|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weightage | Proposal 1 | Proposal 2 | Proposal 3 | Weighted Score 1 | Weighted Score 2 | Weighted Score 3 |
| Management Approach | 0.15 | 80 | 90 | 60 | 12 | 13.5 | 9 |
| Technical Approach | 0.15 | 90 | 50 | 90 | 13.5 | 7.5 | 13.5 |
| Past Performance | 0.2 | 70 | 95 | 90 | 14 | 19 | 18 |
| Price | 0.2 | 90 | 80 | 80 | 18 | 16 | 16 |
| Interview Results and Samples | 0.3 | 80 | 95 | 65 | 24 | 28.5 | 19.5 |
| Total | 1 |  |  |  | 81.5 | 84.5 | 76 |

**Summary:**

* **Proposal 1**: Scored a total of 81.50, demonstrating a balanced approach, particularly strong in Management and Technical approaches.
* **Proposal 2**: Scored 84.50, standing out in Past Performance and Interview Results, although with a lower score in Technical Approach.
* **Proposal 3**: Scored 76.00, offering strong Technical and Past Performance scores but falling behind in Management Approach and Interview Results.

**Recommendation:**

After evaluating the proposals, Proposal 2 emerges as the strongest overall, particularly excelling in Past Performance and Interview Results and Samples. This suggests a reliable track record and quality assurance, crucial for project success. However, Proposal 1 presents a balanced approach, with a competitive price and a robust technical strategy, making it a viable alternative.

Given the project's goals, the strong technical focus, and the need for balanced management, we recommend **Proposal 2** for its comprehensive alignment with NutriScope's objectives, particularly in terms of experience and preparation. This proposal’s past performance and quality samples suggest a dependable partner for project success, providing value beyond its initial scores.