SECTION IX – EVALUATION AND SELECTION

A. INTRODUCTION

The procurement process is a multi–step process to determine the most responsible and responsive proposal that offers "best value" business solution to the California Office of the Secretary of State (SOS). A "best value" evaluation does not emphasize least cost at the exclusion of other factors. It is a balanced assessment consisting of cost and perceived risk matched to the business needs.

This section discusses the process the SOS will follow in evaluating proposals submitted by Bidders in response to the RFP and the criteria to be used in evaluating proposals. The selection process includes review of the Draft Proposals, with confidential discussions where SOS provides feedback to each Bidder, followed by a scored evaluation of Final Proposals.

Bidders are required to thoroughly review all RFP requirements to insure that the proposal and the proposed approaches and plans are fully compliant with RFP requirements and thereby avoid the possibility of being ruled non-responsive. If the Evaluation Team finds that a Final Proposal has a material deviation from specified requirements, that proposal will be considered non-responsive and will not be considered for award.

If the Evaluation Team determines that an acceptable, responsive and responsible proposal has been submitted, contract award will be made to the Bidder that is considered to provide the best value business solution, and not necessarily the lowest cost, which balances business functionality, service delivery and risks, and ultimately reduces SOS's costs to provide the VoteCal functions.

B. VOTECAL EVALUATION TEAM

This procurement is being conducted under the guidance of a Department Official from the Department of General Services (DGS) (refer to RFP Section I.D). The VoteCal Evaluation Team is considered one group, and the opinion of that group is by consensus. Review of Bidder Draft Proposals and evaluation and scoring of Final Proposal Submissions will be by consensus of the entire Evaluation Team.

SOS has established an Evaluation Team comprised of individuals selected from SOS management, voter registration and elections program areas, and information technology staff. The Department Official will serve as a contact point with the Bidder for questions and clarification, and identifies the rules governing the procurement. SOS may engage additional qualified individuals or subject matter experts during the evaluation process to assist the team in gaining a better understanding of technical, financial, legal, contractual, or program issues. These other individuals do not have voting privileges or responsibility for the evaluation process, but they will serve in an advisory capacity.

C. PRE-DRAFT CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSIONS

Prior to Bidders submitting Draft Proposals, SOS will schedule a Confidential Discussion with each Bidder submitting an Exhibit I.A – Bidder's Intention to Submit a Proposal by the date and time designated in the RFP Section I.F - Key Action Dates. These meetings will be held with each Bidder individually to discuss the RFP, clarify any Bidder questions, and discuss the bidding process. A second pre-Draft Confidential Discussion will be scheduled with Bidders prior to submission of the Draft Proposal Responses to again discuss the RFP requirements. These meetings are intended to afford all Bidders an equal opportunity to gain a better understanding of the VoteCal business needs. SOS will not offer suggestions or make recommendations for technical solutions.

D. REVIEW OF DRAFT PROPOSALS

Draft Proposals submitted by the date and time designated in the RFP Section I.F, Key Action Dates, will be opened and reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the RFP.

1. Draft Proposal Review

The Draft Proposal must contain the complete Bidder proposed solution, **without costs**. The main purpose of the Draft Proposal is to provide SOS with a complete proposal (except for cost figures) to identify areas in the Bidder's proposal that, if not corrected, are unclear or could cause the Bidder's Final Proposal to be rejected. SOS will use the Draft Proposal review results to effectively communicate these areas in Bidder proposals during Confidential Discussions with the Bidder. The Draft Proposal format and submission must follow the guidelines presented in Section VIII – Proposal Format and Content.

Draft Proposals will be reviewed by the Evaluation Team for compliance with the complete set of RFP requirements along with any explanations provided by the Bidder to add substance or provide background on how requirements will be met. The Evaluation Team will conduct the reviews to:

- Identify Conditional Statements - Identify "qualifiers" or conditions placed on the proposal (conditional proposals are not acceptable); and
- Document Deficiencies – Identify and document areas in which a proposal appears to be non-responsive, unclear, incomplete, defective, or require additional clarification.

After the Draft Proposal has been reviewed, Confidential Discussions will be scheduled individually with each Bidder to discuss items that need clarification and to disclose defects found by SOS. Prior to Confidential Discussions with the Bidder, the State will prepare a Confidential Discussion Agenda itemizing the points to be covered.

2. Draft Proposal Confidential Discussions

The Draft Confidential Discussions are intended to minimize the risk that a Bidder's Final Proposal will be deemed defective; however, such discussions will not preclude rejection of the Bidder's Final Proposal if such defects are later found. The State does not warrant that all defects will be detected during the Draft Proposal Review. The Evaluation Team will meet with each Bidder to discuss the Bidder's Draft Proposal. These Confidential Discussions will allow the Bidder to request clarification or ask questions specific to its proposed solution, thus protecting the confidential nature of each unique solution. SOS will discuss its concerns and ask for clarification if a response to a requirement of the RFP is not, in the opinion of the Evaluation Team, clear or well defined, or if the proposed solution contains deficiencies. The Evaluation Team may identify aspects of the Draft Proposal that, in its judgment, potentially introduce undesirable risk to SOS. Bidders are strongly encouraged to bring their proposed project team and discuss the Evaluation Team comments at this time.

E. EVALUATION AND SCORING OF FINAL PROPOSALS - Overview

Each Final Proposal received by the date and time specified in the RFP Section I.F, Key Action Dates, will be date and time marked as it is received by the Department Official listed in RFP Section I.D and verified that all responses are submitted under an appropriate cover, sealed and properly identified. Proposal Cost Volumes (Volume III) will remain sealed until the designated time for opening (after scoring has been finalized for all other proposal evaluation areas).

The purpose of this Evaluation Section of the RFP is to outline how the points will be awarded and how a winning Final Proposal will be selected in an impartial manner that preserves the integrity of the

competitive procurement process. During Final Proposal Evaluation, failure to respond to a Project Management, Business, Technical, Administrative, Report Strategy or VoteCal Architecture requirement is considered to be non-responsive and will be considered a material deviation. A Material Deviation is considered a fatal error and will result in Bidder disqualification. The evaluation of Final Proposals will consist of the following steps.

1. ***Preliminary Review and Validation (Pass/Fail)***

   All proposals received by the time and date specified in Section I.F, Key Action Dates, will be acknowledged as having been received at that time. Volume III - Cost Data shall remain sealed and in the possession of the Department Official listed in RFP Section I.D until the evaluations of Volume I have been completed for all Bidders. The Final Proposals will be checked by the Department Official for the presence of proper identification and the presence of required information, in conformance with the bid submittal requirements of this RFP, Section VIII.A. Absence of required information may deem the proposal non-responsive and may be cause for rejection.

   The proposal packages will be reviewed by the Department Official to determine completeness of required documentation and compliance with Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DBVE) and Small Business requirements as prescribed in Section V. The results of this review will be documented using the Preliminary Review Sheet, Exhibit IX.1. All proposals that fail to meet these requirements may be rejected.

2. ***Administrative Requirements Review (Pass/Fail)***

   All Administrative Requirements in RFP Section V are Mandatory. Review of the detailed proposals will begin with the Administrative Requirements listed as requirements in RFP Section V – Administrative Requirements, which are Pass/Fail. All proposals passing this phase of Evaluation will proceed to the Project Management, Business and Technical Requirement Evaluation and Scoring. All proposals that fail to meet these Pass/Fail requirements will be rejected. (NOTE: Evaluation of the response to A4 in this instance is that the Bidder has provided references. These will be evaluated and scored as part of the Project Team Experience when the references are validated.)

3. ***Project Management, Business and Technical Requirements Evaluation and Scoring (Maximum Score = 10,000)***

   The VoteCal Evaluation Team will review and evaluate the Bidder's response to the various Project Management, Business and Technical Requirements according to the processes and criteria described in detail in Section IX.F below.

   All Project Management, Business and Technical requirements are mandatory. For each category, points will be awarded based on the bidder response or references. The points awarded for a category will be translated into the Bidder's score for that category based on the percentage of the points actually awarded compared to the total points possible for that category. The maximum score possible for the evaluation of the Proposal response to the various requirements is 10,000. Table IX.1 summarizes the breakdown of maximum score for each category to be evaluated.

Table IX.1 Bid Evaluation Categories & Scoring for Project Management, Business And Technical Requirements

EVALUATION CATEGORY	Max Score Possible
Project Management Activities and Plans	1500
Training	200
Documentation of System Applications and Hardware Requirements	100
Testing plan	200
Data Conversion	1000
VoteCal System Business Requirements	3000
Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements	1000
VoteCal Technical Requirements	Pass/Fail
Bidder Firm & Key Subcontractor Experience	600
Key Project Team Experience and Organization	400
VoteCal Reporting Strategy	500
VoteCal Architecture	1500
TOTAL SCORE POSSIBLE	**10,000**

4. ***Minimum Point Threshold to Proceed to Cost Opening***

All Final Proposal Submissions with a combined score for Project Management, Business and Technical Requirements of 7,000 or higher (70% of the Maximum Total Score) for these evaluation sections) will proceed to the cost opening. Bidders that do not meet this minimum level score will be eliminated from further consideration due to their solution being of insufficient quality, completeness, clarity, or thoroughness, as reflected in the scores.

5. ***Bid Opening and Cost Assessment (Maximum Score = 10,000)***

The opening of proposal costs will be conducted in public for all proposals that meet or exceed the threshold score for Requirements responses. After opening, all bids will be validated to verify that they are complete and free of math errors. If appropriate, errors will be corrected in accordance with Section II.D.8.c.

In evaluating the score for Proposal costs, the cost for the Optional VoteCal Election Management System (EMS) component, if bid, will be separately considered from the costs for the mandatory VoteCal System. The lowest cost bid will receive the maximum score of 9,500. All other proposals will receive a portion of that score based on the formula identified in Section IX.G below. For proposals that include a bid with costs for the Optional VoteCal EMS, the lowest cost bid will receive the maximum score of 500, and all other proposals with the VoteCal EMS will receive a portion of that score based on the same formula in Section IX.G.

6. ***Determination of Winning Proposal***

The total score (requirements and costs) will be calculated for each proposal. As appropriate, all necessary adjustments for Small Business Preferences and DVBE Incentive credits will be calculated and applied to determine the Final Score for each proposal. The Contract award, if any, will be made to the proposal with the highest Final Score.

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS REQUIREMENTS AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS – Evaluation Process and Determination of Score

1. ***Project Management Activities and Plans (Maximum Score 1500)***

a. INTRODUCTION

All Project Management Requirements in the RFP are ***mandatory****:* (RFP Section VI.B - Project Management Activities and Plans) Bidders must respond to all requirement*ts to have a compliant proposal.* The Evaluation Team will evaluate responses to the Project Management Requirements set forth in Section VI of the RFP.

Scoring of the Project Management Activities and Plans requirements will be based on the Evaluation Team's assessment of the probability that a Bidder's proposed approach will result in successful implementation at an acceptable risk level. The Bidder's project plans, implementation methodologies, and schedule will be evaluated to determine points awarded for responses to Requirements 1 through 10, 16 and 17.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

For each requirement, the Evaluation Team will award points using the criteria detailed in Table IX.2 below.

Table IX.2 Criteria for Award of Points for Project Management Requirements

Percent of Points	Criteria
100%	Response meets or exceeds all elements of the requirement and clearly demonstrates a thorough understanding of project management to the extent that a timely and high quality project management performance is anticipated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of Bidder resource commitments is high.
75%	Response meets at least 75% of the elements of the requirement and demonstrates good project management processes but with weaknesses that are considered minimal and can be mitigated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of resource commitment are adequate but may require additional SOS resources.

Percent of Points	Criteria
50%	Response meets at least 50% of the elements of the requirement for project management with weaknesses that are considered moderate and resolvable but will require more involvement by SOS to mitigate potential risks. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline may be inadequate and will require additional SOS resources to reduce the risk potential.
25%	Response meets at least 25% of the elements of the requirement for best project management practices with identified weaknesses that will require significant resources from SOS to mitigate and ensure project success. Bidder's plans do not demonstrate a strong knowledge of managing a complex project such as VoteCal and consider this deficiency to be a high risk.
5%	Response is minimally acceptable. Bidder's draft plans do not demonstrate thorough knowledge of managing projects of this size, scope, and complexity.

Table IX.3, below, identifies each requirement to which these criteria will be applied, the factors to be considered in that evaluation and the maximum points possible for that requirement.

Table IX.3 Project Management Activities and Plans – Requirements, Evaluation Factors and Maximum Points

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
P-1	**Project Management Plan (PMP)** • Can the Project Management Plan (PMP) be used as the controlling document for managing the VoteCal? • Does it incorporate activities for SOS staff as well as Bidder staff resources? • Is the plan logical, reasonable, and reflects tasks in the SOW with tasks broken down into manageable segments? • Does the PMP indicate which project management standards they are using? • Does the Bidder indicate that the Plan will be updated periodically? • Is the Plan complete, comprehensive, and indicates best project management practices? • Does the PMP indicate sufficient staff on-site to meet SOS project needs? • Does it define the technical and managerial project functions, activities, tasks, and schedules necessary to satisfy the project requirements? • Does it to define the project and identify the level of resources required, thus providing the "baseline" for the change control process? • Does the PMP reflect good project management practices conveying a thorough understanding of the complexity in managing a project of this size and importance?	580

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
	• Does the PMP include a Resource Management component? Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined throughout development and implementation? • Does the PMP identify tasks, based on durations, relationships and dependencies among tasks, timing, and resources (both Bidder, SOS, and county)? • Is the PMP schedule realistic given the assigned resources? • Does it identify major deliverable milestones (e.g., work products and project deliverables and SOS approval points for signoffs)? • Does it include a Gantt chart that is clear, concise, and meets the anticipated SOS schedule?	
P-2	**Schedule Management** Does the Bidder describe its approach to schedule management and include the following elements which indicates the best project management practices of how the Bidder will handle schedule management: • Resource updates? • Tracking of resource activities? • Tracking of milestone progress and reporting? • Critical path monitoring? • Schedule issues? • Status reporting based on work breakdown structure? • Contingency activities?	50
P-3	**Quality Assurance Plan** Does the Bidder include a thorough, complete, and comprehensive draft QA Plan and address the following: • Activities to be conducted in providing a quality assurance review of all work products? • Roles and responsibilities for QA activities? • Quality standards to be used for the project indicated? • Plan describes how quality will be monitored and measured?	100
P-4	**Software Version Control, System Configuration Management and Document Management** Does the Bidder describe thoroughly, completely, and comprehensively the following: • The Software Version Control and Configuration Management methods that will be used during this project? • Tools to be used? • How new modifications or modules will be tracked separate from the COTS package (if appropriate)? • Must include a discussion of how new modifications and/or modules will be integrated and implemented separate from the COTS package when COTS upgrades are required (if appropriate)? • Does the Document Management plan adequately describe how updating of documentation will occur to ensure that system documentation keeps pace with the versioning of the products? • Does the Bidder address deliverable versioning methods and tools?	100

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
P-5	**Requirements Traceability Matrix and Gap Analysis Discussion** • Does the Bidder describe the content and development of a Requirements Traceability Matrix? • Did the Bidder address the Gap Analysis and describe how this will be conducted and incorporated into the Matrix? • Did the Bidder describe how the Requirements Traceability Matrix will be used/updated to track requirements during the various phases of the project? • Does the Bidder discuss how the Matrix will allow for linking test scenarios during the Acceptance Phase? If so, is the method reasonable and accurate?	200
P-6	**Risk Management Plan** Does the Bidder provide a thorough, complete, and comprehensive draft Risk Management Plan? Does the Plan include a thorough discussion of: • How risk management will be conducted? • How risks and potential mitigations will be identified and evaluated? • Risk Management tools to be used (if appropriate)? • Risk Management philosophy? • Risk Management meetings? • Risk mitigation and how the Risk Management Plan will support the oversight and DOF reporting?	200
P-7	**Issue Management Plan** Does the response include the following items with a thorough, complete, and comprehensive response: • Discussion of how issues will be tracked, discussed, assigned, and resolved? • Identify and assign responsible parties? • Is the Bidder's philosophy related to Issue Management sound and reflects best business practices? • List tools and techniques to be used?	200
P-8	**Implementation and Deployment Plan** Did the Bidder include a draft Implementation and Deployment Plan? Does the Plan address the following: • Does the Plan follow best business practices for implementation of a large complex system? • Does the Plan link to the PMP? • Does plan address an implementation strategy of pilot testing, phase cutover, or other? • Is the Plan and schedule realistic, achievable, and allows for contingencies? • Does the Plan address implementation issues during the Acceptance Phase and how they will be handled?	200
P-9	**VoteCal Monthly Project Status Report** • Does the Bidder agree to provide a Monthly Project Status Report to the SOS Project Manager? • Does the Bidder agree to track and assess progress relative to the project's goals and schedule?	10

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
	• Does the Bidder agree to discuss project progress with SOS Project Manager? • Does the response agree to all the required elements for the report (a-e)?	
P-10	**Weekly Status Meeting** • Does the Bidder's Project Manager agree to attend the Weekly Status Meeting in person and to provide an oral and written weekly update?	10
P-16	**Organizational Change Management Plan** • Did the Bidder provide a draft Organizational Change Management and Communication Plan? • Does the draft include how the new methods of business will be implemented for SOS staff and county users? • Does the draft plan adequately identify roles and responsibilities? • Does the communication strategy reflect knowledge of the types of issues commonly rising in a project of this scale and complexity and propose how to overcome the obstacles? • Does the plan discuss how commonly occurring issues should be mitigated? • Does the plan reflect understanding of key issues in the elections and voter registration environment? • Are the strategies for securing support and buy-in from the county users realistic and appropriate?	150
P-17	**Work Standards** • Does the Bidder agree to adhere to the VOTECAL work standards? • Does the Bidder agree to use Microsoft Office 2003 or the SOS approved version in all project correspondence and deliverables? • Does the Bidder agree to comply with SOS security restrictions related to the access of the SOS facilities.? • Does the Bidder propose any exceptions to the established practices? • Does the Bidder agree to maintain the Project Schedule in the SOS approved version of MS Project?	50
	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	**1850**

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND PLANS

The score for each of the Project Management Activities and Plans will be calculated and awarded based on the following procedures:

1) The Bidder's response to each requirement will be separately evaluated and will be awarded a percentage of the possible points for that requirement based on the evaluation criteria in Table IX.2 above.

2) The points awarded for each requirement in this category will be added together to calculate the total points awarded. The total points awarded (Evaluation Points Earned) will be divided by the total Maximum Points Possible (1850) to determine the percentage of points earned for this category.

$$\frac{\text{Evaluation Points Earned}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) The actual RFP score for this category will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for this category (1500) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

Example Calculation of Bidder score for Project Management Activities and Plans:

1. *Assume the Bidder's proposal receives the following points for the various requirements:*

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible	% Earned in Eval	Points Awarded
P-1	**Project Management Plan (PMP)**	580	75%	435.0
P-2	**Schedule Management Plan**	50	100%	50.0
P-3	**Quality Assurance Plan**	100	75%	75.0
P-4	**Software Version Control, System Configuration Management and Document Management**	100	50%	50.0
P-5	**Requirements Traceability Matrix and Gap Analysis Discussion**	200	75%	150.0
P-6	**Risk Management Plan**	200	100%	200.0
P-7	**Issue Management Plan**	200	100%	200.0
P-8	**Implementation and Deployment Plan**	200	25%	50.0
P-9	**VoteCal Monthly Project Status Report**	10	100%	10.0
P-10	**Weekly Status Meeting**	10	100%	10.0
P-16	**Organizational Change Management Plan**	150	75%	112.5
P-17	**Work Standards**	50	50%	25.0
	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	**1850**		**1367.5**

2. *The Percent of Points Earned would be calculated as follows:*

$$\frac{\text{1367.5 (Evaluation Points Earned)}}{\text{1850.0 (Maximum Points Possible)}} = \text{73.9\% of Points Earned}$$

3. The Score actually awarded would be 1108.8, calculated as follows:

1500 (Max Possible Score) X 73.9% of Points Earned = 1108.8 Score Awarded

2. ***Training (Maximum Score 200)***

a. INTRODUCTION

Section VI.B of the VoteCal RFP identifies the following mandatory requirement:

Req. P11 SOS requires the Bidder to propose training for the SOS program team. Bidders must provide a draft Training Plan, which includes course descriptions, prerequisites, content, and length of class for SOS program and IT staff, and county election officials. SOS will provide one (1) training room in Sacramento for proposed solution training.

SOS expects the Bidder to provide training initially to all 35 SOS staff assigned to the VoteCal Project. SOS does not anticipate that any single training class will exceed 20 participants. Any SOS staff training identified by the Bidder and not proposed to be conducted at the SOS Sacramento training facility must include, as part of the cost for training, all travel and SOS per diem associated with travel to the training site for all SOS staff attending (refer to the Bidder's Library for SOS per diem rates). Bidders must consider the degree of integration that independent counties will have when determining the amount of training they will require.

- Bidder must specify in the draft Training Plan and provide VoteCal System training for SOS Voter Registration business program staff, training of SOS technical support staff and Help Desk Staff at the SOS Sacramento Office
- Bidders must provide orientation and training for county staff integrating VoteCal with their existing EMS. Training must be conducted at up to five regional locations (North, Bay Area, Central Valley, Southern California, and Sacramento) to be provided by SOS.
- Bidders must specify in the draft Training Plan and provide training for county staff for counties using the VoteCal EMS.
- Bidders must provide training for SOS staff (to utilize the train the trainer approach) for on-going training post implementation.
- Bidders must specify the IT technical skill sets required for SOS IT staff that will be needed to support the proposed solution. Bidders must describe their technical knowledge transfer method with SOS IT staff and training as part of the Draft Training Plan.
- Bidders must describe their method of knowledge transfer for the SOS program and IT support and Help Desk staff.
- Bidders must specify system requirements for the training room, which will support up to 20 workstations (e.g., minimum configuration of workstations, connectivity requirements, etc.).
- Bidders must identify system requirements for a fully functional Training Environment to support the training room that is separate from the Development, Test and Production environments.

- Training aids, manuals, quick reference guides and other training materials must be provided as part of the solution, reflect the solution as implemented, provided for each student, and also be delivered to SOS in electronic format. Training materials shall become the property of SOS upon completion of the training and may be modified or supplemented as needed by SOS. The Bidder must allow SOS permission to duplicate all materials and manuals.

This Training requirement is mandatory and Bidders must provide a response to the requirement to have a compliant proposal.

The Evaluation Team will evaluate the Bidder's response to the training requirements and determine a Score for this category based on the Evaluation Team's assessment of the probability that a Bidder's proposed approach will result in successful implementation at a perceived acceptable risk level.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

For the response to the Training requirement (P11), the Evaluation Team will award points using the criteria detailed in Table IX.4 below.

Table IX.4 Criteria for Award of Points for Training Requirements

Percent of Points	Criteria
100%	Response meets or exceeds all elements of the requirement and clearly demonstrates a thorough understanding of training to the extent that a timely and high quality training performance is anticipated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of Bidder resource commitments is high.
75%	Response meets at least 75% of the elements of the requirement and demonstrates good training processes but with weaknesses that are considered minimal and can be mitigated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of resource commitment are adequate but may require additional SOS resources.
50%	Response meets at least 50% of the elements of the requirement for training with weaknesses that are considered moderate and resolvable but will require more involvement by SOS to mitigate potential risks. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline may be inadequate and will require additional SOS resources to reduce the risk potential.

25%	Response meets at least 25% of the elements of the requirement for best training practices with identified weaknesses that will require significant resources from SOS to mitigate and ensure project success. Bidder's plans do not demonstrate a strong knowledge of managing a complex project such as VoteCal and consider this deficiency to be a high risk.
5%	Response is minimally acceptable. Bidder's draft plans do not demonstrate thorough knowledge of training for projects of this size, scope, and complexity.

Table IX.5 below identifies each requirement to which these criteria will be applied, the factors to be considered in that evaluation and the maximum points possible for that requirement.

Table IX.5 Training Plan – Evaluation Factors and Maximum Points

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
P-11	**Training Plan** Did the Bidder include a draft Training Plan? Does the Plan address the following: • Is the draft Plan comprehensive, reasonable, and reflect the knowledge required to train users on a system this critical and complex? • Did the Bidder propose on-site training for the program team? • Does the Bidder discuss technical knowledge transfer as well as application knowledge transfer and specify the technical IT skill sets required to support the proposed solution? • Is the training proposed for IT technical support staff reasonable, appropriate, and sufficient for the proposed technical platform? • Is the proposed training plan for program and help desk staff reasonable, appropriate, and sufficient to ensure a successful operation? • Does the training plan sufficiently and appropriately address the training required for county users? Is the proposed training schedule and resource allocation appropriate and sufficient? • Does the proposal specify system requirements for the training room (e.g. number of workstations, minimum configuration of workstations, connectivity requirements, and etc.)? • Does the Bidder discuss providing the Training Environment separate from Test and Production and provide system specifications (and provide the training specifications of how to refresh the database)? • Does the Bidder agree to provide training aids, manuals, quick reference guides, and other training materials? • Does the Bidder agree that the training shall reflect the solution as implemented, shall be provided for each trainee, and shall be delivered in electronic format? • Does the Bidder agree that training materials shall become the property of SOS upon completion of the training and may be modified or supplemented as needed? • Does the Bidder agree to allow SOS to duplicate all materials and manuals?	200

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR TRAINING PLAN

The score for the Bidder's Training Plan submitted in response to Requirement P11 will be directly calculated based on the percentage of points earned. For example, a Training Plan that earns 75% based on the evaluation criteria will earn a score of 150 (200 maximum possible points x 75%).

3. ***Documentation of System Applications and Hardware Requirements (Maximum Score 100)***

a. INTRODUCTION

Section VI.B of the VoteCal RFP identifies the following mandatory requirements:

Req. P13 Bidder's Proposal must contain a detailed specifications list of the hardware (including peripheral equipment, cables, etc.) required to support the proposed VoteCal solution and proposed technical architecture (Exhibit VI.7). Bidder must also supply a complete list of all platform software products that will be used in the development, implementation or management of the proposed VoteCal solution (Exhibit VI.8).

Additionally, if the Bidder's proposal includes the optional VoteCal EMS, then Bidder must identify any *additional* hardware or platform software components that will be used in the proposed VoteCal EMS that are not already included in the core VoteCal System by completing and submitting the following exhibits with the Proposal:

- Exhibit VI.9 – if there are additional hardware items that will be required to implement the VoteCal EMS central component of the system;
- Exhibit VI.10(a–f) – if there are additional hardware items that will be required for counties to implement the VoteCal EMS central component of the system;
- Exhibit VI.11 – if there are additional platform software products that will be required to implement the VoteCal EMS central component of the system;
- Exhibit VI.12(a–f) – if there are additional platform software products that will be required for counties to implement the VoteCal EMS central component of the system;

Bidders must agree to provide, as part of their solution, the following environments:

- Development;
- Test;
- Parallel;
- Training;
- Training Development;
- Staging; and
- Production.
- Bidder must include detailed specifications for all hardware, software, and tools, etc., which are required to support these environments.

Req. P14 The Bidder must include in the Proposal the standard product documentation for any third-party products the Bidder is proposing to meet the requirements (in the Literature Volume IV – refer to Section VIII of the RFP).

The Bidder must agree to implement the proposed solution applications and to provide systems documentation in hardcopy and electronically for the implemented solution in accordance with the Statement of Work (Appendix A, Attachment 1, Exhibits 2 and 3).

These Documentation requirements are mandatory and Bidders must provide a response to the requirements to have a compliant proposal.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

For the response to the requirements for Documentation of System Applications and Hardware (P13 and P14), the Evaluation Team will award points using the criteria detailed in Table IX.6 below.

Table IX.6 Criteria for Award of Points for Documentation of System Applications and Hardware

Percent of Points	Criteria
100%	Response meets or exceeds all elements of the requirement and clearly demonstrates a thorough understanding of the documentation of system applications and hardware requirements to the extent that a timely and high quality training performance is anticipated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of Bidder resource commitments is high.
75%	Response meets at least 75% of the elements of the requirement and demonstrates good understanding of the documentation system applications and hardware requirements but with weaknesses that are considered minimal and can be mitigated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of resource commitment are adequate but may require additional SOS resources.
50%	Response meets at least 50% of the elements of the documentation of system applications and hardware requirements with weaknesses that are considered moderate and resolvable but will require more involvement by SOS to mitigate potential risks. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline may be inadequate and will require additional SOS resources to reduce the risk potential.

25%	Response meets at least 25% of the elements of the documentation of system applications and hardware requirements with identified weaknesses that will require significant resources from SOS to mitigate and ensure project success. Bidder's plans do not demonstrate a strong knowledge of managing a complex project such as VoteCal and consider this deficiency to be a high risk.
5%	Response is minimally acceptable. Bidder's draft plans do not demonstrate thorough knowledge of documentation of system applications and hardware for projects of this size, scope, and complexity.

Table IX.7 below identifies each requirement to which these criteria will be applied, the factors to be considered in that evaluation and the maximum points possible for that requirement.

Table IX.7 Documentation of System Applications and Hardware Requirements – Evaluation Factors and Maximum Points

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
P-13	**Hardware Requirements List** • Did the Bidder's response describe the proposed hardware in detail and does it support the proposed technical architecture? • Did the Bidder complete and submit the Hardware List and the Platform Software List (Exhibits VI.7 & VI.8)? • If the Bidder proposed the optional VoteCal EMS, did the Bidder complete and submit all appropriate Hardware and Platform Software lists for the central component of the VoteCal EMS, as well as for each county tier (Exhibits VI.9 through VI.12f)? • Does the response identify specifications and configuration of all the servers? • Does the response clearly identify components and performance to meet the network connectivity and transport requirements for the complete system? • Is the response consistent with current county workstation configuration and the minimum specifications for end user equipment (SOS staff and counties)? • Does the response identify logical and physical data security objectives and solutions? • Does the Bidder's response identify the tools to be provided to manage the various VoteCal environments? • Does the Bidder describe the various environments as required in the RFP? • Is the solution consistent with the requirement to host the system at SOS with co-location at a state-owned facility?	150
P-14	**Systems Documentation** Does the Bidder agree to provide the following systems documentation for the proposed solution: • System Operations; • System Technical Documentation; • System End User's Documentation; • Help Desk Documentation; • System Technical Schematics and Data Dictionary; • As-Built Documentation of all Configuration, Modification, or Programming; • System Back-up and Recovery procedures; and • System Maintenance Documentation upon completion of the training that may be modified or supplemented as needed? Does the Bidder agree to allow SOS to duplicate all materials and manuals?	50

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR DOCUMENTATION OF SYSTEM APPLICATIONS AND HARDWARE REQUIREMENTS

The score for each of the Documentation requirements will be calculated and awarded based on the following procedures:

1) The Bidder's response to each requirement will be separately evaluated and will be awarded a percentage of the possible points for that requirement based on the evaluation criteria in Table IX.6 above.

2) The points awarded for each requirement in this category will be added together to calculate the total points awarded. The total points awarded (Evaluation Points Earned) will be divided by the total Maximum Points Possible (200) to determine the percentage of points earned for this category.

$$\frac{\text{Evaluation Points Earned}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) The actual RFP score for this category will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for this category (100) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

Example Calculation of Bidder score for Documentation of System Applications and Hardware Requirements:

1. Assume the Bidder's proposal receives the following points for the various requirements:

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible	% Earned in Eval	Points Awarded
P-13	**Hardware Requirements List**	150	75%	112.5
P-14	**Systems Documentation**	50	100%	50.0
	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	**200**		**162.5**

2. The Percent of Points Earned would be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{162.5 (Evaluation Points Earned)}}{\text{200.0 (Maximum Points Possible)}} = \text{81.3\% of Points Earned}$$

3. The Score actually awarded would be 81.3, calculated as follows:

100 (Max Possible Score) X 81.3% of Points Earned = 81.3 Score Awarded

4. ***<u>Test Plan (Maximum Score 200)</u>***

a. INTRODUCTION

Section VI.B of the VoteCal RFP identifies the following mandatory requirement:

<u>Req. P15</u> The Bidder must provide a draft <u>Test Plan</u> that includes a discussion of the proposed Test Methodology and a sample Test Defect Log. The actual detailed Test Plan and Test Defect Log must be submitted no later than fifteen (15) State working days prior to the commencement of testing activities. All business functional and technical requirements in this RFP must be traceable to the Test Plan and the Bidder must provide SOS with a Requirements

Traceability Matrix (refer to Requirement P5), which will provide a link from each test case back to each of the business functional and technical requirements in the RFP for testing purposes.

Bidder must include a discussion of all levels of testing that will be performed and the training to be provided for the SOS testing staff. SOS intends to perform a test with pilot counties (counties to be determined – Bidders should assume a total of 1.5 million voter registration records for the pilot counties). This must be factored into the Bidder's activities, PMP, and schedule.

If a Bidder proposes a COTS (Commercial off-the-Shelf) application or a MOTS (Modified off-the-shelf) application, out of the box testing must be included to validate the base product is functioning properly. Negative testing scenarios must be included. Bidder must address all levels of testing to be performed, including stress testing and how they will manage these activities including managing of the test environments.

The Test Plan must include testing for all configured and programmed items, all programs and reports, and a complete "end to end" test including testing of interfaces to the county systems. It will be the decision of the VoteCal Project Manager when acceptance testing has been successfully completed. The final detailed Test Plan will become the basis for verifying that the system operates as documented and intended.

NOTE: SOS has contracted with an IV&V contractor to perform independent testing of the delivered applications. Bidder must resolve any discrepancies identified by the IV&V contractor before testing is considered accepted and signed-off by SOS. Bidders must factor this activity and working with the IV&V contractor into their work plan.

This Training requirement is mandatory and Bidders must provide a response to the requirement to have a compliant proposal.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

For the response to the Test Plan requirement (P15), the Evaluation Team will award points using the criteria detailed in Table IX.8 below.

Table IX.8 Criteria for Award of Points for Test Plan Requirements

Percent of Points	Criteria
100%	Response meets or exceeds all elements of the requirement and clearly demonstrates a thorough understanding of the testing plan requirements to the extent that a timely and high quality training performance is anticipated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of Bidder resource commitments is high.
75%	Response meets at least 75% of the elements of the requirement and demonstrates good testing plan processes but with weaknesses that are considered minimal and can be mitigated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of resource commitment are adequate but may require additional SOS resources.
50%	Response meets at least 50% of the elements of the testing plan requirements with weaknesses that are considered moderate and resolvable but will require more involvement by SOS to mitigate potential risks. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline may be inadequate and will require additional SOS resources to reduce the risk potential.
25%	Response meets at least 25% of the elements of the testing plan requirements with identified weaknesses that will require significant resources from SOS to mitigate and ensure project success. Bidder's plans do not demonstrate a strong knowledge of managing a complex project such as VoteCal and consider this deficiency to be a high risk.
5%	Response is minimally acceptable. Bidder's draft plans do not demonstrate thorough knowledge of testing plan requirements for projects of this size, scope, and complexity.

Table IX.9 below identifies each requirement to which these criteria will be applied, the factors to be considered in that evaluation and the maximum points possible for that requirement.

Table IX.9 Test Plan – Requirement, Evaluation Factors and Maximum Points

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
P-15	**Test Plan** Was the draft Test Plan provided by the Bidder? • Did it include a sample Test Defect Log? Does it contain sufficient detail and tracking? • Does it clearly identify and discuss the proposed Test Methodology? • Does the Bidder use the traceability matrix that provides a link from each test case back to each of the business and technical requirements in the RFP for testing purposes? • Are all business and technical requirements in this RFP traceable to the Test Plan? • Does the Plan address how the defects will be researched and resolved? • Does the Plan contain a retest function using a structured approach? • Does the sample Test Plan include negative testing scenarios? • Does the Test Plan include training for testers? • Does the plan adequately address functional testing of each system component, end-to-end integration testing, performance and stress testing, fail-over testing, regression testing for system modifications, and acceptance testing? • Does the test plan address proper use of the dedicated test environments to protect the integrity of existing production environments and data.	200

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR TEST PLAN

The score for the Bidder's Training Plan submitted in response to Requirement P15 will be directly calculated based on the percentage of points earned. For example, a Test Plan that earns 75% based on the evaluation criteria will earn a score of 150 (200 maximum possible points x 75%).

5. ***<u>Data Conversion Plan (Maximum Score 1000)</u>***

a. INTRODUCTION

Section VI.B of the VoteCal RFP identifies the following mandatory requirement:

<u>Req. P12</u> The Bidder's Proposal must provide a draft <u>Data Conversion Plan,</u> which describes:

- Data Conversion approach, method, and roles and responsibilities;
- Conformance of all county data to VoteCal standards;
- Integration of existing county voter registration data from multiple counties into a single record for each voter (e.g. one record, one voter);
- Identification of the existing detail data that requires conversion

- The process of testing and validating data conversions prior to full data conversion, and how data conversion errors will be addressed and resolved;
- Recommendation of a conversion strategy of "cut-over", "pilot", or "phased";
- Method of how existing data will be transitioned into the new VoteCal;
- Maintenance of Calvoter and VoteCal systems in parallel during the "pilot" phase and how the integrity of the data will be ensured as the official list of voters while implementation is occurring; and
- Detailed transition schedule of activities that clearly defines key milestones, deliverables, tasks, and responsibilities and which are integrated with the PMP.

A test data conversion must be performed and all data validated and approved by SOS prior to the full conversion occurring. The Bidder must also include a discussion of how data conversion errors will be addressed. Refer to RFP Section III or the Bidder's Library for a discussion of the existing databases, Calvoter file structures, county upload file formats, and data volumes.

This Data Conversion Plan requirement is mandatory and Bidders must provide a response to the requirement to have a compliant proposal.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

For the response to the Data Conversion Plan requirement (P12), the Evaluation Team will award points using the criteria detailed in Table IX.10 below.

Table IX.10 Criteria for Award of Points for Data Conversion Plan Requirement

Percent of Points	Criteria
100%	Response meets or exceeds all elements of the requirement and clearly demonstrates a thorough understanding of data conversion to the extent that a timely and high quality performance is anticipated. Bidder's on-site time, plans, and timeline are reasonable and level of Bidder resource commitments is high.
75%	Response meets at least 75% of the elements of the data conversion requirement but with weaknesses that are considered minimal and can be mitigated. Bidder's draft plan, approach, and timeline are reasonable and level of resource commitment are adequate but may require additional SOS resources.
50%	Response meets at least 50% of the elements of the data conversion requirement with weaknesses that are considered moderate and resolvable but will require more involvement by SOS to mitigate potential risks. Bidder's approach and processes may be inadequate and will require additional SOS resources to reduce the risk potential.

Percent of Points	Criteria
25%	Response meets at least 25% of the elements of the data conversion requirement with identified weaknesses that will require significant resources from SOS to mitigate and ensure project success. Bidder's plans do not demonstrate a strong knowledge of performing data conversion for a complex project such as VoteCal and consider this deficiency to be a high risk.
5%	Response is minimally acceptable. Bidder's draft plan does not demonstrate thorough knowledge of data conversion activities of this size, scope, and complexity.

Table IX.11 below identifies each requirement to which these criteria will be applied, the factors to be considered in that evaluation and the maximum points possible for that requirement.

Table IX.11 Data Conversion Plan – Requirement, Evaluation Factors and Maximum Points

Reqmt. #	Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible
P-12	**Data Conversion Plan** Was the draft Data Conversion Plan provided by the Bidder? • Does the Bidder's response describe their Data Conversion approach and method and are these discussions concise and illustrative of best business practices? • Does the conversion plan adequately and appropriately address the roles and responsibilities of bidder staff, SOS staff, and counties and their EMS vendor? • Does the response include a discussion of conversion strategy of "cut-over", "pilot", or "phased"? • Is the proposed schedule in the conversion plan realistic and is it appropriately timed for the proposed testing and implementation schedule? • Does the response include performing a test data conversion and to have all data validated and approved by SOS prior to the full conversion occurring? • Does the response discuss how data conversion errors will be addressed and resolved? • Does the plan realistically address the integration of data from all counties into a single statewide record for each voter, including integration of document images, voter activity history, and voter participation history? Does the response discuss how data integration issues and errors will be addressed and resolved?	1000

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR DATA CONVERSION PLAN

The score for the Bidder's Data Conversion Plan submitted in response to Requirement P12 will be directly calculated based on the percentage of points earned. For example, a Test Plan that earns 75% based on the evaluation criteria will earn a score of 750 (1000 maximum possible points x 75%).

6. ***VoteCal System Business Requirements (Maximum Score 3000) and Option VoteCal EMS Business Requirements (Maximum Score 1000)***

a. INTRODUCTION

The VoteCal System business requirements are listed in Section VI, Table VI.1. The optional VoteCal EMS business requirements are listed in Section VI, Table VI.2. The business requirements are all mandatory and are broken down by major business functional areas within the response form. Response to each business requirement will be evaluated for compliance with the evaluation criteria in order to obtain the best value solution. At the discretion of SOS, the Bidder may be asked to validate their response by demonstration if the Bidder indicates that an existing software or third-party product can meet the specific requirement.

Bidders are encouraged to provide references to technical literature in response to the specific requirements where the functionality is discussed in the product literature, user or system manuals, etc. This will assist the Evaluation Team in validating the Bidder's response to the requirement. If, by consensus of the Evaluation Team, it is found that the Bidder has submitted a failed response to any of the mandatory business requirements, the Bidder's Final Proposal shall be deemed a material deviation and excluded from further consideration to award.

Bidders may optionally propose the VoteCal EMS. The same method will be used for evaluating and scoring the responses to those requirements. For Bidders proposing the optional VoteCal EMS, all VoteCal EMS requirements in Section VI, Table VI.2 are mandatory. Bidders will not be disqualified for not bidding on the optional VoteCal EMS functionality; however, if the VoteCal EMS functionality is bid failure to address all EMS business requirements may result in award of no points. Also, Bidders who chose not to include a VoteCal EMS in their proposal will receive a zero score for the VoteCal EMS option.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Team will separately evaluate the response to each business requirement to consider whether the response addresses the requirement, while demonstrating best business practices and user ease of use. Scoring for each business functionality requirement will be based on the Evaluation Team's best professional judgment and assessment of the proposal response, including any reference materials to which they are directed for additional information in the Bidder's Proposal response to the requirement. If the response supplied by the Bidder cannot be validated through the supplied documentation or by demonstration, SOS will evaluate the requirement response as they understand it. SOS's determination will be final.

Evaluation points will be used to rate each response. Each requirement will be evaluated and awarded points based on the criteria identified in Table IX.12 below. (Only these point values can be awarded.)

Table IX.12 Criteria for Award of Points for VoteCal System and Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements

Points	Criteria
10 points	Requirement demonstrably met by existing proposed product without modification to business logic, technology or platform. •
7 points	Requirement can be met with modification of or extension to an existing proposed product. •
5 points	Proposed approach appears reasonable and practical but must be developed for this proposed solution. •
2 points	Unable to determine feasibility of approach; *Or* Cannot determine the level of modification required to meet the requirement. •

Table IX.13 below identifies the number of requirements and the maximum total of points that can be awarded for the Bidder's response to the VoteCal System business requirements and the Optional VoteCal EMS business requirements.

Table IX.13 VoteCal Business Requirement Counts and Total Points Possible

	Number of Requirements	Maximum Possible Points
VoteCal System Business Requirements	233	2330
Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements	163	1630

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORES FOR BUSINESS REQUIREMENTS

The score for VoteCal System Business Requirements, as well as for the Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements will be calculated and awarded based on the following procedures:

1) The Bidder's response to each requirement will be separately evaluated and will be awarded a point value for that requirement based on the evaluation criteria in Table IX.12 above.

2) The points awarded for each VoteCal System business requirement will be added together to calculate the total points awarded for the VoteCal System business requirements. The total points awarded (Evaluation Points Earned) will be divided by

the total Maximum Points Possible (2330) to determine the percentage of points earned for the VoteCal System business requirements.

$$\frac{\text{Evaluation Points Earned}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) The actual Proposal score for this category will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for the VoteCal business Requirements (3000) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

If the Bidder includes the optional VoteCal EMS as part of the proposal, the same formula and approach will be used for calculation of the Bidder's score for the optional VoteCal EMS business requirements.

Example Calculation of Bidder Score for VoteCal System and Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements:

Assume the Bidder's proposal receives the 1662 total points for the VoteCal System and 1059 total points for the optional VoteCal EMS business requirements. The Bidders scores for the respective business requirements would be calculated as follows:

Requirement and Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible	Points Actually Awarded	% of Points Earned	Max Possible Score	Bidder's Score
VoteCal System Business Reqs	2330	1662	71.3%	3000	2139
Optional VoteCal EMS Business Reqs.	1630	1059	65.0%	1000	650

7. ***<u>VoteCal Technical Requirements (Pass/Fail)</u>***

a. INTRODUCTION

The VoteCal Technical requirements are listed in Section VI, Table VI.3. All Technical Requirements are Mandatory. The evaluation process will assess the Bidder's responses to the technical requirements in Section VI of the RFP to determine whether they fully address and satisfy each requirement. If, by consensus of the Evaluation Team, it is found that the Bidder has submitted a failed response to any of the technical requirements, SOS will deem the entire proposal non-responsive and the response will be excluded from further consideration.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Team will separately evaluate the response to each technical requirement to consider whether the response addresses the requirement, while demonstrating best business practices and user ease of use. The evaluation for each technical requirement will be based on the Evaluation Team's best professional judgment and assessment of the proposal response, including any reference materials to which they are directed for additional information in the

Bidder's Proposal response to the requirement. If the response supplied by the Bidder cannot be validated through the supplied documentation or by demonstration, SOS will evaluate the requirement response as they understand it. SOS's determination will be final.

Based on the Team's evaluation, each requirement will be rated pass or fail based on the criteria identified in Table IX.14 below.

Table IX.14 Criteria for Pass/Fail Evaluation of Bidder Response to VoteCal Technical Requirements

Rating	Criteria
PASS	• Response meets or exceeds technical requirement.
FAIL	• Response does not meet the technical requirement.

8. ***Bidder Firm and Key Subcontractor Experience (Maximum Score 600)***

a. INTRODUCTION

Section V.C.1 of the VoteCal RFP identifies the following mandatory requirement:

Req. A4 Bidders must provide a minimum of three (3) Bidder customer references for customers of the Bidder and one (1) for their key subcontractors that presently have similar technology and functionality installed and operating for a comparable business process, and where the Bidder provided the implementation services as stated in Section V, Exhibit V.1. SOS reserves the right to call any or all of the references provided. It is the responsibility of the Bidder to contact their customer references and make them aware that SOS may be contacting them for a reference. SOS will inform the Bidder if a reference is non-responsive so they may ensure they are available. If SOS is unable to contact any of the references, the Bidder will be deemed non-responsive. The State has the option of requesting from the Bidder any information the State deems necessary to determine the Bidder's capabilities and past performance.

Bidders must provide references as closely comparable to the SOS VoteCal requirements as possible. Bidders must have experience developing complex interfaces and with data conversions of files from non-relational and relational databases, paper files, electronically stored images, and desktop and server files.

Bidders can earn a maximum score of 600 on their Proposal based on the applicable experience of their firm and any key subcontractors. The score awarded for firm experience will be based entirely upon the information provided by the references identified by the Bidder in their proposal. A minimum of three (3) references will be checked for the Bidder firm and at least one (1) reference will be checked for each key subcontractor firm. A key subcontractor is defined as a subcontracted firm providing more than 10% of the total services.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

At least two (2) members of the Evaluation Team will participate in each reference call. During the call, the Evaluation Team members will:

- Confirm the information provided by the Bidder about the reference's implementation project;
- Ask the reference to directly rate the reference's satisfaction with the Bidder (or Key Subcontractor) with respect to the development and implementation process, the end product delivered, the service and support provided, and the end product's usability.
- Ask detailed questions to further determine the scope of the reference's project and its comparability to the VoteCal Project and to gauge the overall success of the project.

The Firm Client Telephone Reference Calling Questionnaire (Exhibit IX.2) details the questions that are to be asked of each reference. This form will also be used to document the reference's responses. The Evaluation Team will complete one of these forms for each client reference telephone call made.

The Evaluation Team will fax the questions to the reference in advance to ensure they have the resources available to respond to the questions. After the conclusion of the call, the Evaluation Team members will discuss the reference's responses to arrive at a consensus on the comments to include in the documentation and to validate that they all had heard the same score from the reference for each of the question ratings.

Based on the reference responses, points will be awarded for the Bidder's references and a final score will be calculated in the following manner:

1) **Direct Rating by the References (145 points Maximum):** Each reference will be asked to score the Bidder or Key Subcontractor firm from 0 to 5 on a series of questions related to:
   - Customer satisfaction with the firm's performance in project development and implementation;
   - Customer satisfaction with the end product delivered by the firm;
   - Customer satisfaction with the service and support provided by the firm; and
   - Customer satisfaction with the product's Usability.

   The rating provided by the reference to each question will be translated directly into points, i.e., if the reference rates the firm 4 on a particular question, the Bidder will be awarded 4 points for that question. Table IX.15 below summarizes the number of questions and the total possible points for each of the four areas:

Table IX.15 – Firm Reference Question Categories and Points

Question Category	Number of questions	Maximum Points
Satisfaction with the firm's performance in project development and implementation	10	50
Satisfaction with the end product delivered	7	35
Satisfaction with the firm's service and support	6	30
Satisfaction with product's usability	6	30
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE:		**145**

2) **Evaluation Team Rating for Reference's Overall Project Success (100 points maximum):** The Evaluation Team will rate the overall success of the reference's development/implementation project, based on the information provided by the Bidder and the responses from the client reference, assigning a maximum of 100 points for a highly successful project that was delivered on time, on budget, and that fully met the project requirements and objectives. A percentage of the 100 possible points will be awarded based on the following criteria (Table IX.16):

Table IX.16 Criteria for Evaluating Project Success for Firm References

Points	Criteria
100%	All of the following applies: • Project was completed on-time or early (or project was only late due to circumstances totally beyond Bidder control); • Project did not exceed contracted cost (or project cost overages were due to circumstances totally beyond Bidder control); • The delivered system fully met or exceeded project goals, requirements and specifications; • Data conversion and system deployment went smoothly, in accordance with vendor plan; and • The delivered system has been or was actively in use with only minor bugs.
75%	Any one of the following applies: • Project was completed more than 5% late due to circumstances partially under vendor control; • Project was delivered more than 5% over budget due to circumstances partially under vendor control; • The delivered system did not fully meet project goals; requirements and specifications as contracted; • There were significant issues with data conversion or system deployment due to circumstances partially under vendor control; or • Significant bugs or flaws were discovered in the system after it was actively in use.
50%	Any two of the following applies: • Project was completed more than 5% late due to circumstances partially under vendor control; • Project was delivered more than 5% over budget due to circumstances partially under vendor control; • The delivered system did not fully meet project goals; requirements and specifications as contracted; • There were significant issues with data conversion or system deployment due to circumstances partially under vendor control; or • Significant bugs or flaws were discovered in the system after it was actively in use.

Points	Criteria
25%	Any of the following applies: • Project was completed more than 10% late due to circumstances partially under vendor control; • Project was delivered more than 10% over budget due to circumstances partially under vendor control; • There were significant deviations between the delivered system and project goals, requirements and specifications due to circumstances largely under vendor control; • There were significant, foreseeable issues with data conversion or system deployment due to circumstances largely under vendor control; or • Multiple significant bugs or flaws were discovered in the system after it was actively in use.
5%	Any two or more of the following applies: • Project was completed more than 10% late due to circumstances wholly under vendor control; • Project was more than 10% over budget due to circumstances partially wholly vendor control; • There were significant deviations between the delivered system and project goals, requirements and specifications due to circumstances wholly under vendor control (flaws in requirement identification, design and development); • There were significant, foreseeable issues with data conversion or system deployment due to circumstances wholly under vendor control; or • Multiple significant bugs or flaws were discovered in the system after it was actively in use requiring modification of business processes as a workaround; • System is not in active use due to problems or because the delivered system did not meet organizational objectives, as they were identified at the start of the project.

3) **Comparability Factor (0-5) Adjustment:** The sum of the points determined in #1 and #2 above will be multiplied by a project comparability factor to yield the total points for that reference. A project that closely mirrors the requirements, scope, and complexity of the VoteCal Project will receive a higher comparability factor. The comparability factor will be determined in the following manner (Table IX.17, below):

Table IX.17 – Calculation of Reference Comparability Factor

1 point will be added to the comparability factor for submitting a valid reference (e.g., SOS is able to contact the reference);
1 point will be added to the comparability factor if the total project cost exceeded $25 Million;
1 point will be added to the comparability factor if the project required integration on a continuous real-time basis with at least 3 independent systems not under the direct control or management of the vendor or the customer;
1 point will be added to the comparability factor if the project database contained at least 15 Million records in a single key table; and
1 point will be added to the comparability factor if the reference project involved implementation of a statewide voter registration system.

4) **Non-Responsive References:** The following procedures will be followed for references that are non-responsive:
   - After 2 attempts to contact the reference, SOS will notify the Bidder of the client's unresponsiveness;
   - SOS will make one more attempt to contact the reference. If the reference is still unresponsive, the Bidder will receive zero (0) points for that reference, which will be factored into the average reference calculation and final score awarded.

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR BIDDER FIRM AND KEY SUBCONTRACTOR EXPERIENCE

1) **Average Points Per Reference Calculation:** The total points from each reference will be summed and then divided by the number of references checked to determine the average points per reference.

2) **Calculation of the Percentage of Points Earned:** The average points per reference (#1 above) will be divided by the total possible points (1225 – maximum points with comparability factor of 5 for each reference), to determine the percentage of points earned for Firm References.

$$\frac{\text{Average Evaluation Points Per Reference}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) **Calculation of Score for Firm Experience**: The actual Proposal score for Firm Experience will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for the Firm References (600) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2 above.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

<u>Example of Calculation of Firm Experience Score for Bidder & Key Subcontractors</u>:

Refer to the following table for an example of how the Firm Experience Score is determined.

Example Calculation of Bidder Score for VoteCal System and Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements:

Reference Name	(a) Developmt & Implemnt *(max. 50)*	(b) Product Satisfaction *(max. 35)*	(c) Service & Support *(max. 30)*	(d) Product Ease of Use *(max. 30)*	(e) Project Success *(max. 100)*	(f) Sub-Total *(sum a-e)*	(g) Comparability Factor *(max. 5)*	Total Points *(f x g)*
TDM	48	30	30	22	75	205	5	1025
CA DHY	50	35	30	24	100	239	2	478
DCM	45	28	24	28	50	175	4	700
WA VAP	36	20	26	22	50	154	3	462
				1. Subtotal - points for all references				2665
				2. Number of references checked				4
				3. Average points per reference *[#1 divided by #2]*				666.3
				4. Maximum Points Possible				1225
				5. Percent of Points Earned *[#3 divided by #4]*				54.4%
				6. Maximum Possible Score *[= 600]*				600
				7. Firm Experience Score Awarded *[#5 x #6]*				**326.4**

9. ***Key Project Team (Maximum Score 400)***

a. INTRODUCTION

Section VI.E of the VoteCal RFP identifies the following mandatory requirements:

Req. P18 The Bidder must provide an organization chart for their proposed team illustrating reporting lines of authority and how the Bidder envisions the VoteCal Project Manager, SOS IT staff and Voter Registration/Election program staff will relate to their team structure.

Bidders must provide a narrative discussion of their project team organization, roles and responsibilities, as well as the level of on-site (at the SOS office) presence anticipated for each staff person.

Minimum Bidder staffing qualifications for the anticipated roles can be found in Exhibit VI.2. The Bidder must propose specific individuals to fill all key Bidder staffing roles. The Bidder's actual project team must, at a minimum, include the Project Manager, Functional Lead, Technical Lead, Training Lead, Data Conversion Lead, and Programming Lead. One person may fill more than one role for staffing purposes. Staff proposed must demonstrate they have appropriate experience in the role they are proposed for (demonstrated through experience on previous projects). Bidder-proposed key staff that do not meet the minimum qualifications as listed in Exhibit VI.2 will be disqualified during the evaluation phase.

SOS requires the Bidder to maintain continuity of staffing. If and when a contract is awarded, the winning Bidder will be expected to provide the

individuals proposed in key roles (Project Manager, Business Lead, Technical Lead, Programming Lead, Training Lead, Testing Lead, and Data Conversion Lead) if those individuals are still in the employ of the Bidder. Once committed to the project, all proposed staff are expected to remain for the duration of the project in that role. SOS recognizes that a resignation or other events may cause Bidder project team members to be unavailable. VoteCal Project Management reserves the right to approve or deny all Bidder proposed replacement project team members. The proposed replacement staff must have the same or higher-level skills and experience as the staff person leaving the project. SOS reserves the right to validate the proposed replacement staff references prior to approving their participation on the project.

Req. P19 The Bidder must provide resumes for all key individuals identified in Requirement P18 that have been proposed for this project. Resumes must use Exhibit VI.3 Bidder Staff Resume form and must provide one (1) completed exhibit for each staff member proposed.

Note: Bidders should be aware that during the Final Proposal Evaluation, Bidder proposed staff references may be validated. SOS strongly urges the Bidder to bring their proposed Project Manager and other proposed staff to attend the confidential discussions.

Bidders can earn a maximum score of 400 based on an evaluation of the Bidder's proposed Key Project Team. The Key Project Team is defined as the persons in the following roles: Project Manager, Business Program (Elections) Lead, Technical Lead, Programming Lead, Testing Lead, Training Lead and Data Conversion Lead. The score awarded for the Key Project Team will be based on an evaluation of the Bidder's response to Requirements P18 and P19, as well as the responses received in telephone reference checks. At least two (2) references will be checked for the project manager. At least 3 references total will be checked for the remainder of the Key Project Team.

The Bidder's response for requirements P18 and P19 will first be evaluated on a pass/fail basis for satisfaction of these Project Team requirements. Responses that meet these requirements, will be further evaluated and scored on the following factors:

- The degree the proposed Key Project Team meets the preferred experience level for each position;
- The information received from reference checks of Key Project Team members; and
- The VoteCal Evaluation Team's evaluation of the Bidder's staffing proposal and Key Project Team experience.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

1) **Satisfaction of Required Elements (Pass/Fail):** The Bidder's response to the following elements of Requirements P18 and P19 will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis, as listed in Table IX.18 below.

Table IX.18 – Pass/Fail Evaluation of Project Team Requirements Response

SATISFACTION OF REQUIREMENTS P18 and P19	
Criteria	Evaluation Rating
Bidder provided provide an organization chart for their proposed team illustrating reporting lines of authority and how the Bidder envisions the VoteCal Project Manager, SOS IT staff and Voter Registration program staff will relate to their team structure.	PASS FAIL
Bidder provided a narrative discussion of their project team organization, roles and responsibilities, as well as the level of on-site (at the SOS office) presence anticipated for each staff person.	PASS FAIL
Bidder committed to: deliver the promised project team; on-site presence of Key Project Team members throughout their appropriate phase of the project; and continuity of staff throughout the project.	PASS FAIL
All proposed Key Project Team members meet the minimum required qualifications identified in Exhibit VI.2.	PASS FAIL
Note: A FAIL on any of the items above will be deemed a material deviation and will disqualify the Bidder from further consideration.	

2) **Satisfaction of Preferred Experience for Key Project Team Members (160 possible points):** RFP Section VI, Exhibit VI.2 details the minimum qualifications and the preferred qualifications for the Bidder's Key Project Team staff. The following points will be awarded to each Key Project Team member who fully meets the preferred level of experience identified in Exhibit VI.2:
   - Project Manager – 100 points
   - All other Key Project Team members – 10 points each
3) **Project Manager References (130 possible points):** A minimum of two (2) references will be checked for the proposed Project Manager. At least two (2) members of the Evaluation Team will participate in each reference call. During the call, the Evaluation Team will:
   - Confirm the information provided by the Bidder about the reference's implementation project;
   - Ask questions to clarify and document the proposed Project Manager's participation and role reference's implementation project; and
   - Ask the reference to directly rate the proposed Project Manager's abilities and performance on the reference's implementation project.

   The Reference Check Questionnaire for Proposed Project Manager (Exhibit IX.3) details the questions that are to be asked of each reference. This form will also be used to document the reference's responses. The Evaluation Team will fax the questions to the reference in advance to ensure they have the resources available to respond to the questions.

During the call, the reference will be asked to directly rate the proposed Project Manager from 0 to 5 on a series of 26 questions that address the proposed Project Manager's:

- Functional performance and abilities;
- General ability to manage a project; and
- Personal management skills.

The rating provided by the reference to each question will be translated directly into points, i.e., if the reference rates the Team Member "4" on a particular question, the Bidder will be awarded 4 points for that question.

The total possible points for each reference is 130 (26 questions for 5 maximum points each). After the conclusion of the call, the Evaluation Team members will discuss the reference's responses to arrive at a consensus on the comments to include in the documentation and to validate they all had heard the same score from the reference for each of the question ratings.

Non-responsive References: The following procedures will be followed for references that are non-responsive:

- After 2 attempts to contact the reference, SOS will notify Bidder of client's unresponsiveness;
- SOS will make one more attempt to contact the reference. If the reference is still unresponsive, Bidder will receive zero (0) points for that reference, which will be factored into the average reference calculation and final score awarded.

The total points for all references will be summed and then divided by the number of references checked to obtain the average points for the Project Manager references, which will be used as the number of Project Manager Reference points in the calculation of the Bidder's score for the Project Team.

4) **Overall Project Team Evaluation (60 possible points):** The VoteCal Evaluation Team will review the following information to evaluate the Bidders staffing proposal and proposed Key Project Team:

- Bidder's proposed organization chart and the Bidder's narrative discussion of their project team organization, roles and responsibilities, as well as the level of on-site (at the SOS office) presence anticipated for each staff person, provided in response to Requirement P18;
- Bidder's allocation of staffing resources in the proposed Project Plan and Project Schedule provided in response to requirements P1 and 2; and
- Resumes and experience for Key Project Team Members provided by the Bidder.

Additionally, at least 3 references of Key Project Team Members other than the Project Manager will be checked. The form Reference Check Questionnaire for Key Project Team (Exhibit IX.4) details the questions to be asked in these references checks, and is to be used to document the responses received from the reference. Feedback and comments provided on Key Project Team Member in reference check calls will also be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project Team

After reviewing the above information, the Evaluation Team will award points for the Project Team Overall, using the Criteria in Table IX.19 below:

Table IX.19 –Criteria for Assigning Points in Evaluation of Project Team

Points	***Criteria***
10 points	**Excellent** - assessment of the Bidder's proposal with respect to project team experience, organization and resource allocation indicates a very high probability of success in satisfying all State requirements for the project. There are no identified factors that raise doubt with respect to the probability of an entirely successful outcome.
7 points	**Good** - assessment of the Bidder's proposal with respect to project team experience, organization and resource allocation indicates a high probability of success. Any identified negative factors are minor and should be controllable during the course of the project.
5 points	**Acceptable -** assessment of the Bidder's proposal with respect to project team experience, organization and resource allocation indicates an acceptable probability of success, although there are negative factors that will require management attention throughout the course of the project.
0 points	**Unacceptable -** assessment of the Bidder's proposal with respect to project team experience, organization and resource allocation indicates sufficient deficiencies and real doubts as to the successful outcome of the project. Negative factors are significant and may not be controllable. One or more proposed team member will need to be replaced.

Using the criteria in Table IX.19, the Project Team will award 0 – 10 points for each of the factors listed in Table IX.20 (below) with respect to the Proposed Key Project Team. The points awarded for each factor will be summed to obtain the total points earned for the Overall Project Team.

Table IX.20 – Overall Project Team Evaluation Factors

Project Team Evaluation Factors (10 points possible each)
1) Does the proposed organization chart and narrative provided in response to Requirement P18 indicate sufficient staffing to ensure project success?
2) Have the Key Project Team Members had a similar level of responsibility on previous projects of similar size and scope?
3) Are the proposed project assignments entirely consistent with the experience and skill levels of the assigned individuals?
4) Does the narrative on staffing indicate that Key Project Team members are sufficiently committed to on-site participation throughout the expected duration of their role on the project?
5) Where relevant, does the Key Project Team staff have demonstrable expertise with the proposed products and technologies?
6) Do the reference checks of Key Project Team members support the experience and abilities claimed by the Bidder and indicate superior performance?

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR KEY PROJECT TEAM

1) **Calculation of Total Points Earned:** The total points awarded for each of the following from Section IX.F.9.b will be summed to determine the Total Points Earned for the Key Project Team in the Proposal:
   - Preferred Experience (Items #IX.F.9.b.2);
   - Project Manager References (Item # IX.F.9.b.3); and
   - Overall Project Team Evaluation (Item # IX.F.9.b.4).

2) **Calculation of the Percentage of Points Earned**: The Total Points Earned for the Key Project Team will be divided by the total possible points for the Key Project Team category (350), to determine the Percentage of Points Earned.

$$\frac{\text{Total Evaluation Points Awarded}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) **Calculation of Score for Key Project Team**: The actual Proposal score for Key Project Team will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for the Key Project Team (400) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2 above.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

Example Calculation of Bidder Score for Key Project Team:

1. *Assume the Bidder's proposal receives the following points for the various requirements:*

Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible	Points Awarded
Preferred Experience	160	120
Project Manager References	130	116
Overall Project Team Evaluation	60	47
TOTAL	**350**	**283**

2. *The Percent of Points Earned would be calculated as follows:*

$$\frac{\text{283 (Evaluation Points Earned)}}{\text{350 (Maximum Points Possible)}} = \text{80.9\% of Points Earned}$$

3. *The Score actually awarded would be 323.6, calculated as follows:*

400 (Max Possible Score) X 80.9% of Points Earned = 323.6 Score Awarded

10. ***<u>VoteCal Reporting Strategy (Maximum Score 500)</u>***

a. INTRODUCTION

RFP Section VI.G requires the Bidder to provide a detailed description of their Reporting Strategy for the VoteCal System solution. Additionally, specific VoteCal Reporting requirements are identified in the RFP Section VI Technical Requirements (Table VI.3), Requirements T13.1 through T13.13. Finally, RFP Section IV, Exhibit VI.5 and Exhibit VI.6 identify standard reports that must be provided by the bidder as part of the VoteCal System.

The VoteCal Evaluation Team will evaluate the Bidder's detailed description of the proposed Reporting Strategy, as well as the responses to the various reporting requirements (e.g. how the Bidder proposes to implement the extensive reporting requirements and provide the standard reports for the VoteCal solution).

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Team will use the criteria in Table IX.21 (below) to rate the Bidder's Reporting Strategy for multiple factors and award points for each factor.

Table IX.21 –Criteria for Assigning Points in Evaluation of Reporting Strategy

Points	Criteria
10 points	**Superior** - Overall, the proposal exceeds SOS expectations and objectives in the completeness and demonstrability of this factor in an existing system developed or provided by the bidder in at least one referenced project.
7 points	**Very Good** -The factor is satisfactorily addressed in the proposal, but it cannot be fully demonstrated in an existing, referenced system or project. However, the approach is clearly and completely described, is clearly viable, and is based upon standard or best business practices.
5 points	**Satisfactory** - The factor is addressed in the proposal, although the response either incompletely describes how the factor will be addressed; or the approach appears to be viable but is not demonstrable with respect to the factor.
3 points	**Poor** - Some factors are not addressed in the proposal, or are neither demonstrable nor clearly viable. Claims of functionality or performance cannot be supported and do not appear viable for the application intended.

The above criteria will be used to assign points for the Reporting Strategy with respect to the six factors listed in Table IX.22 below. Each factor can receive a maximum of ten points for that factor, for a maximum of 60 possible points total for the Reporting Strategy.

Table IX. 22 – Evaluation Factors for Proposed Reporting Strategy

Criteria
Comprehensiveness. The degree to which the reporting strategy meets all of the current and potential future reporting requirements of the system.
Elegance and Simplicity. The use of common components to support reporting functions throughout the system, and the use of components for their normal purposes without excessive fragmentation of tasks.
Performance. The ability of the reporting strategy to provide satisfactory turnaround on the creation of large or complex reports without degrading the performance of other system components and functions.
Usability. The ease of use of the reporting strategy, including the ease with which staff can be trained to produce reports, the ability to modify existing reports and to add new reports by trained end users without programming support, and the degree to which the user interface is easy and intuitive without excessive manual tasks or complexity.
Adaptability and Extensibility. The ability of the reporting strategy to support reporting requirements beyond those specified in this proposal without significant system modification.
Familiarity. The use of commonly-used reporting tools or languages, and existence of sufficient qualified individuals so that personnel can be recruited and trained to perform reporting tasks, including both the generation of existing reports and the creation of new and modified reports.

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR REPORTING STRATEGY

1) **Calculation of Total Points Earned:** The total points awarded for each of the dimensions in the above Section will be summed to determine the Total Points Earned for the Reporting Strategy.

2) **Calculation of the Percentage of Points Earned**: The Total Points Earned for the Reporting Strategy will be divided by the total possible points for the Reporting Strategy category (60), to determine the Percentage of Points Earned.

$$\frac{\text{Total Evaluation Points Awarded}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) **Calculation of Score for Reporting Strategy**: The actual Proposal score for Reporting Strategy will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for Reporting Strategy (500) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2 above.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

Example Calculation of Bidder Score for Reporting Strategy:

1. *Assume the Bidder's proposal receives the following points for the various requirements:*

Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible	Points Awarded
Comprehensiveness	10	10
Elegance & Simplicity	10	7
Performance	10	10
Usability	10	5
Adaptability & Extensibility	10	7
Familiarity	10	3
TOTAL	**60**	**42**

2. *The Percent of Points Earned would be calculated as follows:*

$$\frac{\text{42 (Evaluation Points Earned)}}{\text{60 (Maximum Points Possible)}} = \text{70.0\% of Points Earned}$$

3. *The Score actually awarded would be 350.0, calculated as follows:*

500 (Max Possible Score) X 70.0% of Points Earned = 350.0 Score Awarded

11. ***<u>VoteCal Architecture (Maximum Score 1500)</u>***

a. INTRODUCTION

RFP Section VI.H requires the Bidder to provide a detailed description of the proposed architecture of their VoteCal System solution.

The VoteCal Evaluation Team will evaluate the Bidder's detailed description of the proposed VoteCal Architecture, as well as the Bidder's responses to the various technical requirements.

b. EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation Team will use the criteria in Table IX.23 (below) to rate the Bidder's proposed VoteCal Architecture for multiple factors and award points for each factor.

Table IX.23 –Criteria for Assigning Points in Evaluation of VoteCal Architecture

Points	Criteria
100 points	**Superior** - Overall, the proposal exceeds SOS expectations and objectives in the completeness and demonstrability of this factor in an existing system developed or provided by the bidder in at least one referenced project.
70 points	**Very Good** - The factors is satisfactorily addressed in the proposal, but it cannot be fully demonstrated in an existing, referenced system or project. However, the approach is clearly and completely described, is clearly viable, and is based upon standard or best business practices.
50 points	**Satisfactory** - The factor is addressed in the proposal, although the response either incompletely describes how the factor will be addressed; or the approach appears to be viable but is not demonstrable with respect to the factor.
30 points	**Poor** - Some factors are not addressed in the proposal, or are neither demonstrable nor clearly viable. Claims of functionality or performance cannot be supported and do not appear viable for the application intended.

The above criteria will be used to assign points for the VoteCal Architecture with respect to the twelve factors listed in Table IX.24 below. Each factor can receive a maximum of ten points for that factor, for a maximum of 1200 possible points total for the VoteCal Architecture.

Table IX.24 – Evaluation Factors for Bidder VoteCal Architecture

Evaluation Factors of the Proposed Technical Architecture
Comprehensiveness. The degree to which the proposed architecture meets all of the functional and performance requirements of the RFP and business goals of the FSR.
Elegance and Simplicity. The clarity and simplicity of the design, minimization of components, degree to which data and communications paths are direct and non-recursive, and hardware and software components are used for their normal, proven purposes without excessive fragmentation of tasks.
Flexibility. The ability of the architecture to accept modifications to business rules and data elements and to extend functionality, capacity and performance at minimal cost and effort.
County EMS Compatibility. The ease with which existing county EMS systems can be modified to use the required application program interfaces, and the ability for county users to employ the intrinsic user interfaces without excessive task duplication or complication.
Currency. The use of actively marketed and developed hardware and software, and current business and technical practices and structures.
Interoperability. The ease with which the system can exchange data or obtain services from external systems, and the appropriate use of independent national and international standards.
Stability. The tolerance of the architecture for above-average workloads, and other abnormal stresses.
Maintainability. The ability of the system to be maintained by personnel with commonly available skills; the use of easily obtained software and hardware, and the ease with which necessary changes and updates can be applied to the system.
Availability and Robustness. The ability of the architecture to deliver very high availability, including the tolerance for common system component failures and the ability to perform routine maintenance without interrupting service.
Disaster Recovery. The ability to recover the system to full functionality with all data intact following an event that destroys or renders unusable the primary system facility at SOS.
Security and Privacy Protection. Comprehensive mechanisms to prevent accidental or malicious use, destruction, of modification of system resources or data, and specific mechanisms, including but not limited to those required by applicable statute or regulation, to ensure that private and confidential data are not disclosed or exposed for disclosure to unauthorized entities.
Network Sufficiency. The network solution provides sufficient bandwidth to support required and proposed performance, and is compatible with the other factors in this category.

c. CALCULATION OF THE SCORE FOR THE VOTECAL ARCHITECTURE

1) **Calculation of Total Points Earned:** The total points awarded for each of the dimensions in the above Section will be summed to determine the Total Points Earned for the Proposal's VoteCal Architecture.

2) **Calculation of the Percentage of Points Earned**: The Total Points Earned for the VoteCal Architecture will be divided by the total possible points for the VoteCal Architecture category (1200), to determine the Percentage of Points Earned.

$$\frac{\text{Total Evaluation Points Awarded}}{\text{Maximum Points Possible}} = \text{\% of points earned}$$

3) **Calculation of Score for VoteCal Architecture**: The actual Proposal score for VoteCal Architecture will be calculated by multiplying the maximum possible score for VoteCal Architecture (1500) by the percentage of earned points calculated in step 2 above.

(Maximum Possible Score) X (% of Points Earned) = RFP Score Awarded

Example Calculation of Bidder Score for VoteCal Architecture:

1. *Assume Bidder's proposal receives the following points for the various requirements:*

Evaluation Factors	Max Points Possible	Points Awarded
Comprehensiveness	100	70
Elegance & Simplicity	100	100
Flexibility	100	100
County EMS Compatibility	100	50
Currency	100	70
Interoperability	100	100
Stability	100	100
Maintainability	100	70
Availability & Robustness	100	30
Disaster Recovery	100	50
Security & Privacy Protection	100	70
Network Sufficiency	100	100
TOTAL	**1200**	**910**

2. *The Percent of Points Earned would be calculated as follows:*

$$\frac{\text{910 (Evaluation Points Earned)}}{\text{1200 (Maximum Points Possible)}} = \text{75.8\% of Points Earned}$$

3. *The Score actually awarded would be 1137.0, calculated as follows:*

1500 (Max Possible Score) X 75.8% of Points Earned = 1137.0 Score Awarded

G. COST ASSESSMENT (Maximum Score = 10,000 points)

A maximum score of 10,000 is possible for the Cost Assessment portion of the evaluation. The Cost Proposals from all participating Bidders will not be opened until the Evaluation Team has completed the evaluation process for Project Management, Business and Technical Requirements. Only Bidders that are compliant in all previous evaluation areas and exceeding 70% of the maximum total score for those categories will continue in the evaluation process and have their Cost Proposals opened. Bidders may be awarded up to 9,500 points for their costs for the VoteCal System. Bidders proposing the VoteCal EMS may be awarded up to 500 additional points for their costs for the optional system.

All participating Bidders and interested parties shall be notified as to the date and time when a public opening of proposal costs will be conducted.

The cost assessment is a two-step process. In the first step the Cost Proposals will be opened and the Evaluation Team will validate all cost tables for accuracy (math errors) and to ensure all items identified in the Bidder's Proposal (i.e., deliverables) have been included in the Cost Tables.

Errors and inconsistencies will be dealt with according to procedures contained in Section II.D.8,c - Errors in the Final Proposal. Adjustments will be made for the purpose of evaluation in accordance with procedures described in RFP Section VII – Cost Tables and RFP Section II. Only those cost adjustments will be made for which a procedure is described in this RFP. When the cost table validation has been complete, the cost Score for each Bidder's Final Proposal are determined by applying the math adjustments and calculating the final Total Cost for each Bidder.

In the second step of the cost assessment, the formula is applied to the adjusted total cost for a VoteCal System Final Cost Point total as follows.

Example Calculation of Bidder Score for Proposal Cost for the VoteCal System:

The maximum cost score achievable is 9,500.

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Final Cost Proposal} \times 9{,}500}{\text{Bidder's Final Cost Proposal}} = \text{Bidder Final Cost Score}$$

Bidder Final Proposal Costs:

Bidder A	$1,100,000
Bidder B	$3,000,000
Bidder C	$2,040,000

Bidder A	(1,100,000 * 9,500)/1,100,000)	= 9,500 Cost Score
Bidder B	(1,100,000 * 9,500)/3,000,000)	= 3,483 Cost Score
Bidder C	(1,100,000 * 9,500)/2,040,000)	= 5,123 Cost Score

The same cost formula will be applied to the optional VoteCal EMS total cost for all proposals that include this option. Proposals that do not include a VoteCal EMS optional will receive zero for the VoteCal EMS Cost score.

H. DETERMINATION OF WINNING PROPOSAL

1. *Finalization of Final Proposal Points*

All Bidders' points awarded for each area of the Evaluation are tallied to determine the total points awarded for each. Table IX.25 illustrates the maximum possible in each evaluation area.

Table IX.25 – Maximum Possible Score for Each Evaluation Area

Evaluation Area	Maximum Possible Score	
Preliminary Review (Pass/Fail)		
Administrative Requirements (Pass/Fail)		
Requirements		
Project Management Activities and Plans	1500	
Training	200	
Documentation of System Applications and Hardware Requirements	100	
Testing plan	200	
Data Conversion	1000	
VoteCal System Business Requirements	3000	
Optional VoteCal EMS Business Requirements	1000	
VoteCal Technical Requirements	Pass/Fail	
Bidder Firm & Key Subcontractor Experience	600	
Key Project Team Experience and Organization	400	
VoteCal Reporting Strategy	500	
Technical Architecture	1500	
TOTAL POSSIBE SCORE: Project Mgmt., Business & Technical Reqs		10,000
Evaluation of Project Management, Business, Technical and Added Value Total Points (Numbers posted at Cost Opening)		
Cost Assessment		
VoteCal System Proposal Cost	9,500	
Optional VoteCal EMS Proposal Cost	500	
TOTAL POSSIBE SCORE: Cost Assessment		10,000
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS:		**20,000**

2. *Determination of the Small Business Preference*

The Small Business participation preference will be applied after the scores for cost have been calculated. Per Government Code, Section 14835, et seq., Bidders who qualify as a California certified small business and Bidders that commit to using small business subcontractors for 25% or more of the value of the contract will be given a 5 percent preference for contract evaluation purposes only.

The 5% preference is calculated on the total number of points awarded to the highest scoring non-small business that is responsible and responsive to the proposal requirements. If after applying the small business preference a small business has the highest score, no further preferences would be applied as the small business cannot be displaced from the highest score position by application of any other preference.

The rules and regulations of this law, including the definition of a California-certified small business for the delivery of goods and services, are contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 1896, et seq. and can be viewed online at www.pd.dgs.ca.gov/smbus.

Table IX.26 Scoring Example with Small Business Preferences Applied, illustrates how the Small Business preference would be applied. In the example, Bidder A initially has the most points. Bidder C is a California-certified small business. Bidder D is a non-small business that is using California-certified small businesses to perform work that amounts to 25% of the value of the contract. In this scenario, Bidder C earns the 5% small business preference, which is applied to the total "earned" points (accumulated technical, non-technical and cost points, prior to incentives and preferences). Bidder D earns the 5% small business preference, which is applied to the total "earned" points to yield the highest overall point total. In this example, Bidder C would be awarded the contract, because a small business cannot be displaced by any other preference, even though applying the small business preference to Bidder D would have given Bidder D the higher point total.

Table IX.26 - Scoring Example with Small Business Preferences Applied

	Bidder	A	B	C	D
1	Bidder Firm is a Small Business?	No	No	Yes	No
2	Proposal Meets Small Business Requirements?	No	No	Yes	Yes
3	Technical Requirement Points (Row 3)	268	255	245	248
4	Cost Points (row 4)	280	240	300	299
5	Non-Technical points (row 5)	0	0	0	0
6	The Bidder's Cost bid that has the total Combined Highest Cost and Non-Technical Points (Row 4 + Row 5) = Row 6 (300; in this case, Bidder C)	300	300	300	300
7	Total Points Score before any Incentives (Row 3 + Row 4 + Row 5) = Row 7	548	495	545	547
8	Small Business Preference - Highest points Bidder in Row 7 that is not a small business, times 5% = Row 8	0	0	(548 x.05) = 27.4	(548 x .05) =27.4

	Bidder	A	B	C	D
9	Total Points with Small Business Preference Applied (Row 7 + Row 8) = Row 9	548	495	572.4	574.4
10	Subtraction of Preference Points from Non-Small Businesses	0	0	0	27.4
11	Total Final Points with Small Business Preference Applied	548	495	572.4	547

In this example, Bidder D would appear to receive the award, but the law states that a California certified small business cannot be displaced by a large business, which receives preference points. Therefore, when you remove the small business preference points from, Bidder D, Bidder C, has the most points and will receive the award.

3. *Determination of the DVBE Incentives*

In accordance with Section 999.5(a) of the Military and Veterans Code, an incentive will be given to Bidders who provide California certified Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) participation. The State shall apply an incentive to proposals that include California certified DVBE participation. The maximum incentive for this procurement is 5% of the points available, and is based on the amount of DVBE participation obtained, according to Table IX.27.

Table IX.27 - Confirmed DVBE Participation Incentive

Confirmed DVBE Participation of:	DVBE Incentive	DVBE Incentive Points
4% or more	5%	1,000
3% or more but less than 4%	4%	800
2% or more but less than 3%	3%	600
1% or more but less than 2%	2%	400
Less than 1%	0%	0

The DVBE incentive percentage is applied to points earned by the Bidder. For this RFP, the total points available are 20,000.

Table IX.28 illustrates how DVBE incentives and Small Business Preferences would be applied. In this example, Bidder B initially has the most points (16530 total points). Bidder C is a California certified small business. Bidder D is a non-small business that is using California certified small businesses to perform work that amounts to 25% of the value of the contract. As a small business, Bidder C earns the five percent (5%) small business preference, which is applied to the total "earned" points (accumulated technical, non-technical and cost points, prior to incentives and preferences). As a large business using California certified small businesses to perform work that amounts to 25% of the value of the contract, Bidder D earns the 5% small business preference which is applied to the total "earned" points also. Bidder D earns 1000 DVBE incentive points.

Table IX.28 Example of Bidder Points with Small Business and DVBE Incentives and Preferences Applied

#	Scoring Step	Bidder A	Bidder B	Bidder C	Bidder D

#	Scoring Step	Bidder A	Bidder B	Bidder C	Bidder D
	Meets Small Business Requirement?	No	No	Yes	Yes
1	Technical Requirements Score	0	9295	9055	8455
2	Cost Points	0	7235	4590	6555
3	Non-Technical Points (none for this procurement)	0	0	0	0
4	The Bid that has the Total Combined Highest Cost and Non-Technical Points (row 3 + row 4)		X		
5	Total Points Score before any Incentives (row 2 + row 3 + row 4)	0	16,530	13,645	15,010
6	Small Business Preference ((highest points from row 6 that is not a small business) * 5%)	0	0	(16,530* 0.05) = 826.5	(16,530* 0.05) = 826.5
7	Total Points with Small Business Preference (row 6 + row 7)	0	16,530	14,471.5	15,836.5
8	DVBE Incentive	0	0	0	5%
9	DVBE Incentive Points from Table IX.27	0	0	0	1000
10	Total Points for Evaluation Purposes Only (row 8 + row 10)	0	16,530	14,471.5	16,836.5

In the example, Bidder D would have the highest number of points (16836.5) and would receive the award.

4. *Winning Proposal Summary*

The State Evaluation Team will determine which responsive Bidder proposal has the highest combined score for the technical and administrative scored requirement, the cost and the preferences. The highest sum of the cost score, the evaluation factors score, the DVBE and the small business preference points will determine the Bidder selected for contract award.

G. CONTRACT AWARD

The Contract award, if any, will be made to the responsive and responsible Bidder having the highest total score.

EXHIBIT IX.1 – PRELIMINARY REVIEW FORM

Bidder Name: _____

The response package includes the following:

Received (10) copies of Volumes I and IV	Yes ☐ No ☐
Received (10) copies of Volumes II and III (Vol. III validated at cost opening)	Yes ☐ No ☐
Received (10) CD-ROM versions of Volumes I and III (Vol. III validated at cost opening)	Yes ☐ No ☐
Received by time and date specified in RFP	Yes ☐ No ☐
One complete set of all volumes containing original signatures marked "**Master Copy**"	Yes ☐ No ☐
VOLUME I – RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENTS	
Section 1: Cover Letter	Yes ☐ No ☐
• A statement to the effect that the proposal is a firm and irrevocable offer that is good for 180 calendar days.	Yes ☐ No ☐
• List of all subcontractor firms and staff proposed.	Yes ☐ No ☐
• A statement expressing the Bidder's availability of staff and other required resources for performing all services and providing all deliverables as described in this RFP.	Yes ☐ No ☐
• A statement expressing that the Prime contractor is responsible for all proposed subcontractors.	Yes ☐ No ☐
Section 2: Executive Summary	Yes ☐ No ☐
Section 3: Response to the Administrative Requirements (Section V)	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Exhibit V.1 - Customer References	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Exhibit V.2- DVBE Participation	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Exhibit V.3 – Worker's Compensation Insurance Certificate	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Letter of Bondability	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Exhibit V.4 - Standard 204	Yes ☐ No ☐

VOLUME I – RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENTS (CONTINUED)	
Preference Programs Requested: Small Business Preference Claimed? Yes ☐ No ☐ TACPA Preference Claimed? Yes ☐ No ☐ EZA Preference Claimed? Yes ☐ No ☐ LAMBRA Preference Claimed? Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
Section 4: Response to the Business and Technical Requirements RFP Section VI	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Project Management Approach Requirements	Yes ☐ No ☐
• VoteCal Mandatory Business Requirements	Yes ☐ No ☐
• VoteCal EMS Business Requirements (Optional)	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Reporting Strategy	Yes ☐ No ☐
• VoteCal Architecture	Yes ☐ No ☐
• Technical Requirements	Yes ☐ No ☐
Section 5: Response to the Project Team Experience Requirements RFP Section V	
VOLUME II – COMPLETED CONTRACT	
This volume must contain a completed contract. Submission of a contract with SOS unapproved modifications may cause the Final Proposal to be deemed non-responsive. If the Bidder is proposing VoteCal EMS, a completed contract for that option must also be included.	Yes ☐ No ☐
VOLUME III – COST DATA	
Cost Proposal is submitted in a separate and sealed envelope.	Yes ☐ No ☐
VOLUME IV – LITERATURE	
This volume will contain all technical and other reference literature necessary to support the responses to the requirements of this RFP (i.e., product "glossy" brochures, equipment technical specification brochures, technical or user manuals that may be advertised in response to the requirements, and other advertising materials). Literature must be tabbed, page numbered, indexed, and properly annotated so SOS can readily verify compliance with the stated requirements. Any references to cost figures in the literature must be replaced with "XXXX".	Yes ☐ No ☐

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____
Department Official

_____
Date

Exhibit IX.2 – Client Telephone Reference Calling Questionnaire

To be used to validate the reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #A-4	
Bidder Name:	***Firm/Sub-Contractor Name:***
Scheduled date and time of attempted contact(s):	Contact #1 Contact #2 Contact #3
Time of contact interview:	Start: End Time:
Type of Business (circle 1):	Public Private Sector
System Profile	
Operating System & Version #:	
Application Product(s) and Version # Used:	
Circle all that are appropriate:	COTS Custom Developed COTS Modified Other:
List Elections related Modules Installed and In Production Use, if any:	Statewide Voter Registration Local Voter Registration Election Management Others:
List Elections related Modules Available and not In Production Use by reference:	
Reason for Not Using Modules:	
Number of End Users (direct users who directly interact with the system):	
Number of records in current system:	
Number of records converted from legacy system to new:	
Why was this product chosen?	Functionality? Ease of Use? Integration ease with current technology? Other Considerations? (Explain) Was the Vendor willing to build new functionality? Yes No
What types of databases are currently implemented in the system?	DB2 IDMS IMS Oracle VSAM file SQL Other
Does your vendor solution interface with any independent business applications or systems? (Identify/list) (Examples, DMV, counties, etc)	(Verify from actual reference)

To be used to validate the reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #A-4					
Bidder Name:			***Firm/Sub-Contractor Name:***		
Project Description					
Total Project Cost:		Project Start Date:		Project End Date:	
Project Objectives:					
Bidder Firm's Involvement:					
Project Benefits:					
Comments:					
Project Success					
How long has the system been in production?					
Were the Project's objectives, as stated by the customer, met? If not, explain.					
Was the system implemented substantially as proposed?					
What significant issues were experienced during development and implementation?					
On Time? If not how late and the reasons?					
On Budget? If not how much over budget and the reasons?					
Would you use this Implementer on another project? If no, why not?					
How could the vendor have done better?					
Any other comments:					
On a scale of 0-5 (5 being the highest & 0 being the lowest score), rate the following:			***Rating***	***Comments***	
Customer Satisfaction with Development/Implementation					

To be used to validate the reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #A-4		
Bidder Name:	***Firm/Sub-Contractor Name:***	
Quality of implementation team?		
Project methodology & quality assurance?		
Contractor responsiveness to your needs/concerns?		
If data conversion was part of the implement, rate the accuracy and timeliness of conversion?		
How effective and thorough was the training of your staff and, if applicable, 3rd party users?		
How effective was the change control process?		
How accurate and effective was the risk management process?		
How effective was the management of communications and organization change?		
How thorough, complete and accurate was the product testing?		
Rate the quality of the detailed specifications and design?		
Total – Development/Implementation *(50 points possible)*		
Customer Satisfaction with the Product Delivered		
How satisfied are your users with the system/product?		
How would you rate system usability or user friendliness?		
Rate the effectiveness and readability of end-user documentation. If online help was substituted for documentation, rate its effectiveness for that purpose?		
Rate the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of on-line help?		
How well does the system meet performance specifications? (Responsiveness, batch processing windows)		
Rate the reliability of the system? (Availability and frequency of unscheduled outages)		
Rate the quality of systems and operations documentation?		
Total – Product Satisfaction *(35 points possible)*		

To be used to validate the reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #A-4		
Bidder Name:	***Firm/Sub-Contractor Name:***	
Customer Satisfaction with Service and Support		
Rate the vendor response time for service and support?		
Rate the timeliness and effectiveness of problem analysis. (Troubleshooting, determination re: bug fix or enhancement)		
Rate the timeliness of bug fixes and problem resolution?		
Rate the usability and effectiveness of the problem reporting and tracking process.		
Rate the effectiveness of the problem escalation process.		
Rate the courtesy and professionalism of the customer support team.		
Total – Service & Support *(30 points possible)*		
Customer Satisfaction with Product Ease of Use		
How effective are the vendor provided procedures and tools for system monitoring and management?		
Rate the ability to adapt the system to changing business requirements without modifying code, scripts or database schema.		
Rate the end-user application interface for intuitiveness?		
How well is the user interface designed for efficient user processing with minimal keystrokes and linear task processing?		
How clear and appropriate are the error messages presented to the user?		
How would you rate the ease of creating and modifying reports?		
Total – Product Ease of Use *(30 points possible)*		
Evaluation of Project Success		
Total Points – Project Success *(100 points possible)*		
Justification and Comments:		

To be used to validate the reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #A-4	
Bidder Name:	***Firm/Sub-Contractor Name:***

Exhibit IX.3 – Reference Check Questionnaire for Proposed Project Manager

To be used to validate the Project Mgr references provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Req. #P-19	
Bidder Name:	***Project Mgr Name:***
General Project Profile of Reference	
Contact Name:	
Title:	
City, State, Zip:	
Phone:	
Scheduled date and time of attempted contact(s):	Contact #1 Contact #2 Contact #3
Time of contact interview:	Start: End Time:
Type of Business (circle 1):	Public Private Sector
What were the start and end dates for the project development and implementation?	
Project Role	
What was this person's role on the Project	
Indicate the Start and End dates of that role	
Percentage of time the PM was on-site?	
Was this consistent with customer expectations?	
Was this sufficient for project success?	
If the PM left before the conclusion of the Project, why?	
What was the size of the Total Project Team? (Contractor and customer staff)	*Contractors:* *Customers:*
For how many customer project team members was the PM responsible for work assignments and functional direction?	

To be used to validate the Project Mgr references provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Req. #P-19		
Bidder Name:	***Project Mgr Name:***	
Identify the functions for which the PM was responsible on the project	☐ Project Planning ☐ Project Schedule Management ☐ Project Reporting ☐ Project Budget and cost control ☐ Risk & Issue Management ☐ Deliverables Management ☐ Quality Assurance ☐ Change Control ☐ Documentation ☐ Design Cycle ☐ Development Cycle ☐ Testing & Implementation Cycle ☐ Product support and help desk functions ☐ Training ☐ Data Conversion	
ON a Scale of 0-5 (5 being the highest & 0 being the lowest score), rate the following:	***Rating***	***Comments***
Functional Performance & Abilities		
Did the person work with any of the following areas (if so rate their performance and ability in that area:		
• Project Planning		
• Project Schedule Management		
• Project Reporting		
• Project Budget and cost control		
• Risk & Issue Management		
• Deliverables Management		
• Quality Assurance		
• Manage Change Control Process		
• Documentation		
• Design Cycle		
• Development Cycle		

To be used to validate the Project Mgr references provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Req. #P-19		
Bidder Name:	***Project Mgr Name:***	
• Testing & Implementation Cycle		
• Product support and help desk functions		
• Training		
• Data conversion		
General Ability to Manage a Project		
Rate the PM's ability to manage and control project scope		
Rate the PM's ability to control project costs		
Rate the PM's ability to control project schedule		
Rate the likelihood you would hire this person in this capacity for future projects		
Personal Management Skills		
Rate the PM's personal management skills in the following areas:		
• Written Communications		
• Verbal communications		
• Meeting planning & facilitation		
• Organization		
• Customer service and responsiveness		
• Leadership & personnel management		
• Follow thru		
Other comments/questions		
Total Points for PM Reference Check		

Exhibit IX.4 – Reference Check Questionnaire for Key Project Team

To be used to validate the key project team reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #P19	
Bidder Name:	***Team Member Name:***
General Project Profile of Reference	
Contact Name:	
Title:	
City, State, Zip:	
Phone:	
Scheduled date and time of attempted contact(s):	Contact #1 Contact #2 Contact #3
Time of contact interview:	Start: End Time:
Type of Business (circle 1):	Public Private Sector
What were the start and end dates for the project development and implementation?	
Project Role	
What was this person's role on the Project? (Function? In a lead position?)	
Indicate the Start and End dates of that role	
Percentage of time the team member was on-site?	
Was this consistent with customer expectations?	
Was this sufficient for project success?	
If the team member left before the conclusion of their responsibilities on the Project, why?	
What was the size of the Total Project Team? (Contractors and customer)	***Contractors*** ***Customers***
For how many project team members was this person responsible for work assignments and functional direction?	

To be used to validate the key project team reference provided by the Bidder in response to Proposal Item #P19		
Bidder Name:	***Team Member Name:***	
ON a Scale of 1-5 (5 being the highest & 1 being the lowest score), rate the following:	***Rating***	***Comments***
Rate the person in the following areas:		
• Technical ability for the role assigned		
• Performance for the role assigned		
• Written & Verbal Communications		
• Organization		
• Customer service and responsiveness		
• Leadership & supervisory skills		
• Follow through		
Rate the likelihood you would hire this person in this capacity for future projects		
Other comments/questions		