CALIFORNIA CONNECT CONTRACT OVERSIGHT MANAGEMENT (COM)
EVALUATION AND SCORING CRITERIA

Name of Proposer:	
Name of Scorer/Rater:	

SCORING DEFINITIONS	
Comprehensive	Fully addresses all major elements of the criterion with specific, relevant, and well-supported details and/or examples. Demonstrates a thorough understanding and no material weaknesses are identified.
Good	Addresses all major elements of the criterion with clear and relevant detail. Demonstrates a strong understanding; any weaknesses or omissions are minor and do not materially affect the proposed approach.
Fair	Adequately addresses the major elements of the criterion and demonstrates an acceptable understanding, but the response lacks detail, support, or clarity in one or more areas.
Poor	Partially addresses the criterion but contains significant gaps, weaknesses, unsupported statements, or limited relevant detail that raise concern about the Proposer's ability to perform the requirement.
Fail	Does not address, is materially nonresponsive to, or demonstrates insufficient understanding or capability to satisfy the criterion.

Evaluator instruction: Score each criterion against the published rubric based on the information provided and evaluated in accordance with the solicitation. Use the Evaluator Notes column to document the basis for the score, including material strengths, weaknesses, omissions, and the relevant proposal section/page when practicable. ***Please note that this document will become public record.***

TECHNICAL EVALUATION (50 points)

Evaluation Criterion	Max Points	Fail	Poor	Fair	Good	Comprehensive	Evaluator Score	Evaluator Notes
1. Technical Understanding and Proposed Oversight Methodology What to look for: Understanding of COM's independent oversight role and a practical approach to contract/performance oversight, deliverable and financial validation, risk/issues, reporting, materiality, and separation from Vendor Partner operations.	15	0–3 Does not adequately address the criterion or shows little understanding.	4–6 Limited understanding; significant gaps or largely generic approach.	7–9 Adequate understanding; addresses the major elements but lacks detail or integration.	10–12 Strong, practical and well-supported approach that addresses the major elements.	13–15 Comprehensive, specific and highly effective approach demonstrating superior understanding.		
2. Organizational Experience and Technical Capability What to look for: Relevant experience performing independent contract/program oversight in government, public-sector, regulated, multi-vendor, or comparable environments, including performance, financial, data/reporting, risk, and executive-level oversight.	10	0–2 Does not adequately demonstrate relevant experience or capability.	3–4 Limited relevant experience or weakly comparable examples.	5–6 Adequate relevant experience and capability.	7–8 Strong relevant experience with well-supported comparable examples.	9–10 Comprehensive and highly relevant experience demonstrating superior capability.		
3. Qualifications of Proposed Key Staff and Staffing Approach What to look for: Qualifications and relevant experience of proposed Key Staff; clear roles and accountability; continuity; availability; and a staffing approach that demonstrates the ability to perform the COM responsibilities described in the SOW.	10	0–2 Qualifications and proposed approach do not adequately address the requirements.	3–4 Limited relevant qualifications or significant weaknesses in the proposed approach.	5–6 Adequate qualifications and approach to performing the required Key Staff responsibilities.	7–8 Strong qualifications and a clear, well-supported approach to performing the required Key Staff responsibilities.	9–10 Highly relevant qualifications and a comprehensive approach demonstrating superior capability to perform the required Key Staff responsibilities.		
4. Work Plan, Transition Strategy, and Quality Assurance What to look for: A feasible work plan and Transition-In approach, knowledge transfer, schedules, quality assurance, issue escalation, continuity, and readiness to begin uninterrupted COM oversight.	15	0–3 Does not adequately address the criterion or is not feasible.	4–6 Limited plan with significant gaps.	7–9 Adequate and generally feasible plan, but some areas lack detail.	10–12 Strong, detailed and feasible plan with clear controls and responsibilities.	13–15 Comprehensive, highly integrated plan demonstrating superior readiness and low transition risk.		
						TECHNICAL SUBTOTAL		Maximum: 50

KEY STAFF INTERVIEW (20 points)

Interview questions will be developed before the interviews and asked consistently of all interviewed Proposers. Interview responses will be scored using the four criteria below.

Evaluation Criterion	Max Points	Fail	Poor	Fair	Good	Comprehensive	Evaluator Score	Evaluator Notes
5.1 Understanding of COM Scope of Work and Independent Oversight Role What to look for: Understanding of COM's role and boundaries, materiality-based oversight, and appropriate relationship with CPUC and Vendor Partners.	5	0 Does not demonstrate an adequate understanding.	1 Limited understanding or significant misunderstanding of COM's role.	2 Adequate understanding but limited depth.	3–4 Strong understanding and sound application.	5 Comprehensive understanding and exceptional application of COM's independent oversight role.		
5.2 Relevant Knowledge and Professional Judgment What to look for: Ability to apply contract, financial, performance, data, risk, and oversight knowledge and exercise sound professional judgment.	5	0 Does not demonstrate adequate knowledge or judgment.	1 Limited knowledge or weak reasoning.	2 Adequate knowledge and generally reasonable judgment.	3–4 Strong knowledge and sound professional judgment.	5 Comprehensive knowledge and exceptional professional judgment.		
5.3 Ability to Identify and Address Oversight Risks and Issues What to look for: Ability to identify material risks/issues, distinguish isolated from recurring concerns, validate evidence, and recommend appropriate escalation or follow-through without directing Vendor Partner operations.	5	0 Does not identify or appropriately address material risks/issues.	1 Limited risk identification or inappropriate response.	2 Adequately identifies major issues and a reasonable response.	3–4 Strong risk identification, prioritization and follow-through.	5 Comprehensive risk-based analysis with exceptional prioritization and response.		
5.4 Communication of Findings and Recommendations What to look for: Ability to communicate findings clearly, concisely, objectively, and at the appropriate level for CPUC and Vendor Partners.	5	0 Communication is materially unclear or nonresponsive.	1 Limited clarity, organization, or audience awareness.	2 Adequate communication but lacks some clarity or prioritization.	3–4 Strong, clear, concise and professional communication.	5 Comprehensive and exceptionally clear, objective, decision-useful communication.		
						INTERVIEW SUBTOTAL		Maximum: 20

COST EVALUATION (30 points)

Cost Evaluation – 30 points. Cost will be evaluated in accordance with the cost evaluation methodology identified in the solicitation.

Technical Evaluation	50
Key Staff Interview	20
Cost Evaluation	30
TOTAL	**100**

Technical Score	
Interview Score	
Cost Score	
TOTAL SCORE	

COM EVALUATION SCORING SUMMARY

Evaluation Component	Maximum Points	Score	Notes
Technical Understanding & Proposed Oversight Methodology	15		
Organizational Experience & Technical Capability	10		
Qualifications of Proposed Key Staff & Staffing Approach	10		
Work Plan, Transition Strategy & Quality Assurance	15		
Technical Evaluation Subtotal	50		
Key Staff Interview	20		
Cost Evaluation	30		

TOTAL SCORE	**100**	

Item	Evaluation Guidance / Note
Overall structure	100 total points: 70 technical (50 written technical + 20 interview) and 30 cost.
Rating scale	Fail / Poor / Fair / Good / Comprehensive. Point ranges scale to each criterion's maximum points. Evaluators should select the rating that best reflects the response and assign a score within that published range based on the degree to which the response satisfies the criterion.
Consistent application	Each qualified proposal must be evaluated against the same published criteria and scoring standards. Technical scores should be based on the merits of the response to the criterion, not on undisclosed preferences or criteria.
Evaluator documentation	Evaluator Notes should briefly state the basis for each score, including material strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or concerns, and identify the relevant proposal section/page when practicable. Scores should be supportable from the evaluation record.
Written technical criteria	Reflect the COM Secondary justification: technical understanding/oversight methodology, organizational experience/technical capability, qualifications of proposed personnel/staffing approach, transition strategy, quality assurance, and independent oversight capability.
Interview	Four 5-point factors. Interview questions will be developed before interviews, tied to the published interview criteria, and asked consistently of all interviewed Proposers. Interview scoring must be based on the response provided during the interview and the published interview criteria.
Minimum Qualifications	MQs remain pass/fail and are not double-scored. Comparative technical scoring evaluates the strength and relevance of responsive information beyond minimum qualification requirements.
Staffing approach	The staffing criterion evaluates the qualifications and approach of the proposed Key Staff and the Proposer's ability to perform the COM requirements. A Proposer is not awarded additional points solely for proposing a greater number of optional support staff.
Cost scoring	Cost Evaluation is worth 30 points and will be scored in accordance with the cost evaluation methodology identified in the solicitation.
Scoring philosophy	Evaluation focuses on substantive, evidence-based, materiality-focused oversight and appropriate separation from Vendor Partner operations. The quantity of comments, findings, or proposed administrative layers is not itself a basis for a higher score.
Level of detail	The rubric uses concise criterion-specific scoring anchors so all evaluators apply the same framework while retaining reasonable professional judgment within the published point ranges.