

Committee Evaluation Summary

**RFP 24-500669 Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP-1) Implementation**

<b>Criteria (points)</b>	<b>NIA Realty</b>	<b>RE Global</b>	<b>National Property Institute</b>
<b>Technical Approach (15points)</b>	NIA expressed their interest in providing the services, however, was not very detailed in their approach.	RE Global did a great job explaining their technical approach.	NPI technical approach was very thorough and concise.
<b>Project Management (10 point)</b>	Nia Realty did not have very much experience in Project Management. The explanation was not specific as to how they would manage the project.	REI was able to thoroughly explain their project management capabilities and aligning them with their personnel.	NPI was very detailed in explaining their execution for project management.
<b>Personnel / Staffing (20 Points)</b>	NIA provided information in reference to personnel and their backgrounds.	RE Global was able to show that they have experienced personnel to handle the project.	National Property Institute was able to show that they have experienced personnel to handle the needs of this project.
<b>Organization Qualifications/ Experience (20 points)</b>	NIA was able to show some limited qualifications and experience.	RE Global was able to show their experience with NSP programs. They appear to be capable of performing the job duties.	NPI was able to show their years of experience with other NSP programs in other counties. They appear to be capable of performing the job duties.
<b>Financial Responsibility (5 Points)</b>	All Financials were acceptable due to the amount of time the business has been around and able to manage using the finances provided.	All Financials were acceptable due to the amount of time the business has been around and able to manage using the finances provided.	All Financials were acceptable due to the amount of time the business has been around and able to manage using the finances provided.
<b>References / Past Performances (5 points)</b>	The references that were received were favorable. One (1) did not reply.	One (1) reference was favorable. Of the three references submitted one (1) reference was submitted twice. One (1) reference did not reply.	The references that were received were favorable. One (1) did not reply.
<b>LSBE Participation (Max. 10)</b>	The Proposer has 20% participation with a certified LSBE-DeKalb.	The Proposer has 20% participation with a certified LSBE-MSA.	The Proposer has 20% participation with a certified LSBE-DeKalb.