

**AMENDMENT
FOR
RFP NUMBER 0A02014**

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: 8/24/01

The State of Ohio, through the Department of Administrative Services, Computer Services Division, for the Office of Budget and Management (OBM) and the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) is issuing this amendment for the Request for Proposals entitled:

Ohio Administrative Knowledge System (OAKS) Business Needs Analysis

DATE RFP ISSUED:	July 31, 2001
INQUIRY PERIOD BEGINS:	July 31, 2001
INQUIRY PERIOD ENDS:	August 30, 2001 at 8:00 A.M.
OPENING DATE:	September 6, 2001
OPENING TIME:	11:00 A.M.
OPENING LOCATION:	Department of Administrative Services Computer Services Division Bid Room 30 East Broad Street, 40 th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

The attached page(s) represent the Request for Proposals (RFP) amendment for the RFP listed above. Please use replacement pages contained in this document to replace the page(s) previously issued by the State.

Specifications and requirements that have been revised are indicated with strikethroughs, bold type and underscores.

The committee will rate the Proposals, passing the Mandatory Requirements, based on the following criteria and weight assigned to each criterion.

TABLE 2

Criteria	Weight	Maximum Allowable Points
Proposal Requirements (TABLE 3)	70% 85%	4,464
Interview	10% 15%	638 788
Cost	20%	1,276
Total	100%	6,378 5,252

The following table lists the proposal requirements that will be evaluated and scored. The items included in the tables below will be used to determine the technical points and represent ~~70%~~ ~~85%~~ of the total weighted score. The Offeror, General and Staffing sections are weighted 30%, 35%, and 35% respectively. Many of the items are further defined in Attachment 2.

NOTE: Additional consideration will be given to proposals with a total project duration of less than thirty-six (36) weeks.

TABLE 3

Requirement	Weight	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds	Greatly Exceeds
Offeror					
1. Offeror Profile	20	0	5	7	9
2. Offeror Experience	12	0	5	7	9
Offeror Mandatory Requirements					
3. The offeror must have experience as the prime contractor in performing a business needs analysis for a completed ERP project implementation in state government within the past five (5) years.	20	REJECT	5	7	9
4. The offeror must have experience as the prime contractor or subcontractor in a successfully completed ERP project implementation in state government within the past five (5) years.	20	REJECT	5	7	9
5. The offeror must have five (5) years government experience at the federal, state, local or province level.	20	REJECT	5	7	9
6. The offeror must have experience with and propose a methodology that is consistent with SEI-CMM Level 2 or better.	20	REJECT	5	7	9
7. The offeror must have been an established entity for a minimum of 10 years.	20	REJECT	5	7	9
Offeror Desirable Qualifications					
8. The offeror has experience with a methodology that is consistent with SA-CMM Level 2 or better.	6	0	5	7	9
9. The offeror has experience with assisting clients in development of overall architecture, and the technical support for the implementation of that architecture within an ERP project.	12	0	5	7	9

The interviews will be scheduled at the discretion of the evaluation committee and will be held in the former Jeffrey Mining Warehouse located at 274 East First Avenue, Suite 200, Columbus. At the offeror's expense, the candidate must be available for an on-site interview.

Based upon the offeror's Proposal and interview, the State may decide that a Proposal is not in the best interest of the State, and may preclude it from further consideration.

Cost. Once the technical merits of a Proposal are considered, as described above, the costs of that Proposal will be considered. But it is within the committee's discretion to wait to factor in a Proposal's cost until after any interviews, presentations and discussions. Also, before evaluating the technical merits of the Proposals, the committee may do an initial review of costs to determine if any Proposals should be rejected because of excessive cost. And the committee may reconsider the excessiveness of any Proposal's cost at any time in the evaluation process.

The evaluation committee will then calculate the offeror's cost points after the offeror's total technical and interview points are determined. The offeror's cost points are calculated using the following formula:

Cost Points = (Lowest Offeror's Not to Exceed Fixed Price/Offeror's Not to Exceed Fixed Price) X C

- **Where the value of C is 1,276, 20% of the total weighted evaluation points.**

Total points will be determined by summing the technical points, ~~and~~ the Interview points **and the cost points**. See Attachment 19 for details on the scoring methodology.

Total Points = Technical Points (~~70%~~ ~~85%~~) + Interview Points (~~10%~~ ~~15%~~) + **Cost Points (20%)**

Clarifications & Corrections. It is the State's expectation that serious, experienced offerors will diligently consider the objectives and requirements of this RFP, and submit Proposals that represent their best efforts to comprehensively respond to the needs of the State. Accordingly, the State will consider each submission to be the offeror's best Proposal.

However, during the evaluation process, the Procurement Representative or the evaluation committee may request clarifications from any offeror under active consideration and may give any offeror the opportunity to correct defects in its Proposal if the Procurement Representative believes doing so does not result in an unfair advantage for the offeror and it is in the State's interests.

Alternatively, if there is to be no clarification phase because the committee feels it is unnecessary or inappropriate, the committee may choose to bypass the clarification and correction phase and make an award based solely on the evaluation and interview phase.

Financial Ability. Part of the Proposal evaluation criteria is the qualifications of the offeror, which includes as a component the offeror's financial ability to perform the Contract. This RFP may expressly require the submission of audited financial statements from all offerors in the Proposal contents attachment. But if the Proposal contents attachment does not make this an express requirement, the evaluation committee may still insist that an offeror submit audited financial statements for the past three (3) years if the committee is concerned that an offeror may not have the financial ability to carry out the Contract.

In evaluating an offeror's financial ability, the weight the committee assigns, if any, to that financial ability will depend on whether the offeror's financial position is adequate or inadequate. That is, if the offeror's financial ability is adequate, the value assigned to the offeror's relative financial ability in relation to other offerors may or may not be significant, depending on the nature of the Work. But if the evaluation committee believes the offeror's financial ability is not adequate, that decision will be a fatal one for the offeror's Proposal, and the committee may reject the Proposal despite its other merits.

Additional Interviews, Demonstrations, and Presentations. The Proposal evaluation committee may require some offerors to interview with the committee, make a presentation about their Proposal, and/or demonstrate their products or services. The presentations, demonstrations, and interviews will be scheduled at the convenience and discretion of the evaluation committee.

The evaluation committee may record any presentations, demonstrations, and interviews.

Determination of Responsibility. The evaluation committee may review the highest-ranking offeror to ensure that it is responsible. The contract may not be let to an offeror that is determined to be not responsible. The evaluation committee's determination of an offeror's responsibility may include the following factors: the offeror's and key contract personnel's experience, the offeror's and key contract personnel's past conduct on previous contracts, the offeror's and key contract personnel's past performance on previous contracts, the offeror's and key contract personnel's management skill, the offeror's compatibility with the agency for which DAS has issued this RFP and the offeror's ability to execute the contract properly.

Contract Negotiations. The final phase of the evaluation process may be contract negotiations. Negotiations will be scheduled at the convenience of the committee. The selected offeror(s) must negotiate in good faith.

Negotiations may be conducted with any offeror who submits a competitive Proposal, but the committee may limit discussions to specific aspects of the RFP. Any clarifications, corrections, or negotiated revisions that may occur during the negotiations phase will be reduced to writing and incorporated in the RFP or the offeror's proposal, as appropriate. Any offeror whose Proposal continues to be competitive will be accorded fair and equal treatment with respect to any clarification, correction, or revision of the RFP and will be given the opportunity to negotiation revisions to its Proposal based on the amended RFP. But should the evaluation process have resulted in a top-ranked Proposal, the committee may limit negotiations to only that offeror and not hold negotiations with any lower-ranking offeror. If negotiations are unsuccessful with the top-ranked offeror, the committee may then go down the line of remaining offerors, according to rank, and negotiate with the next highest-ranking offeror. Lower ranking offerors do not have a right to participate in negotiations conducted in such a manner.

Auction techniques that reveal one offeror's price to another or disclose any other material information derived from competing proposals are prohibited. Any oral modification of a proposal will be reduced to writing by the offeror as described below.

Following negotiations, the committee may set a date and time for the submission of best and final proposals by the remaining offeror(s). Best and final proposals may be submitted only once, unless the committee makes a written determination that it is in the State's interest to conduct additional discussions. In such cases, the committee may require another submission of best and final proposals. Otherwise, discussion of, or changes in, the best and final proposals will not be allowed. If an offeror does not submit a best and final proposal, the offeror's immediately previous proposal will be considered the offeror's best and final proposal.

It is entirely within the discretion of the committee whether to permit negotiations. **An offeror must not submit a Proposal assuming that there will be an opportunity to negotiate any aspect of the Proposal. The committee is free to limit negotiations to particular aspects of any Proposal, to limit the offerors with whom the committee wants to negotiate, or to dispense with negotiations entirely.**

The evaluation committee generally will not rank negotiations. The negotiations will normally be held to correct deficiencies in the preferred offeror's Proposal. If negotiations fail with the preferred offeror, the committee may negotiate with the next offeror in ranking. Alternatively, the committee may decide that it is in the interests of the State to negotiate with all the remaining offerors to determine if negotiations lead to an adjustment in the ranking of the remaining offerors.

From the opening of the Proposals to the award of the Contract, everyone working on behalf of the State to evaluate the Proposals will seek to limit access to information contained in the Proposals solely to those

people with a need to know the information. They will also seek to keep this information away from other offerors, and the evaluation committee will not be allowed to tell one offeror about the contents of another offeror's Proposal in order to gain a negotiating advantage.

Before the award of the Contract or cancellation of the RFP, any offeror that seeks to gain access to the contents of another offeror's Proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

Negotiated changes will be reduced to writing and become a part of the contract file open to inspection to the public. The written changes must be drafted and signed by the Contractor and submitted to the evaluation committee within five (5) business days. If the evaluation committee accepts the change, the Procurement Representative will give the offeror written notice of the committee's acceptance. The negotiated changes to the successful offer will become a part of the Contract.

Failure to Negotiate. If an offeror fails to provide the necessary information for negotiations in a timely manner, or fails to negotiate in good faith, the State may terminate negotiations with that offeror.

ATTACHMENT ONE: PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

This section describes the Work and what the Contractor must do to complete the Work. It also describes what the Contractor must deliver as part of the completed Project (the Deliverables).

Scope of Work. The Contractor must perform the detailed analyses and develop the detailed specifications required to implement OAKS. This work must be performed for each of the five (5) business functions.

Deliverable #1 – Requirements Document. For each of the five major business functions, the Contractor must perform an analysis of the current and (known) future needs of the business processes. The State will provide Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to supply the business knowledge which is critical to the completion of this task. The Document must include:

1. Context Diagrams – The Context Diagrams depicting the State’s current environment (See Attachment 5) must be validated or revised by the Contractor based upon the business needs analysis findings. Each context diagram must include a single circle representing one of the five major business functions, all the external entities, and at least one data flow connected to each external entity. Each data flow must have a unique label identifier and be represented as either an inbound or an outbound flow. Each external entity should be represented only once per business function diagram (even if the business function diagram is represented on multiple pages, except where the volume of data flows with an external entity require additional page representation).
2. Context Diagram Narratives – Using the Context Diagrams and the narratives developed by the State (See Attachments 5 and 6), the Contractor must validate and revise the narrative descriptions of all data flows which exist between the business functions and the external entities (Attachment 7) that are depicted on the Context Diagrams.
3. Module Level Requirements – The Contractor must validate and revise the high level requirements identified by the State (See Attachment 8). This includes adding to the document to include additional requirements identified during the business needs analysis. The requirements definitions should be complete but not compound, consistent (in terms of format, type of content, and interrelationship with other related requirements), and unambiguous.
4. Process Flows (data flow diagrams) - Using the Context Diagrams and Module Level Requirements as a reference, the Contractor must further analyze and document the detailed business processes. The processes are to be represented by data flow diagrams that visually depict the transformation of the data flows between the business functions and the external entities. The data flow could reference a document (the purchase order), report (the end of month report), a verbal transfer of data (“the supervisor tells us the start date”), or any other item that represents the flow of data between an external entity and the business function. The data flowing in must be sufficient to perform the transformation indicated and to create the outgoing flows. The logic and policy to perform the process are described in the process descriptions (see ~~Deliverable #2~~ **Deliverable #1** part 5. below). In addition, all data associated with each data flow needs to be defined. The Contractor must use the CASE tool System Architect 2001 to document the process flows.
5. Detailed Process Descriptions – The Contractor must write detailed process descriptions for each process diagram that is created. These process narratives must thoroughly describe the logical processing and not the current system’s automated data processing related functions. The descriptions must include the logic and policies required to complete the process and/or references to the applicable Business Rule.
6. Business Rules - The Business Rules must be documented in structured English or in a common procedure language and must be based on the requirements and processes identified.
 7. Entity Relationship Diagrams (ERD) – The Contractor must create the ERD which visually displays the major data entities and relationships. The ERD must contain the entities, the attributes for each entity, the definitions of each attribute (length, type, definition, etc.), the

ATTACHMENT NINETEEN: SCORING METHODOLOGY

The evaluation committee will utilize the following scoring methodology to determine the total points.
Third Table, Proposal Requirements. The three sections will be weighted as follows:

- 30% Offeror
- 35% General
- 35% Staffing
- 100%

The maximum raw scores that can be earned in each section are:
 1,350 Offeror Profile
 996 General
 2,118 Staffing

In order to achieve the scoring ratio of 30:35:35, the maximum raw scores will be adjusted as follows:

Section	Maximum Raw Score	Adjustment Factor	Adjusted Maximum Raw Score	
Offeror Profile	1,350	.9920	1,339.2	30%
General	996	1.5687	1,562.4	35%
Staffing	2,118	0.7377	1,562.4	35%
Adjusted Total Score			4,464	100%

Total Scoring: The offeror's Proposal and Interview will be weighted as follows:

- ~~85% Proposal~~
- ~~15% Interview~~
- ~~100%~~

~~The adjusted maximum raw scores that can be earned in each section are:
 4,464 Proposal
 788 Interview
 5,252 Total~~

- 70% Proposal
- 10% Interview
- 20% Cost
- 100%

The adjusted maximum raw scores that can be earned in each section are:
4,464 Proposal
638 Interview
1,276 Cost
6,378 Total