

Exhibit D, Evaluation Tool RFQ No. HHS0017298 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Organization Experience			
1.1	Evaluate the Respondent organization's experience providing legal support, advice and legal services, working with clients and vendors on complex information technology and intellectual property law related matters.	15%		
1.2	Evaluate the Respondent organization's experience with information technology compliance related to federal and state law matters.	15%		
Subtotal		30%		
2	Staff Experience and Qualifications			
2.1	Evaluate the Respondent designated Lead Attorney's specialized legal qualifications and experience with information technology and intellectual property law related matters.	10%		
2.2	Evaluate the Respondent staff attorney qualifications and experience providing legal services for information technology law related matters.	10%		
2.3	Evaluate the Respondent Lead Attorney qualifications experience in advising and representing clients on complex information technology legal matters, including but not limited to: agreements, intellectual property, data privacy and security, artificial intelligence, dispute resolution, and risk management.	15%		
2.4	Evaluate the Respondent staff experience with information technology compliance related to federal and state laws, rules, and regulations.	10%		
Subtotal		45%		
3	Demonstrated Competence			
3.1	Evaluate the Respondent organization's demonstrated competence, understanding, commitment, and experience assisting entities with similar complex legal matters involving information technology, including intellectual property, security, data privacy, artificial intelligence, and risk management.	15%		
3.2	Evaluate the Respondent organization's demonstrated competence with similar matters with State and federal agencies.	10%		
Subtotal		25%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Exhibit D, Evaluation Tool RFQ No. HHS0017298		
Evaluation Scoring Guide		
Score	Level	Description
Unacceptable	1	Response does not address requirement. Response is completely unacceptable.
Unacceptable	2	Response mentions requirement, but is not responsive to the elements of the requirement.
Unacceptable	3	Response addresses requirement, but response described does not allow the agency to fulfill mission.
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	4	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (would require both the agency and Respondent to make significant changes not currently anticipated).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	5	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require both the agency and Respondent to make minor changes not currently anticipated).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	6	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require changes to be made by Respondent only).
Acceptable	7	Response clearly satisfies requirement but has some minor weaknesses.
Acceptable	8	Response clearly satisfies requirement.
Acceptable	9	Response satisfies requirements and has some benefits above requirement.
Exceptional	10	Response far exceeds all aspects of requirement.

For the purposes of this exhibit, "the agency" means the contracting state agency as specified in the solicitation.

Exhibit D, Evaluation Tool RFQ No. HHS0017298		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Organization Experience	30%
2	Staff Experience and Qualifications	45%
3	Demonstrated Competence	25%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%