This Evaluator Instruction Sheet serves as a grading rubric to ensure scoring consistency across the committee. It specifically defines the difference between a "High (10)," "Average (5)," and "Non-Responsive (0)" score for the most critical or conditional items.

Evaluator Scoring Rubric: 0-10 Scale Definitions

Evaluation Committee's scoring of Proposer's overall capability

4.10.1 Financial Viability and Marketplace Success (100 Points)

4.10.1.1 Corporate Stability & Performance (30 pts)

- Score 9–10 (27–30 pts): 5+ years of audited financials showing consistent liquidity and growth.
- Score 5–8 (15–24 pts): 2–3 years of history or unaudited statements that demonstrate basic solvency.
- Score 0–4 (0–12 pts): Failed to provide financial history or provided evidence of significant fiscal instability.

4.10.1.2 Step-by-Step Order Workflow (30 pts)

- Score 9–10 (27–30 pts): A seamless, automated, or highly detailed workflow that ensures every Eligible Purchaser receives contract-compliant pricing and immediate transition to support/training without administrative delay.
- Score 5–8 (15–24 pts): A functional workflow that requires significant manual intervention or lacks clear triggers for training and SLA commencement.
- Score 0–4 (0–12 pts): Vague or non-existent workflow; failure to demonstrate how contract pricing is applied or how the service transition occurs.

4.10.1.3 Market Presence (20 pts)

- Score 9–10 (18–20 pts): Evidence of high market share in public safety and multiple industry-recognized awards.
- Score 5–8 (10–16 pts): Established presence with limited market share or niche focus; awards are internal or minor.
- Score 0–4 (0–8 pts): New entrant with no documented success in the public safety technology sector.

4.10.1.4 Past Performance (20 pts)

- Score 9–10 (18–20 pts): Three references from multi-jurisdictional agencies using the solution for 2+ years with positive feedback.
- Score 5–8 (10–16 pts): References are from single-site agencies or have used the solution for less than a year.
- Score 0–4 (0–8 pts): References are unverifiable, negative, or were not provided.

4.10.2 Ability to Sell and Deliver Service (150 Points)

4.10.2.1 Scalability Plan (50 pts)

- Score 9–10 (45–50 pts): Comprehensive, detailed plan showing the technical and administrative infrastructure to handle massive growth.
- Score 5–8 (25–40 pts): Basic plan mentioning "cloud scalability" but lacking specific logistical details for rollout.
- Score 0–4 (0–20 pts): Little to no evidence provided regarding the capacity to handle an enterprise-level rollout.

4.10.2.2 Compliance & Retention Documentation (50 pts)

- Score 9–10 (45–50 pts): Explicit documentation of the ability to meet varying state privacy/retention laws, specifically Florida Statute Ch. 119.0712.
- Score 5–8 (25–40 pts): Generic compliance statements that do not specifically reference Florida-specific statutory requirements.
- Score 0–4 (0–20 pts): Failed to provide specific documentation regarding data sovereignty or statutory compliance.

4.10.2.3 Data Purge & Integrity Policies (50 pts)

- Score 9–10 (45–50 pts): Provides proof of automated, logic-based deletion that requires no manual intervention. Includes immutable audit logs showing exactly when data was purged and by what authority (statute or policy).
- Score 5–8 (25–40 pts): Manual or "as requested" purge cycles. System has the ability to delete data, but the workflow is not fully automated or requires significant administrative oversight.
- Score 1–4 (5–20 pts) Basic "delete" function exists but lacks sophisticated lifecycle logic or detailed forensic logs of the purge events.
- Score 0 pts: No mention of automated purge logic, data integrity access controls, or lifecycle management.

Operations and Logistics Plan (100 points)

4.10.3.1 Geographic Coverage (20 Points)

Requirement: Documentation of the national service/repair network and the ability to provide timely on-site support across the United States (Ref. Section 3.10.3).

- Score 9-10 (18-20 pts): Extensive national footprint with established on-site repair capabilities in all major regions.
- Score 5-8 (10-16 pts): Service network exists but relies heavily on depot repair (shipping items back) or has limited on-site coverage.
- Score 0-4 (0-8 pts): Little to no documentation of a support network or repair infrastructure.

4.10.3.2 Service Level Agreements - SLAs (35 Points)
Requirement: Example SLAs showing guaranteed response and resolution times for Critical, High, and Low-severity issues (Ref. Section 3.10.3).

- Score 9-10 (31.5-35 pts): Aggressive, binding resolution times for all tiers with clear escalation paths.
- Score 5-8 (17.5-28 pts): Standard response times with "best effort" resolution targets; lacks granular tier definitions.
- Score 0-4 (0-14 pts): No formal SLA provided or terms are overly vague.

4.10.3.3 Implementation Strategy (25 Points)
Requirement: A Project Management Plan outlining the transition from Purchase Order to "Go-Live" status, including risk mitigation (Ref. Section 3.10.4).

- Score 9-10 (22.5-25 pts): Detailed timeline with clear milestones, dedicated project managers, and comprehensive risk mitigation strategies.
- Score 5-8 (12.5-20 pts): Generic implementation timeline that lacks specific agency-level transition steps.
- Score 0-4 (0-10 pts): No formal project plan or implementation roadmap provided.

4.10.3.4 Marketing Strategy (20 Points)
Requirement: A brief overview of how the Proposer will promote this cooperative contract to eligible entities to drive volume (Ref. Section 3.8.3).

- Score 9-10 (18-20 pts): Aggressive strategy targeting FSA members via state-specific events, webinars, and dedicated contract landing pages.
- Score 5-8 (10-16 pts): Passive marketing approach or generic national campaign with no specific focus on the cooperative vehicle.
- Score 0-4 (0-8 pts): No marketing or outreach strategy provided.

4.10.4 Innovation and Value-Added Attributes (100 points)

4.10.4.1 Interoperability (30 Points)
Requirement: Proof of integration with common RMS/CAD systems and open API documentation (Ref. Section 3.9.3).

- Score 9–10 (27–30 pts): Documented, pre-built integrations with major public safety platforms and full access to open APIs. Open APIs that can be configured at no additional cost to the agency. Many times these are very costly “engineering” scopes.
- Score 5–8 (15–24 pts): API availability is mentioned, but requires custom development or lacks proven third-party connectors. May also have APIs that are configurable at cost to the agency
- Score 0–4 (0–12 pts): Little to no evidence of system interoperability or API support.

4.10.4.2 AI Governance Documentation (20 Points)

- Score 9–10 (18–20 pts): Provides a comprehensive governance manual showing a self-service "Admin Console" for guardrails. Explicitly confirms in writing that all sensitivity and logic adjustments are included at no additional cost for the life of the contract. Provides access to audit logs and inputs/outputs from AI models.

- Score 5–8 (10–16 pts): Documentation confirms guardrails are adjustable by the user, but the interface is described as "basic" or requires minor technical support. General confirmation of "no fees" is provided but lacks granular detail on specific guardrail limits. Audit logs track usage but with limited to no detail on inputs/outputs.

- Score 1–4 (2–8 pts): Guardrails are mentioned, but documentation suggests that "advanced" adjustments or logic changes may require vendor intervention or are not fully self-service.

- Score 0: Failed to provide AI governance documentation or specifically noted that guardrail modifications require paid professional services/modification fees.

4.10.4.3 Advanced AI Tools (10 Points)

Requirement: Evidence of efficiency tools such as Assisted Redaction or Automated Transcription (Ref. Section 3.7.4).

- Score 9–10 (9–10 pts): Functional AI tools with proven accuracy OR high degree workflow automation and advanced metadata indexing that provides similar time-savings.

- Score 5–8 (5–8 pts): Basic search tools or "roadmap" features that are not yet live.

- Score 0–4 (0–4 pts): No innovation or efficiency tools described.

4.10.4.4 Chain of Custody (20 Points)

Requirement: Description of hashing algorithms (SHA-256), or similar, and immutable audit trails (Ref. Section 3.9.5).

- Score 9–10 (18–20 pts): Uses industry-standard (SHA-256) hashing with automated, tamper-proof logs for every evidence interaction.

- Score 5–8 (10–16 pts): Basic audit trails are present but lack high-level encryption or automated logging features.

- Score 0–4 (0–8 pts): No description of evidence security or chain of custody integrity.

4.10.4.5 Training (20 Points)

Requirement: Details on "Train-the-Trainer" programs and multi-modal delivery methods (Ref. Section 3.10.4).

- Score 9–10 (18–20 pts): Comprehensive training plan including on-site, remote, and self-paced options with a certified "Train-the-Trainer" track.

- Score 5–8 (10–17 pts): Standard training materials or remote-only options without a formal trainer certification program.

- Score 0–4 (0–9 pts): No formal training delivery methods or program details provided.

4.10.5 Depth & Breadth of Offered Solutions (150 Points)

4.10.5.1 Capabilities Overview (60 Points)

- Score 9–10 (54–60 pts): Clear vision for a unified ecosystem with a roadmap showing modularity and future-proofing.
- Score 5–8 (30–48 pts): Solid existing capabilities but a vague or non-existent roadmap for future technology integration.
- Score 0–4 (0–24 pts): Limited or disjointed solutions that do not suggest a cohesive ecosystem.

4.10.5.2 Technical Specifications (50 Points)

- Score 9–10 (45–50 pts): All hardware exceeds minimum requirements for battery life and environmental ruggedness (IP ratings).
- Score 5–8 (25–40 pts): Hardware meets the "minimums" but lacks extended battery cycles or high-tier weather sealing.
- Score 0–4 (0–20 pts): Fails to provide specific spec sheets or hardware does not meet the minimum SOW requirements.

4.10.5.3 Security & Encryption (40 Points)

- Score 9–10 (36–40 pts): Provided a current, valid third-party certificate(s) or third-party audits for all security claims.
- Score 1–5 (4–20 pts): Agency Policy Cap. "Self-attestation" provided without external certification (scored significantly lower as per policy).
- Score 0 (0 pts): No mention of FIPS, SOC 2 or CJIS security protocols. ***A score of 0 results in disqualification***

4.10.6 TCO Package scored by HCSO FSD (400 Points)

Financial Transparency & Auditability (150 Points)

- **Consistency (50 pts):** Audit matching the Mock Quote, Mock Invoice, and Narrative.
  Formula: (Valid Points / 3) * 50
  HCSO will verify three matching points:
  1. Mock Quote Total is equal to Mock Invoice Total.
  2. Spreadsheet Line Items is equal to Narrative Description.
  3. Scenario Total is equal to the Sum of Parts.
- **Clarity of "All-In" Cost (50 pts):** Ease of identifying the 5-year lifecycle cost.
  - 50 Points awarded for providing an editable Excel with easily identified sections and complete with 5-year cost breakdown.
  - 25 Points awarded for providing Pricing Document in searchable/calculable format.
  - 0 Points awarded for PDF only or missing 5-year totals.
- **Simplicity of UOM (50 pts):** Clearly defined Units of Measure to prevent "billing surprises."
  - 50 Points awarded for all items using fixed units of measure (each, annual, per user, hour, etc)
  - -10 points deducted for every “usage-based” or “estimated” fee (e.g. “starts at,” “variable data fees”).

Relative Financial Value (250 Points)

Pricing will be evaluated based on the Category Discounting Model. Proposers shall provide a firm-fixed percentage discount off their MSRP (Manufacturer’s Suggested Retail Price) for each subcategory they are bidding. This model ensures the contract remains a 'Living Vehicle,' allowing for the addition of new products within an awarded subcategory as technology evolves, provided they adhere to the awarded discount rate.

- **Competitive Discounting (100 pts):** Depth of the "Cooperative Discount" relative to Offers from same Technology-Ecosystem Award Categories.
  - (Lowest Proposer Average TCO Component Discount by Weight / Subject Proposer Average TCO Component Discount by Weight) * 100 (See 3.13.4)
- **Category Discount (50 pts):** Guaranteed discount percentages for future technology releases.
  - (Subject Sum of Discount % / Highest Subject Sum of Discount % Offered in Category) * 50
- **Quantity-Tiered Pricing (75 pts)**: Points for this component will be awarded based on the Proposer’s "Efficiency Index," calculated across three (3) established Anchor Points.
  - Calculation Method: HCSO will average the guaranteed minimum discount percentages provided by the Proposer for the following unit quantities: 10 units, 100 units, and 500 units.
  - (Subject Average Anchor Discount / Highest Average Anchor Discount in Category) * 75
- **Price Stability (25 pts):** Documented caps on annual inflation or firm-fixed pricing.
  - 25 Points awarded for Firm Fixed pricing for the initial 5-year term.
  - 15 Points awarded for an annual escalation capped at a fixed % (e.g. CPI or 3% max).
  - 5 Points awarded where price is “subject to market” or includes “force majeure” or extraneous price adjustment clause.
  - 0 points awarded if no price stability statement is provided.