CMIPS II
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
HHSDC 4130-141A
Addendum ~~8~~10

Section 10
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 3

2 EVALUATION TEAM 3

3 EVALUATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES 4

3.1 DRAFT PROPOSAL REVIEW 4
3.2 FINAL PROPOSAL REVIEW 5
3.2.1 Submission Review 5
3.2.2 Compliance Review – Volume 1 and Volume 2 5
3.2.3 Scoring Review 5

4 FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION SCORING 5

4.1 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS – CORPORATE REFERENCE SCORING 7
4.2 SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS 10
4.2.1 Architecture Design Specification 10
4.2.2 Concept of Operations Scenarios 11
4.2.3 Capacity Management Plan 12
4.3 PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS 13
4.3.1 Project Master Plan 14
4.3.2 Master Work Plan 18
4.3.3 Project Staffing Plan 18
4.3.4 Key Staff 19
4.3.4.1 Key Staff Scoring 19
4.3.4.2 Proposed Key Staff Interviews 21
4.4 FUNCTIONAL SCORE AND POINT ALLOCATION 22

5 COST EVALUATION 22

5.1 COST SUBMISSION REVIEW 22
5.2 COST REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION 22
5.3 STATE DATA CENTER SERVICES COST EVALUATION 23
5.4 COUNTY DESKTOP COMPUTER COST 23
5.5 PREFERENCE EVALUATIONS 23
5.5.1 Small Business Preference 23
5.5.2 Local Agency Military Base Recovery Act (LAMBRA) Preference. 24
5.5.3 Target Area Contract Preference Act (TACPA) Preference 24
5.5.4 Enterprise Zone Act (EZA) Preference 24
5.6 COST SCORE AND POINT ALLOCATION 24

6 DETERMINATION OF WINNING PROPOSAL 25

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. EVALUATION TEAM MATRIX 3
TABLE 2. EVALUATION SCORING 6
TABLE 3. CORPORATE REFERENCE RESPONSES 9
TABLE 4. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS SCORING 10
TABLE 5. ARCHITECTURE DESIGN SPECIFICATION SCORING 11
TABLE 6. OPERATIONS SCENARIO SCORING 12
TABLE 7. CAPACITY MANAGEMENT PLAN SCORING 13
TABLE 8. PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS SCORING 14
TABLE 9. PROJECT MASTER PLAN (PMP) SCORING 14
TABLE 10. MASTER WORK PLAN SCORING 18
TABLE 11. PROJECT STAFFING PLAN SCORING 19
TABLE 12. KEY STAFF SCORING 20
TABLE 13. TOTAL PROJECT COST EVALUATION 24
TABLE 14. COST SCORING EXAMPLE 25

1 INTRODUCTION

This section defines the plan for the evaluation of proposals that are offered in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). This plan documents the procedures and checklists that are used to ensure that Bidder selection will be the best value solution for the State. This plan covers only the evaluation process, running from the day that Draft Proposals are due to release of the Notice of Intent to Award.

2 EVALUATION TEAM

The State has established an Evaluation Team comprised of individuals selected from Department of General Services (DGS); Office of Systems Integration (OSI), Department of Technology Services (DTS); Department of Health Services (DHS); California Department of Social Services (CDSS) management, staff, and their representatives; and County Personal Care Services Program/IHSS Plus Waiver/In-Home Support Services (PCSP/IPW/IHSS) Residual Program staff. The Evaluation Team is responsible for the review and evaluation of Bidder proposals in accordance with the process described in this section. The State may engage additional qualified individuals during the process to assist the Evaluation Team in gaining a better understanding of technical, legal, contractual, or program issues. These individuals do not have voting or scoring privileges or responsibility for the evaluation process.

The Evaluation Team is comprised of five Sub-Teams focusing on individual areas:

- Administrative Requirements Sub-Team (AR)
- Project Management Requirements Sub-Team (PT)
- System Requirements Sub-Team (ST)
- Concept of Operations Sub-Team (CO)
- Cost Review Sub-Team (CR)

Each Sub-Team focuses on subcomponents of the Proposal as described below but may reference other sections of the Proposal to support their findings. At least one member from the PT Sub-Team will review the entire set of deliverables for consistency.

Table 1. Evaluation Team Matrix

	SUB- TEAM				
SUB-SECTION	AR	PT	ST	CO	CR
Submission Review	✕				
Volume 1 – Response to Requirements includes:					
Tab 1 General (Cover Letter, Proposal Transmittal Form, Executive Summary, Table of Contents and Literature)	✕				
Tab 2 Administrative Requirements Response	✕				
Tab 3 System Requirements Response	✕				
Tab 4 Statement of Work Response	✕				
Tab 5 Corporate References	✕				
Tab 6 System Requirements Plans and Documents			✕	✕	

	SUB- TEAM				
SUB-SECTION	AR	PT	ST	CO	CR
Tab 6.1 Architecture Design Specification			✕		
Tab 6.2 Concept of Operations Scenarios				✕	
Tab 6.3 Capacity Management Plan			✕		
Tab 7 Project Management Plans and Documents		✕			
Tab 7.1 Project Master Plan		✕			
Tab 7.2 Master Work Plan		✕			
Tab 7.3 Project Staffing Plan		✕			
Tab 7.4 Key Staff	✕	✕			
Tab 7.5 Statement of Work Traceability Matrix		✕			
Tab 8 Proposal Exhibits	✕				
Volume 2 –Contract	✕				
Volume 3 – Cost Proposal					✕

The Sub-Teams will consult as needed with subject matter experts, including CDSS legal, State Data center Services staff, State Network Services staff, CMIPS project management consultant, CMIPS system engineering consultant, CMIPS business process consultant, County program managers, and County Information Technology (IT) staff.

3 EVALUATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

The following paragraphs outline the steps involved in the evaluation process.

3.1 Draft Proposal Review

The AR Sub-Team will conduct a submission review and a compliance review on the Draft Proposals in the same manner as described in Paragraph 3.2, Final Proposal Review. The Evaluation Team Sub-Teams will review their assigned deliverables as indicated in Table 1. Evaluation Team Matrix to identify the following:

- Any “qualifiers,” “assumptions” or conditions placed on the proposal (conditional proposals and invalid assumptions are not acceptable).
- Document areas in which a Bidder’s Proposal appears to
  - Be non-responsive to the requirements of the RFP
  - Require additional clarification
  - Introduce unreasonable risk to the State

Note: The presence of cost data in the Draft Proposal may be grounds for rejection.

After the submission and review of the Draft Proposals, a Confidential Discussion date and time is set with each Bidder to discuss items identified during the Draft Proposal review. For specific information see Section 2, RULES GOVERNING COMPETITION, Paragraph 3.5, Draft Proposal and Paragraph 3.6, Confidential Discussion with Each Bidder.

The State does not warrant that all defects will be detected, and such notification does not preclude the rejection of the Final Proposal due to errors subsequently identified and those remaining in the Final Proposal.

3.2 Final Proposal Review

During evaluation of the Final Proposal, the Evaluation Team may request help from the Bidder to locate information in the Proposal and to clarify the Bidder's intent if the proposal appears to contain conflicting information. However, this request for clarification is not an opportunity for the Bidder to change or add material to its proposal.

3.2.1 Submission Review

The AR Sub-Team conducts a submission review. This is to determine if the proposal satisfies the following criteria:

1. Was Delivered on time
2. Was properly marked and sealed
3. Properly identified the "Master" copies
4. Provided separately sealed Volume 3 - Cost Proposal
5. Provided the correct number of copies
6. Was in conformance with the requirements of Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT.

Absence of required information may result in the Proposal being deemed nonresponsive and may be cause for rejection.

3.2.2 Compliance Review – Volume 1 and Volume 2

The Evaluation Teams review the following components of the Bidder's Proposal to determine whether it meets the mandatory requirements:

- Volume 1 – Response to Requirements
- Volume 2 –Contract

If a proposal fails to meet any mandatory requirement satisfactorily or contains any "qualifiers", "assumptions" or conditions that are unacceptable to the State, the proposal may be considered nonresponsive and may be rejected. If all mandatory requirements are not met and the deficiencies are material, the Bidder will be considered nonresponsive and will be eliminated from further evaluation.

3.2.3 Scoring Review

Proposals that meet all of the minimum requirements of the RFP during the Submission Review and Compliance Review will be given a base score of zero (0). Points will be awarded only for exceeding mandatory or minimum requirements with products or services that provide value to the State based on the criteria defined in Paragraph 4, Functional Evaluation Scoring, Paragraph 5, Cost Evaluation, and Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

4 FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION SCORING

The best value to the State is evaluated based on a maximum of 10,000 points which is the sum of the Total Functional Score and the Cost Score as shown in Table 2, Evaluation Scoring. The

Functional Score represents 6,000 points or sixty percent (60%) of the total points attainable as defined in the following paragraphs. The other 4,000 points or forty percent (40 %) of the total available points is associated with the Cost Score as defined in Paragraph 5, Cost Evaluation.

Table 2. Evaluation Scoring

CATEGORY	MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE	RFP SECTION REFERENCE
Administrative Requirements	800	5
System Requirements	2,800	6
Project Management Requirements	2,400	6
Total Functional Score	**6,000**	
Cost Score	4,000	8
Total Score (Best Value to the State)	**10,000**	

The Total Functional Score (up to 6,000 points) is the sum of the three category scores for Administrative Requirements, System Requirements, and Project Management Requirements. In turn, each category score consists of the sum of the scores for deliverables required for that category. Each deliverable score is the sum of the scores for individual requirements within that deliverable. The following is the process used to score the proposal:

1. Each Evaluator reviews his/her assigned deliverables. The Administrative Requirements evaluators review the Corporate References. The System Requirements evaluators review the deliverables for the Architecture Design Specification and Capacity Management Plan, as defined in Table 4. System Requirements Scoring. The Concept of Operations evaluators review the Concept of Operations Scenarios as defined in Table 4. The Project Management Requirements evaluators review the deliverable for the Project Master Plan, Master Work Plan, Project Staffing Plan, and Key Staff References, as defined in Table 8 Project Management Requirements Scoring.
2. Each deliverable has a set of scorable requirements. For example, the Project Master Plan scorable requirements are based on individual sections of the plan as shown in Table 9. Project Master Plan (PMP) Scoring. The Sub-Team assigned for a category and deliverable reviews each scorable requirement and agrees by consensus upon a raw score based on the scale from Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology. The Sub-Team enters a final raw score (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, or 100%) for each scorable requirement into the evaluation worksheet.
3. The Sub-Team calculates the score for each scorable requirement by multiplying the raw score percentage from step 2 by the points available for the scorable requirement. For example, within the Project Master Plan (PMP) deliverable, there are 30 points available for the scorable requirement of “Training” as shown in Table 9. So if that scorable requirement received a raw score of 80%, then that scorable requirement would have a score of 24.0 (80% of 30).
4. The score for the deliverable is the total of the scores for scorable requirements from step 3.
5. The category score is the sum of the deliverable scores from step 4.

6. Finally the Evaluation Team calculates the Total Functional Score by summing the category scores from step 5.

4.1 Administrative Requirements – Corporate Reference Scoring

There are eight hundred (800) maximum points available for the Mandatory Scorable Corporate Reference Requirement. The Bidder must submit at least three reference contacts as defined in Section 5, ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, Paragraph 3.3, Corporate References. If the proposal contains more than three references, the State will perform reference checks on the first three that can be contacted. If a reference cannot be contacted within three tries the Evaluation Team may decide to continue trying or they may post a zero score for the reference. If necessary, the AR Sub-Team will ask additional questions to clarify Corporate Reference responses.

1. The State will contact references and first validate the information provided in response to Section 6, SOW and Section 6, SyRS as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Paragraph 6.1.5, Tab 5 - Corporate References. The validated information will be used to assess the minimum qualifications, which include the following:
   a. The Bidder has been awarded at least three (3) contracts for projects that were under contract and active within the past five (5) years to implement and maintain a system whose functionality is similar in size and complexity to the requirements of this RFP where:
      i) Each project system had at least 1,000 users (mandatory).
      ii) The contract budget for each project was at least $30M (mandatory).
      iii) At least one project provided payroll management for at least 80,000 employees (mandatory).
      iv) At least one project resulted in a system that was successfully designed, developed, implemented, and accepted by the Corporate Reference prior to Bid submission date (mandatory).
      v) At least one project has implemented a system with users that are geographically disbursed in at least 30 separate locations (mandatory).
      vi) At least one project had a system for case management (desirable).
   b. Collectively, the Bidder's proposed team has provided services for all facets of the system life cycle, including planning, design, development, implementation, maintenance and operation as evaluated in the project and system descriptions and validated by the questions in item # 4 below (desirable).
2. In the event that information obtained from the Bidder is incorrect based on the reference validation, the State will assess minimum qualifications based on the corrected information. If the Bidder fails to meet the minimum qualifications, the State shall reject the proposal.
3. For the corporate reference scoring, the term "Bidder" applies to the collective team of the prime contractor and its subcontractors. For example, if the prime contractor has successfully completed two major IT projects and a subcontractor one, then the proposal may use those three projects for references.
4. The State will ask the reference contact the following questions, and follow-up questions as appropriate, and determine scores for each response.
      i) How successful was the Bidder in project management?

~~i)~~ii) How effective was the Bidder in helping to control "scope creep" during the Design, Development and Implementation (DDI) phase?

iii) (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

~~ii)~~iv) How effective was the Bidder in controlling the Contract budget during DDI? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

~~iii)~~v) How effective was the Bidder in controlling the project schedule during DDI? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

b. How successful was the Bidder at system development?

i) (Not Successful, Somewhat Successful, Successful, Very Successful, Exceptionally Successful, Not Applicable)

c. Was the Bidder successful at system implementation based on the following:

i) Completed acceptable Implementation Plan? (No, Yes, Not Applicable)

ii) Completed successful data clean up? (No, Yes, Not Applicable)

iii) Completed successful data conversion? (No, Yes, Not Applicable)

iv) How effective was user training? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

v) How successful was the Bidder in executing the implementation plan? (Not Successful, Somewhat Successful, Successful, Very Successful, Exceptionally Successful, Not Applicable)

d. How successful was the Bidder at system maintenance for the project?

i) How effective was the Bidder at applying timely corrections to system defects? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

ii) How successful was the Bidder at applying requested enhancements to the system? (Not Successful, Somewhat Successful, Successful, Very Successful, Exceptionally Successful, Not Applicable)

e. How successful was the Bidder at system operations for the project?

i) How successful was the Bidder at meeting system availability and performance requirements? (Not Successful, Somewhat Successful, Successful, Very Successful, Exceptionally Successful, Not Applicable)

ii) How effective was the Bidder at managing interfaces? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

f. How effective was the Bidder's user support and help desk? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

g. How effective was the Bidder's system and user documentation? (Not Effective, Somewhat Effective, Effective, Very Effective, Exceptionally Effective, Not Applicable)

h. How successful was the Bidder in working with the reference customer? (Not Successful, Somewhat Successful, Successful, Very Successful, Exceptionally Successful, Not Applicable)

i. What was the quality of the team the Bidder provided on the project? (Low, Average, High, Not Applicable)

j. What was the stability of the team the Bidder provided on the project? (Low, Average, High, Not Applicable)

Each of the three Corporate Reference checks can receive a maximum of two hundred and sixty-seven (267) points. The Bidder can earn a maximum of 15 points for the two desirable qualifications defined in Paragraph 4.1, Administrative Requirements: five points for item 1a(vi) and ten points for item 1b. The remaining 252 points are evaluated based on the responses given by the Corporate Reference contacts to the 18 questions above. Each question is weighted equally (14 maximum points each). A Corporate Reference response is given zero (0) points if a reference contact responds with "Not Applicable" to a question. A Corporate Reference response is also given zero (0) points if a reference contact responds with either "Not Effective", "Not Successful", or "No" to a question. All other responses are scored based on the percentage of maximum points shown in Table 3, Corporate Reference Responses. For example, if the answer to Question a(i) is "effective" the resulting score would be seven (14 times 50%).

Table 3. Corporate Reference Responses

RESPONSE SET	PERCENTAGE OF POINTS AVAILABLE FOR THE QUESTION
Questions a, c(iv), d(i), e(ii), f, g	
Not Effective	0%
Somewhat Effective	25%
Effective	50%
Very Effective	75%
Exceptionally Effective	100%
Not Applicable	0%
Questions b, c(v), d(ii), e(i), h	
Not Successful	0%
Somewhat Successful	25%
Successful	50%
Very Successful	75%
Exceptionally Successful	100%
Not Applicable	0%
Questions i, j	
Low	33%
Average	67%
High	100%
Not Applicable	0%
Question Set c (i-iii)	
No	0%
Yes	100%

RESPONSE SET	PERCENTAGE OF POINTS AVAILABLE FOR THE QUESTION
Not Applicable	0%

The total score for an individual Corporate Reference check is the sum of the points evaluated for each question asked of the reference contact. The total score for the Corporate Reference for each Bidder is the sum of all three reference scores.

4.2 System Requirements

Two thousand eight hundred (2,800) maximum points are available for the System Requirements. The State awards points for each System Scorable Requirement response based on how well the Bidder has exceeded, by providing products or services that add value to the State, the requirements in Section 6, SOW and Section 6, SyRS as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT.

Table 4. System Requirements Scoring

SYSTEM REQUIREMENT	POINTS AVAILABLE
Architecture Design Specification	1,300
Concept of Operations Scenarios	1,000
Capacity Management Plan	500
Total	**2,800**

4.2.1 Architecture Design Specification

One thousand three hundred (1,300) maximum points are available for the Architecture Design Specification (ADS). Each subsection within the ADS is scored separately and the available points are identified in Table 5. Architecture Design Specification Scoring. The State evaluates each section on how well the Bidder meets or exceeds the requirements in Section 6 SOW, Section 6, SyRS and industry standard as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Table 3. Architecture Design Specification Format.

Scoring Criteria

Each ADS section score is determined by the points available multiplied by the Evaluation Team rating (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) which is based on the scoring criteria in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

In determining the level of "confidence that the proposal item is not risk-prone" in Exhibit 10-1, the Proposal ADS evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. How well the proposal supports the System Quality Attributes as defined in Appendix A, Acronyms and Glossary.
2. How well the Bidder's proposed integration of components supports task completion.
3. The compatibility with existing State and County equipment, architecture and procedures.

Table 5. Architecture Design Specification Scoring

ADS REF	SECTION	POINTS AVAILABLE
2	System Overview	20
3	Architectural Design	5
3.1	CMIPS II Production Environment	140
3.2	Development Environment	115
3.3	Test Environment	115
4	Top-Level Database Design	~~105~~95
5	Concept of Execution	5
5.1	Automated Time and Attendance	10
5.1.1	Automated Time and Attendance Architecture	55
5.1.2	Automated Time and Attendance Concept of Execution	75
5.2	Forms	10
5.2.1	Forms Architecture	40
5.2.2	Forms Concept of Execution	75
5.3	Reports	10
5.3.1	Reports Architecture	45
5.3.2	Reports Concept of Execution	60
5.4	External Interface	10
5.4.1	External Interface Architecture	45
5.4.2	External Interface Concept of Execution	60
5.~~6~~5	System Performance	10
5.~~6~~5.1	System Performance Architecture	45
5.~~6~~5.2	System Performance Concept of Execution	60
5.~~7~~6	~~System Administration~~User Security	10
5.~~7~~6.1	~~System Administration Architecture~~User Security architecture	25
5.~~7~~6.2	~~System Administration~~User Security Concept of Execution	40
5.~~8~~7	Printer Specification	20
5.8	Workstation Configuration	10
6	Requirements Allocation Matrix	90
	Total	**1,300**

4.2.2 Concept of Operations Scenarios

A total of one thousand (1,000) maximum points are available for the total Concept of Operations Scenarios score. The total Concept of Operations Scenario score is the sum of scores for the System Overview, the Concepts for the Proposed System, and each of the eight Concept of Operations scenarios as shown in Table 6, Operations Scenario Scoring. Each scenario is evaluated on how well the Bidder meets or exceeds the requirements in Section 6, SOW and industry standards as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Table 4. Concept of Operations Format.

Scoring Criteria

Each Concept of Operations section score is determined by the points available in Table 6, multiplied by the Evaluation Team rating (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) which is based on the scoring criteria in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

In determining the level of "confidence that the proposal item is not risk-prone" in Exhibit 10-1, the Concept of Operations evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. How well the Concept of Operations Scenario meets the proposed business flows.
2. How well the level of automation benefits the system users and program consumers.

Table 6. Operations Scenario Scoring

CON OPS REF	SCENARIOS	POINTS AVAILABLE
2	System Overview	40
3	Concepts for the Proposed System	60
	Scenarios	
4	Case Management – Scenario 1	110
4	Case Management – Scenario 2	110
4	Payroll – Scenario 3	110
4	Payroll – Scenario 4	90
4	Provider Management – Scenario 5	150
4	Program Management – Scenario 6	150
4	Forms Generation – Scenario 7	90
4	Reports – Scenario 8	90
	Total	**1,000**

4.2.3 Capacity Management Plan

Five hundred (500) maximum points are available for the Capacity Management Plan. The total Capacity Management Plan score is the sum of scores for each section of the Capacity Management Plan as shown in Table 7, Capacity Management Plan Scoring. Each section is evaluated on how well the Bidder meets or exceeds the requirements in Section 6, SOW and industry standards as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Table 5 Capacity Management Plan Format.

Scoring Criteria

Each Capacity Management Plan section score is determined by the points available in Table 7 multiplied by the Evaluation Team rating (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) which is based on the scoring criteria that in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

In determining the level of "confidence that the proposal item is not risk-prone" in Exhibit 10-1, the Capacity Management Plan evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. How well defined and proven is the methodology supporting the Capacity Management Plan.

2. How well the Bidder's methodology supports Capacity Management.
3. How well the Plan leverages the existing infrastructure.

Table 7. Capacity Management Plan Scoring

SECTION NUMBER	SECTIONS	POINTS AVAILABLE
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview	2
1.2	Document Overview	1
1.3	References	1
2	Assumptions	10
3	Organization	0
3.1	Organizational Structure	20
3.2	Roles and Responsibilities	30
4	Processes and Procedures	0
4.1	Capacity Management Process	10
4.1.1	Planning	35
4.1.2	Monitoring and Analysis	35
4.1.3	Problem Resolution	35
4.1.4	Reporting and Metrics	30
4.2	Interface with Change Management	10
4.3	Interface with DDI Release Management	10
4.4	Interface with M&O Release Management	10
4.5	Interface with Service Level Management	0
5	Production Capacity Plan	10
5.1	Server Capacity	40
5.2	Client Workstation Capacity	25
5.3	Network Capacity	50
5.4	Storage Capacity	35
6	Resource Forecast	60
7	Risks	40
	Total	**500**

4.3 Project Management Requirements

Two thousand four hundred (2,400) maximum points are available for Project Management Requirements. The State evaluates the Bidder's Project Management approach based on the

requirements Section 6, SOW as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT. The scoring methodology for the Project Management requirements can be found in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology. Table 8. Project Management Requirements Scoring identifies the maximum points for each Project Management Requirement.

Table 8. Project Management Requirements Scoring

PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT	POINTS AVAILABLE
Project Master Plan	900
Master Work Plan	400
Project Staffing Plan	100
Key Staff References	1000
Total	**2,400**

4.3.1 Project Master Plan

Nine hundred (900) maximum points are available for the Project Master Plan. The total Project Master Plan score is the sum of scores for the each section of the Project Master Plan as shown in Table 9. Project Master Plan (PMP) Scoring. Each section is evaluated on how well the Bidder meets or exceeds the requirements in Section 6, SOW and industry standards as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Table 6 Project Master Plan Format.

Scoring Criteria

Each Project Master Plan section score is determined by the points available in Table 9 multiplied by the Evaluation Team rating (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) which is based on the scoring criteria that in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

In determining the level of "confidence that the proposal item is not risk-prone" in Exhibit 10-1, the Project Master Plan evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. How well defined and proven are the proposed methodologies for task accomplishment.
2. How well the contractor processes fit and flow with the State and County business processes.
3. How well the level of automation benefits the State and County staff and program consumers.

Table 9. Project Master Plan (PMP) Scoring

PMP Heading Number	PMP Section	POINTS Available
1	OVERVIEW	0
1.1	PROJECT PURPOSE AND SCOPE	1
1.2	PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS	1
1.3	PROJECT DELIVERABLES	1
1.4	SCHEDULE AND SUMMARY	1
1.5	REFERENCES	1
2	PROJECT ORGANIZATION	0
2.1	External Organization	1

PMP Heading Number	PMP Section	**POINTS** Available
2.2	Internal Structure	2
2.3	Roles and Responsibilities	2
3	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	0
3.1	PROJECT PLANNING	1
3.1.1	Project Master Plan (PMP)	1
3.1.2	Master Work Plan	1
3.1.3	Schedule	1
3.1.4	Budget Planning	1
3.2	CONTROL PROCESSES	0
3.2.1	Schedule and Budget Management	25
3.2.2	Staffing Management	15
3.2.3	Deliverable Standards and Acceptance Process	0
3.2.4	Issue Management	25
3.2.5	Change Management	15
3.2.6	Configuration Management	15
3.2.7	Risk Management	5
3.2.8	Project Metrics	5
3.2.9	Corrective Action Plan (CAP)	0
3.3	PROJECT INITIATION	5
3.4	PROJECT CLOSEOUT	5
4	TECHNICAL PROCESSES	0
4.1	SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	0
4.1.1	System Development Planning	5
4.1.2	System Requirements Validation	10
4.1.3	Concept of Operations Scenarios	5
4.1.4	General System Design (GSD)	10
4.1.5	Detailed System Design (DSD)	15
4.1.6	Coding and Documentation	15
4.1.7	Development Reporting and Metrics	15
4.2	SYSTEM TEST AND EVALUATION	0
4.2.1	Test Planning and Deliverables	5
4.2.2	Software Unit and Component Testing	15
4.2.3	Integration Testing	15
4.2.4	System Qualification Testing	15
4.2.5	Regression Testing	5
4.2.~~5~~6	Release Readiness Review	~~10~~5
4.2.~~6~~7	System Test and Evaluation Reporting and Metrics	15

PMP Heading Number	PMP Section	**POINTS** Available
4.3	SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENTS	0
4.3.1	System Maintenance and Enhancement Overview	15
4.3.2	Project Maintenance Planning	10
4.3.3	Modification Management	25
4.3.4	Defect Corrections	20
4.3.5	Release Management	20
4.4	SYSTEM OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION	0
4.4.1	System Operation Planning	10
4.4.2	Data Distribution	10
4.4.3	Capacity Planning and Management	0
4.4.4	Operations Management	15
4.4.5	System Security	15
4.4.6	Backup and Recovery	10
4.4.7	Data Archive	10
4.4.8	Disaster Recovery	10
4.4.9	Customer Service/Help Desk	20
4.4.10	System Administration Reporting and Metrics	5
4.5	STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION	0
4.5.1	Implementation Roles and Responsibilities	10
4.5.2	Statewide Implementation Planning	15
4.5.3	Business Change Management	20
4.5.4	System Deployment Preparation	0
4.5.4.1	Data Cleanup	20
4.5.4.2	Data Conversion	15
4.5.4.3	Site Preparation	15
4.5.4.4	Training	~~30~~20
4.5.4.5	Training Materials	5
4.5.4.6	Communications and Public Outreach	5
4.5.5	Release Installation	10
4.5.6	Pilot Operation	15
4.5.7	County Deployment	40
4.5.8	CDSS Deployment	10
4.5.9	Business Services Migration	15
4.5.10	Implementation Reviews	5
4.5.11	Implementation Reporting and Metrics	10

PMP Heading Number	PMP Section	**POINTS** Available
4.6	PROGRAM SUPPORT	0
4.6.1	Program Support Planning	5
4.6.2	Case Management Services	5
4.6.3	Payroll Processing Services	0
4.6.3.1	Daily Processing	10
4.6.3.2	Taxes	5
4.6.3.3	W2	5
4.6.3.4	Withholding Management	5
4.6.3.5	Liens	5
4.6.3.6	Warrant Problem Management	5
4.6.3.7	Timesheet Processing	~~30~~25
4.6.3.8	Direct Deposit Services	5
4.6.4	Program Integrity Services	10
4.6.5	Funding Source Management	10
4.6.6	Website Management	15
4.6.7	Forms Support	10
4.6.8	Reporting Support	10
4.6.9	Project Service Requests	5
4.6.10	CDSS APB Infrastructure Support	0
4.6.11	Legal Impact Analysis Services	0
4.6.12	Program Support Reporting and Metrics	5
5	SUPPORTING PROCESSES	0
5.1	COMMUNICATION	5
5.2	DOCUMENTATION MANAGEMENT	0
5.3	QUALITY MANAGEMENT	0
5.3.1	Product Assurance	10
5.3.2	Verification and Validation	10
5.3.3	Process Assurance	10
5.3.4	Joint Reviews	5
5.3.5	Quality Reporting and Metrics	10
5.4	SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT	5
5.5	PROCESS IMPROVEMENT	0
5.6	FACILITIES	0
5.7	HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE	0
	TOTAL	**900**

4.3.2 Master Work Plan

Four hundred (400) maximum points are available for the Master Work Plan. The total score for the Master Work Plan is the sum of the scores for each section defined in Table 10. Master Work Plan Scoring. The State evaluates each section based on the requirements defined in Section 6, SOW and Section 6, SyRS as referenced in Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Paragraph 6.1.7.2 Tab 7.2 – Master Work Plan.

Scoring Criteria

Each Master Work Plan section score is determined by the points available in Table 10 multiplied by the Evaluation Team rating (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) which is based on the scoring criteria that in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

In determining the level of "confidence that the proposal item is not risk-prone" in Exhibit 10-1, the Master Work Plan evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. The correlation between the Master Work Plan and the activities proposed in the Project Master Plan.
2. The correlation between the Master Work Plan and the resources proposed in the Project Staffing Plan.
3. The accuracy and completeness of the activities identified to complete the task(s) and milestones.
4. The accuracy and completeness of the task dependencies.

Table 10. Master Work Plan Scoring

WORK PLAN PHASE	POINTS AVAILABLE
Initiation	90
Design, Development. & Implementation	
Requirements Validation	90
General Design	35
Detail Design	35
Coding & Documentation	35
System Test	35
Statewide Implementation	35
Maintenance & Operations	45
Total	400

4.3.3 Project Staffing Plan

One hundred (100) maximum points are available for the Project Staffing Plan. The total Project Staffing Plan score is the sum of scores for the each section of the Project Staffing Plan as shown in Table 11. Project Staffing Plan Scoring. Each section is evaluated on how well the Bidder meets or exceeds the requirements in Section 6, SOW and industry standards as referenced in

Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT, Table 8. Project Staffing Plan Format. Each section is evaluated on how well the Bidder exceeded the requirements by providing products or services that add value to the State based on the criteria below. The scoring methodology that will be used to evaluate the requirements can be found in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

Scoring Criteria

Each Project Staffing Plan section score is determined by the points available in Table 11 multiplied by the Evaluation Team rating (0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) which is based on the scoring criteria that in Exhibit 10-1 Scoring Methodology.

In determining the level of "confidence that the proposal item is not risk-prone" in Exhibit 10-1, the Project Staffing Plan evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. The effectiveness of the Bidder's organization, the lines of responsibility and logical division of resources.
2. The level and suitability of the staffing resource allocation.
3. The approach to defining staffing levels to meet project requirements without exceeding staff resource availability.
4. Correlation with the Project Master Plan.
5. Correlation with the Master Work Plan.

Table 11. Project Staffing Plan Scoring

PSP REF	TITLE	POINTS AVAILABLE
3	Staff Management	10
3.1	Organization	25
3.2	Training and Knowledge Transfer	0
3.3	Staff Replacement Procedures	10
3.4	Staffing Plan Assumptions	5
4	Roles and Responsibilities	30
5	Staff Qualifications	0
6	Resource Allocation	10
7	State Staff Interaction	10
	Total	**100**

4.3.4 Key Staff

4.3.4.1 Key Staff Scoring

One thousand (1,000) maximum points are available for the Key Staff References. The State scores each Key Staff member's experience against the requirements in Section 6, SOW as referenced Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT.

The total years and months experience stated on the Resume Summary Form, Exhibit 9-3, should equal the experience documented in the Resume. If a discrepancy exists between the Resume Summary Form and the Resume, the Resume takes precedence and is used in the evaluation and scoring calculation.

Proposed Staff who meet the minimum requirements for their designated role but do not exceed them are given zero (0) points. Proposed staff who exceed the minimum requirements for their designated role but do not exceed the desired experience requirements are scored on a graduated scale. This graduated percentage is calculated by taking the number of months in excess of the minimum required duration divided by the difference between the minimum and desired length of experience in months. The percentage is then applied to the total points available for that position. Proposed Staff who meet or exceed the desired experience requirements are awarded the full points available for that role. Points available for each Key Staff role are identified in Table 12. Key Staff Scoring.

Based on the Bidder's response in its Proposal for the experience of each Key Staff member, the evaluator first determines if all requirement elements have been addressed satisfactorily and the time cited does not overlap time used to qualify for another requirement. The evaluator then determines the amount of experience attributable to that Key Staff member and calculates the graduated percentage used to determine total points. Some items are "yes" or "no," for example, whether the Contractor Project Director has a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree. In those cases, the evaluator will enter a 0 for a "no" and 100% for a "yes."

Table 12. Key Staff Scoring

ROLE	POINTS	MINIMUM EXPERIENCE	DESIRED EXPERIENCE
Contractor Project Manager			
Overall PM Experience	60	5 Years	10 Years
Large System Experience	50	2 Years	5 Years
Managing Large Teams	50	3 Years	5 Years
MBA	15	N/A	Yes
IEEE12207	15	N/A	2 Years
CMM Level 3	30	N/A	1 Year
PMP certification	15	N/A	Yes
State Social Services Program Experience	15	N/A	1 Year
Contractor Technical Project Manager	0		
Overall PM Experience	40	5 Years	8 Years
Large System Experience	30	2 Years	5 Years
Proposed Hardware	30	3 Years	8 Years
Proposed Operating System	30	3 Years	8 Years
Proposed DBMS	30	3 Years	8 Years
Proposed Payroll System	30	3 Years	8 Years
Implementing Proposed System on WAN	15	3 Years	8 Years
Large System IEEE 12207 Experience	15	3 Years	8 Years
Security Experience	15	2 Years	5 Years
State Social Services Program Experience	15	N/A	2 Years
IEEE 12207	15	N/A	2 Years

ROLE	POINTS	MINIMUM EXPERIENCE	DESIRED EXPERIENCE
CMM Level 3	15	N/A	2 Years
Contractor Systems Implementation Manager	0		
Overall Implementation Mgr Experience	35	4 Years	6 Years
Large System Experience	25	3 Years	5 Years
Large Geographically Dispersed Experience	35	3 Years	5 Years
Large Team Experience	20	3 Years	5 Years
State Social Services Program Experience	15	N/A	1 Year
CA Agency statewide implementation	15	N/A	1 Year
Contractor Test Manager	0		
Large System Test Mgr Experience	50	3 Years	5 Years
Formal Testing Experience (e.g. IEEE, ISO)	50	5 Years	8 Years
IEEE 12207	35	2 Years	5 Years
Proposed Technology	35	2 Years	5 Years
State Social Services Program Experience	15	N/A	1 Year
IEEE 1012 Test Mgr Experience	15	1 Year	3 Years
Contractor Training Manager	0		
Large System Training Mgr Experience	35	2 Years	4 Years
Conduct Training for Large Business System	30	2 Years	4 Years
Training Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures	30	2 Years	4 Years
State Social Services Program Experience	15	2 Years	4 Years
Manage Large Training Team	15	2 Years	4 Years
Total	**1,000**		

4.3.4.2 Proposed Key Staff Interviews

As part of the scoring review, the State may require interviews of the Bidder's team of proposed Key Staff identified in the above table. The interview is to verify and validate the staff experience information provided by the Bidder in the Final Proposal. If the experience demonstrated by staff in the interviews varies from the Resume Summary form the Key Staff score will be adjusted accordingly and reasons for adjustments documented. Subsequent to the Key Staff interviews, any such documentation will be transmitted to the Bidder for verification and additional clarification.

The State shall notify the Bidder of the time and location of the oral interview not less than five (5) days in advance. The oral interviews will be conducted in Sacramento, California. There will be only one (1) oral interview for each Bidder's team, which will last approximately two (2) to three (3) hours. If Key Staff are unable to attend the interview in person, the State will make arrangements for a conference call so that Key Staff can participate in the interview. If Key Staff are not available during the oral interview, the State will attempt to validate staff experience via a separate telephone interview. Experience validated by telephone, either conference call or subsequent interview, will be awarded only 75% of the total evaluated score for that Key Staff member. If the State is unable to validate experience, 0 points will be awarded for that Key Staff person.

4.4 Functional Score and Point Allocation

The total scores from the Administrative Requirements, the System Requirements and the Project Management Requirements scores will be totaled to provide the Total Functional Score. The Total Functional Score will be posted at the Cost Proposal opening

5 COST EVALUATION

The Cost Requirements Sub-Team will evaluate the Cost Proposals for compliance with the RFP requirements. The Cost Evaluation will consist of the following steps:

- Cost Submission Review
- Cost Requirements Evaluation
- Consistency with Volume 1
- State Data Center Services Cost Evaluation
- County Desktop Computer Cost
- Preference Evaluations

5.1 Cost Submission Review

The Cost Requirements Sub-Team conducts a submission review. This is to evaluate that Volume 3 – Cost Proposal meets the following requirements:

1. Was delivered on time
2. Was properly marked and sealed in a separate container
3. Properly identified the “Master” copy
4. Had the correct number of copies
5. Contained a completed Artifact 18 – Cost Worksheets
6. Was in conformance with the format specifications of Section 9, PROPOSAL FORMAT.

Absence of required information may result in the Proposal being deemed nonresponsive and may be cause for rejection.

5.2 Cost Requirements Evaluation

The Cost Requirements Evaluation of the Final Proposal focuses on ensuring that the following requirements are met:

1. All required cost tables are included in the required format.
2. The additional hardware and/or software items presented are consistent with and include all of the items identified in the Architecture Design Specification submitted in response to Section 6, TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS - Statement of Work, Paragraph 4.1.4, General System Design and elsewhere in the Proposal.
3. The Bidder cost information includes costs of the staff, services, software purchase/lease/license, hardware, and tools to meet the requirements defined in this RFP.

Costs, quantities and extensions are checked for any mathematical errors. The calculated fields in the Bidder’s hard copy Cost Proposal should match those in the Bidder’s submitted soft copy of Artifact 18 - Cost Worksheets. The Cost Evaluation Sub-Team will, in addition, re-enter the Bidder’s data from the hard copy Cost Proposal into its own copy of Artifact 18 – Cost

Worksheets for verification. If there are differences, the Cost Requirements Sub-Team will make corrections allowed in RFP Section 2, RULES GOVERNING COMPETITION, Paragraph 3.11.3, Errors in the Final Proposal. After all Cost Proposals are evaluated, the Cost Requirements Sub-Team meets to calculate the Cost Score, taking into account Bidder Preferences, as applicable. See Paragraph 5.5, Preference Evaluations and subparagraphs.

5.3 State Data Center Services Cost Evaluation

State Data Center Services costs are those required to provide the CMIPS II infrastructure required to meet the RFP requirements and proposed Architecture Design Specification, Capacity Management Plan, and Master Work Plan. State Data Center costs include:

- Physical data center environment costs
- Server hardware and software operation and support costs
- Server storage and usage costs
- Media handling and storage costs
- Wide Area Network costs

As part of the Cost Evaluation, the Cost Requirements Sub-Team, with assistance from the State Data Center subject matter experts, will evaluate Volume 3 – Cost Proposal to verify that the descriptions, quantities and costs of State Data Center services are consistent with Artifact 15A – State Data Center Statement of Work, Artifact 15B –Network Services Statement of Work, Artifact 17 State Data Center Service Standards, and "Base Rate Schedule" and "Rates Guide" available at http://www.hhsdc.ca.gov/rates.asp and http://www.teale.ca.gov/services/billing/. The Cost Requirements Sub-Team, with assistance from the State Data Center subject matter experts, will evaluate if the quantities are consistent with the proposed Architecture Design Specification, Capacity Management Plan, and Master Work Plan. If the services or quantities of services are inconsistent, the Cost Requirements Sub-Team will recalculate the costs of services to verify they are correct. If incorrect, the total cost of State Data Center Services in the Cost Proposal will be corrected. Any corrections will be submitted to the DGS Procurement Official.

5.4 County Desktop Computer Cost

The Bidder calculates the quantity and cost of desktop computers that the Counties need to acquire to meet the desktop specification defined in the Bidder's Architecture Design Specification and the number of County desktops currently at each site that do not meet the Bidder's Architecture Design Specification as identified in Artifact 8 - County Infrastructure Surveys. For evaluation purposes any current County desktop computer that does not meet the CPU clock speed or ~~,~~ Memory requirements~~, or disk storage capacity~~ of the Bidder's Architecture Design Specification will be calculated as requiring replacement.

5.5 Preference Evaluations

Bidder Preferences are evaluated based on the following.

5.5.1 Small Business Preference

All Bidders who claim the small business preference and are responsive certified small businesses will have their proposal(s) increased as defined in Section 5, ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, Paragraph 4.1, Small Business Preference.

5.5.2 Local Agency Military Base Recovery Act (LAMBRA) Preference.

Based on the five percent (5%) Worksite Preference Eligibility and Labor Hours preference and the one percent (1%) to four percent (4%) Workforce Preference, the preferences are limited to a maximum of nine percent (9%), not to exceed fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) per bid. In combination with any other preferences, the maximum limit is fifteen percent (15%) of the lowest responsive bid; and, in no case more than one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) per bid.

5.5.3 Target Area Contract Preference Act (TACPA) Preference

Based on the five percent (5%) Worksite Preference Eligibility and Labor Hours preference and the one percent (1%) to four percent (4%) Workforce Preference, the preferences are limited to a maximum of nine percent (9%), not to exceed fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) per bid. In combination with any other preferences, the maximum limit is fifteen percent(15%) of the lowest responsive bid; and, in no case more than one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) per bid.

5.5.4 Enterprise Zone Act (EZA) Preference

Based on the five percent (5%) Worksite Preference Eligibility and Labor Hours preference and the one percent (1%) to four percent (4%) Workforce Preference, the preferences are limited to nine percent (9%), not to exceed fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) per bid. In combination with any other preferences, the maximum limit is fifteen percent (15%) of the lowest responsive bid; and, in no case more than one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) per bid.

5.6 Cost Score and Point Allocation

The Cost Score of each Bidder's Final Proposal will be determined after any adjustments as described in Section 2, RULES GOVERNING COMPETITION, Paragraph 3.11.3, Errors in the Final Proposal have been made, any errors corrected, and consideration of the Small Business, LAMBRA, TACPA and EZA Bidding Preferences, if applicable. Once all Total Evaluated Costs are determined, the Cost Review Sub-Team will calculate the Cost Score for each responsive Bidder to the nearest hundredth of a point.

The Cost Score represents forty percent (40%) of the total points attainable in the RFP evaluation process. The maximum Cost Score is four thousand (4,000) points. The total project cost for evaluation purposes includes costs from the Contractor, Data Center(s), County, and Legacy CMIPS System Contract listed in Table 13. Total Project Cost Evaluation.

Table 13. Total Project Cost Evaluation

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Line #	**Cost Component**	**DDI Phase Cost**	**M&O Phase Cost**	**Contract Cost (7 Years)**	**Three one-year M&O extensions**	**Total Contract Cost (10 Years)**
1	**Prime Contract Cost**	$ -	$ -	$	$	$
2	Hardware	$ -	$ -	$	$	$
3	Software	$ -	$ -	$	$	$
4	Contractor DDI Services	$ -	N/A	$		$
5	Contractor M&O Services	$ -	$ -	$	$	$
6	Performance Bond	$ -	$ -	$	$	$
7	Unanticipated Tasks	$ -	$ -	$	$	$

8	**County Desktop Computer Cost**	$ -	N/A	$		$
9	**State Data Center Services**	$ -	$ -	$	$	$
10	***Total Proposal Cost***	$ -	$ -	$	$	$

All Bidder Cost Scores are based on the ratio of the Bidder's Total Proposal Cost to the Total Proposal Cost associated with the lowest responsive proposal multiplied by the maximum number of cost points (4,000), as shown below.

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Total Proposal Cost} \times 4{,}000}{\text{Bidder's Total Proposal Cost}} = \text{Bidder's Cost Score}$$

Table 14. Cost Scoring Example

BIDDER	TOTAL PROPOSAL COST	CALCULATION	BIDDER SCORE
A	$375,000	$\frac{\$350{,}000 \text{ (Bidder B)} \times 4{,}000 \text{ (weight)}}{\$375{,}000 \text{ (Bidder A)}}$	3,733
B	$350,000	$\frac{\$350{,}000 \text{ (Bidder B)} \times 4{,}000 \text{ (weight)}}{\$350{,}000 \text{ (Bidder B)}}$	4,000
C	$420,000	$\frac{\$350{,}000 \text{ (Bidder B)} \times 4{,}000 \text{ (weight)}}{\$420{,}000 \text{ (Bidder C)}}$	3,333

6 DETERMINATION OF WINNING PROPOSAL

The winning Proposal is the responsive Proposal that has the highest combined score for the Functional evaluation and the Cost evaluation as .determined by summing the points awarded for each of the categories, Administrative Requirements, System Requirements, Project Management Requirements, and Cost Score, identified in Table 2, Evaluation Scoring.

EXHIBIT 10-1 SCORING METHODOLOGY

SCALE	METHODOLOGY
0%	1. The proposal item completely fails to meet State requirements. 2. The proposal item completely fails to conform to standards. 3. **No** confidence that the proposal item is not Risk-prone, i.e. the review finds that, although an item was not shown to be "wrong," the approach taken involves risks and there are known safer alternative methods. (A complete explanation must be provided) 4. **No** confidence that the proposal item can be implemented or executed within the constraints of the budget, schedule, and available resources. (A complete explanation must be provided) 5. The instructions in Section 9, Proposal Format have not been followed. 6. The proposal item is ambiguous. 7. The proposal item is inconsistent with the rest of the proposal.
20%	1. The proposal item meets some State requirements but does not meet requirements for function(s) that affect critical system performance or services. 2. The proposal item conforms to some identified standard(s) but does not conform to standards for function(s) that affect critical system performance or services. 3. **Very low** confidence that the proposal item is not Risk-prone, i.e. the review finds that, although an item was not shown to be "wrong," the approach taken involves risks and there are known safer alternative methods. (A complete explanation must be provided) 4. **Very low** confidence that the proposal item can be implemented or executed within the constraints of the budget, schedule, and available resources. (A complete explanation must be provided) 5. The instructions in Section 9, Proposal Format have not been followed. 6. The proposal item is ambiguous. 7. The proposal item is not consistent with the rest of the proposal.
40%	1. The proposal item meets all the State requirement(s) except for some function(s) that may affect system performance or service delivery, but workaround strategies can be implemented to compensate for loss of performance. 2. The proposal item completely conforms to all the identified standard(s) except for some function(s) that may affect system performance or service delivery, but workaround strategies can be implemented to compensate for loss of performance. 3. **Low** confidence that the proposal item is not Risk-prone, i.e. the review finds that, although an item was not shown to be "wrong," the approach taken involves risks and there are known safer alternative methods. 4. **Low** confidence that the proposal item can be implemented or executed within the constraints of the budget, schedule, and available resources. 5. The instructions in Section 9, Proposal Format have not been followed. 6. The proposal item is ambiguous. 7. The proposal item is not consistent with the rest of the proposal.
60%	1. The proposal item meets all the State requirement(s) except for some function(s) that may have noticeable effect on system performance or service delivery but only creates an inconvenience to the user if the function does not perform in accordance with requirements. 2. The proposal item completely conforms to all the identified standard(s) except for some functions that may have noticeable effect on system performance or service

SCALE	METHODOLOGY
	delivery but only creates an inconvenience to the user if the function does not perform in accordance with requirements. 3. **Guarded** confidence that the proposal item is not Risk-prone , i.e., the review finds that, although an item was not shown to be "wrong," the approach taken involves risks and there are known safer alternative methods. 4. **Guarded** confidence that the proposal item can be implemented or executed within the constraints of the budget, schedule, and available resources. 5. The instructions in Section 9, Proposal Format have been followed. 6. The proposal item has some ambiguity but would have noticeable effect on system performance or service delivery. 7. The proposal item is some inconsistencies with the rest of the proposal but would have noticeable effect on system performance or service delivery.
80%	1. The proposal item meets all the State requirement(s) 2. The proposal item conforms to all the identified standard(s). 3. **High** confidence that the proposal item is not Risk-prone (i.e., the review finds that, although an item was not shown to be "wrong," the approach taken involves risks and there are known safer alternative methods) 4. **High** confidence that the proposal item can be implemented or executed within the constraints of the budget, schedule, and available resources. 5. The instructions in Section 9, Proposal Format have been followed. 6. The proposal item is unambiguous. 7. The proposal item is consistent with the rest of the proposal.
100%	1. The proposal item exceeds the State requirement(s) 2. The proposal item exceeds requirements from all the identified standard(s). 3. **Very high** confidence that the proposal item is not Risk-prone. 4. **Very high** confidence that the proposal item can be implemented or executed within the constraints of the budget, schedule, and available resources. 5. The instructions in Section 9, Proposal Format have been followed. 6. The proposal item is unambiguous. 7. The proposal item is consistent with the rest of the proposal.