan is significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work)

Offeror	Rating	Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "10" or "1" rating for debriefing purposes The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>
Blue	10 5 1	
Goldenrod	10 5 1	
Purple	10 5 1	
Salmon	10 5 1	Addresses external stakeholders, reduced customizations, future upgrades, methodology to achieve 100% fit, ongoing use of AIDER, just in time software licensing/installation, roll back contingency plans, hardware infrastructure, traffic control vs estimated effort etc. which other offerors did not address or did not address as thoroughly.
White	10 5 1	

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Work Plan and that you have had no prior knowledge of any plan and whom they belong to. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Cheryl Shakespeare
Printed Name

Cheryl Shakespeare
Signature

10/21/10
Date

SAA ✓

Work Plan Rating Sheet

The Work Plan is a tool to assist in identifying highly-experienced/highly-performing offerors. Each Plan should be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to visualize what they are going to do before they do it. The Work Plan should be developed around fulfilling the base requirements within the known project constraints of cost, time, and system expectations. The Plans should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the plans the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Plans the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Plan should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the plan provides significantly higher value than the average plan (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the plan is about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision)
- C. A "1" represents that the plan is significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work)

Offeror	Rating	Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "10" or "1" rating for debriefing purposes The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>
Blue	10 5 1	
Goldenrod	10 5 1	
Purple	10 5 1	Recognized importance of planning, share point site, static environment test, described dedicated resources
Salmon	10 5 1	Included several items that others didn't, biggest factor was their experience with existing Alaska systems
White	10 5 1	

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Work Plan and that you have had no prior knowledge of any plan and whom they belong to. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Marilyn Hagen
Printed Name

Marilyn Hagen
Signature

10/22/10
Date

5/27/11

Work Plan Rating Sheet

The Work Plan is a tool to assist in identifying highly-experienced/highly-performing offerors. Each Plan should be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to visualize what they are going to do before they do it. The Work Plan should be developed around fulfilling the base requirements within the known project constraints of cost, time, and system expectations. The Plans should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the plans the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Plans the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Plan should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the plan provides significantly higher value than the average plan (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the plan is about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision)
- C. A "1" represents that the plan is significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work)

Offeror	Rating	Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "10" or "1" rating for debriefing purposes The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>
Blue	10 5 1	
Goldenrod	10 5 1	
Purple	10 5 1	not dominant ; failed to provide the detail needed to explain the how, etc. Lacked detailed compared to the others in order to fully understand their thought out plan - Shows deficiency & no value
Salmon	10 5 1	* Had all the dominant factors of Blue, Goldenrod & white, but has prior knowledge of AKPAV, AKSTS and WPA which is different & very beneficial to the SOL.
White	10 5 1	

lacks the method

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Work Plan and that you have had no prior knowledge of any plan and whom they belong to. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Stacie Bentley Stacie Bentley 10/22/10
 Printed Name Signature Date

SMB

Work Plan Rating Sheet

The Work Plan is a tool to assist in identifying highly-experienced/highly-performing offerors. Each Plan should be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to visualize what they are going to do before they do it. The Work Plan should be developed around fulfilling the base requirements within the known project constraints of cost, time, and system expectations. The Plans should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the plans the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Plans the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Plan should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the plan provides significantly higher value than the average plan (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the plan is about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision)
- C. A "1" represents that the plan is significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work)

Offeror	Rating	Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "10" or "1" rating for debriefing purposes The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>
Blue	10 5 1	
Goldenrod	10 5 1	
Purple	10 5 1	
Salmon	10 5 1	THERE EXP. W/ ALASKAS INFRASTRUCTURE DIFFERTIATES THEM FROM THE OTHERS
White	10 5 1	

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Work Plan and that you have had no prior knowledge of any plan and whom they belong to. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Tom Mayor

Printed Name

J. J.

Signature

10/22/10

Date

SAA