

EXERCISE 1  
STRUCTURING REQUIREMENTS

DOCUMENT SET 3



State of California  
Information System  
System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
RFP

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>I-5</b>
I.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL	I-5
I.2 BACKGROUND	I-5
I.2.1 CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE MANDATE	I-5
I.2.2 STRATEGIC REGIONAL OPPORTUNITY BEYOND CALIFORNIA	I-6
I.2.3 DEVELOPMENT	I-7
I.2.4 RENEWABLE CERTIFICATES	I-8
I.2.5 CERTIFICATES	I-8
I.2.6 CONTRACT-BASED VS. ELECTRONIC-BASED TRACKING SYSTEMS	I-9
I.3 PROJECT SCOPE	I-10
I.3.1 SCOPE OF THE COMPLETE SOLUTION	I-10
I.3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENVISIONED SOLUTION	I-10
I.3.3 SCOPE OF THE SOLUTION COVERED IN THIS RFP	I-11
I.3.4 PROJECT ORGANIZATION	I-12
I.3.5 PROJECT STRUCTURE	I-13
I.3.6 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT	I-14
I.3.7 PRODUCTION AND OPERATIONS ENVIRONMENT	I-14
I.3.8 PRIMARY CLIENT ENTITIES DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATIONAL PHASES	I-14
I.4 PROCUREMENT PROCESS	I-15
I.4.1 BIDDERS' CONFERENCE	I-16
I.4.2 DRAFT PROPOSAL PHASE	I-16
I.4.3 FINAL PROPOSAL PHASE	I-16
I.5 SINGLE BIDDER AND BIDDER PAYMENT	I-18
I.6 SCOPE OF THE RFP AND BIDDER ADMONISHMENT	I-18
I.7 PROCUREMENT OFFICIAL	I-19
I.8 BIDDERS' LIBRARY	I-20
I.9 KEY ACTION DATES	I-20
I.10 FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY INFORMATION	I-21
BIDDER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	I-21
I.11 PARTICIPATING BIDDER INFORMATION	I-22
I.11.1 INTENTION TO BID	I-22
I.11.2 CONFIDENTIALITY	I-22



## I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS

### I.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

The purpose of this Request for Proposal (hereafter called RFP) is to obtain proposals from qualified Bidders who can provide the [REDACTED] (hereafter called the [REDACTED]) with a [REDACTED] tracking and registry system. The selected Bidder will provide the [REDACTED] with an existing renewable [REDACTED] tracking and registry system (or similar [REDACTED] certificate-tracking system), modify the system to meet [REDACTED] requirements, implement the system within 12 months, supply the technical infrastructure,<sup>1</sup> and provide the technical staff to operate and maintain the system for a period of four years. All modifications to the Bidder's base system are considered a work for hire. It is the [REDACTED] intent to own the base system as well as all revisions.<sup>2</sup>

By issuing this RFP the [REDACTED] is in no way committed to awarding a contract. The [REDACTED] reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received if determined to be in the best interest of the [REDACTED] to do so. Responses to this RFP will be evaluated based on the total proposal, and the award, if made, will be to a single Bidder.

### I.2 BACKGROUND

#### I.2.1 CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE MANDATE

The [REDACTED] Program was formed in 1996 to help increase the statewide production of [REDACTED]. In 2002, the California Legislature created the state's [REDACTED] Standard (hereafter called [REDACTED]).<sup>3</sup> To achieve an electricity portfolio for California in which 20 percent of the electricity retail sales will be served by renewable energy by December 2017, the RPS requires sellers to increase the renewable content of their electricity sales by a minimum of one percent of total retail sales per year beginning in 2003. California's energy policy "accelerates" the RPS schedule to a target of 2010 rather than 2017.<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Supplying the "technical infrastructure" refers to the bidder providing the facility, hardware, telecommunication, and other materials needed to provide the operating environment to run and support the [REDACTED] tracking and registry system.

<sup>2</sup> These terms supersede Paragraph 37.a of the "General Provisions - Information Technology" of the State model contract language referenced via the link included in Appendix B, Attachment 2 of this RFP.

<sup>3</sup> Senate Bill [REDACTED] established California's [REDACTED]. Senate Bill [REDACTED] and Senate Bill [REDACTED] modify California's [REDACTED] and provide clarification on out of state eligibility. For additional information, please access [REDACTED].

<sup>4</sup> The 2010 target was formally adopted in a joint agency report, the [REDACTED] Action Plan adopted by the California [REDACTED] the California [REDACTED], and the California [REDACTED] in the spring of 2003 ([REDACTED]). In the 2003 [REDACTED] Policy Report ([REDACTED] Report), the [REDACTED] confirmed support for the target of 20 percent by 2010 and concluded that more ambitious,



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>IV. PROPOSED SOLUTION</b> .....	<b>IV-5</b>
IV.1 INTRODUCTION .....	IV-5
IV.1.1 CONTEXT FOR BIDDER'S COMPONENT OF PROPOSED SOLUTION .....	IV-5
IV.2 CONCEPTUAL MODEL .....	IV-8
IV.2.1 PURPOSE OF CONCEPTUAL MODEL .....	IV-8
IV.2.2 OVERVIEW OF THE [REDACTED] CONCEPTUAL MODEL .....	IV-8
IV.2.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSIGNMENT TO A CONCEPTUAL LAYER .....	IV-10
IV.2.4 INTERFACE LAYER .....	IV-10
IV.2.5 APPLICATION LAYER .....	IV-15
IV.3 OPERATING ENVIRONMENT .....	IV-21
IV.3.1 PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT AND HOSTING.....	IV-22
IV.3.2 DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT AND HOSTING .....	IV-22
IV.3.3 ON-GOING SERVICE SUPPORT .....	IV-22

State of California  
[REDACTED] Information System [REDACTED]  
System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
RFP [REDACTED]

This page intentionally left blank.

## IV. PROPOSED SOLUTION

### IV.1 INTRODUCTION

As introduced in Section I of this RFP, California's 2002 policies and legislative mandates included a requirement that the design and implement a tracking and registry system to support California's. Because this requirement aligned with WGA's strategic commitment to strengthen State and Federal policy and systems, the and the WGA resolved to explore developing a regionally-based tracking and registry system to serve the western States and Provinces. This Section of the RFP describes the solution envisioned by the sponsors and contributing stakeholders.

#### IV.1.1 CONTEXT FOR BIDDER'S COMPONENT OF PROPOSED SOLUTION

As introduced in Section I of this RFP, the complete solution is comprised of two components. The Feasibility Study Report (FSR) describes these two components as:

1. Acquire an information system to meet requirements and provide the technical infrastructure<sup>1</sup> and staff to operate that system. The proposed solution recommends purchasing the rights to an existing tracking and registry system (or a similar environmental certificate-tracking system) and contracting with a contractor to modify it to meet the requirements and to provide the technical infrastructure and technical staff to operate the system once operational.
2. Establish an institutional home to house the Program and to provide staff to develop and administer the program. The proposed solution recommends utilizing as the institutional home for the Program and hiring two full-time staff to operate at to develop and administer the Program and to perform administrative operation of the information system.<sup>2,3</sup>

It should be noted that the scope of this RFP and of the proposed solution described in this Section of the RFP addresses the first of the two solution components stated above. However, it is essential that the Bidder understand that the Bidder's proposed solution must integrate and coordinate closely with the staff, processes, and procedures operating at that will comprise the second solution component. Therefore, the scope of this second solution component is briefly described below to provide the Bidder the fuller context of the complete solution.

<sup>1</sup> Providing the "technical infrastructure" refers to the contractor providing the facility, hardware, telecommunication, and other materials needed to provide the operating environment to run and support.

<sup>2</sup> This component of the solution also includes contracting with to provide accounting, IT, facility, and other administrative support services to the Program on an "as needed" basis.

State of California  
Information System  
System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
RFP#

The [REDACTED] will contract with [REDACTED] to:

- Serve as the institutional home for the V [REDACTED] Program;
- Employ and support full-time, dedicated V [REDACTED] staff charged with [REDACTED] Program development and delivery and the administrative operations of the information system (V [REDACTED] Administrator); and,
- Sponsor the board committee that will provide governance and executive management of V [REDACTED] once it enters the Operational Phase.

Although the [REDACTED] Administrator will participate in the [REDACTED] Implementation Phase as part of the [REDACTED] Project team, the full complement of the services [REDACTED] is contracted to provide [REDACTED] will not come into play until the Operational Phase.

Figure IV-1: [REDACTED] Solution Operational Phase graphically depicts both components of the [REDACTED] solution and summarizes the primary responsibilities of constituent roles during the Operational Phase.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>V. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>V-5</b>
V.1 INTRODUCTION .....	V-5
V.2 BIDDER REFERENCES AND STAFF CAPABILITY .....	V-6
V.3 BUSINESS QUALIFICATIONS.....	V-7
V.3.1 PRIME CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITY .....	V-7
V.4 RISK MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS.....	V-10
V.4.1 PERFORMANCE BOND .....	V-10
V.5 BUSINESS PRACTICE REQUIREMENTS.....	V-10
V.5.1 AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) COMPLIANCE STATEMENT .....	V-10
V.5.2 OPTIONAL PREFERENCE CLAIMS .....	V-11
V.6 TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS .....	V-14
V.6.1 TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	V-14
V.6.2 PRODUCTIVE USE REQUIREMENTS .....	V-15
V.6.3 GENERAL DOCUMENTATION.....	V-16
V.6.4 THIRD-PARTY SOFTWARE LICENSING .....	V-17
V.7 STATEMENT OF WORK.....	V-17
V.8 ON-GOING DETAILED PLAN REQUIREMENT .....	V-18
V.9 AMENDMENTS.....	V-18
V.10 OWNERSHIP OF BASE SYSTEM.....	V-18

[REDACTED]

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**VI. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-5**

- VI.1 INTRODUCTION ..... VI-5
  - VI.1.1 ABOUT [REDACTED] SCOPE AND REQUIREMENTS – NEED FOR EXTENSIBILITY..... VI-5
  - VI.1.2 KEY SUCCESS FACTORS DURING THE OPERATIONAL PHASE – QUALITY AND RELIABILITY ..... VI-6
  - VI.1.3 IMPORTANCE OF CAPABILITY TO TRANSITION [REDACTED] ..... VI-6
- VI.2 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-7
  - VI.2.1 REQUIREMENTS RESPONSE MATRICES..... VI-8
  - VI.2.2 SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS..... VI-10
  - VI.2.3 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-11
  - VI.2.4 IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-11
  - VI.2.5 SERVICE SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-12
- VI.3 STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND BIDDER EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-12
  - VI.3.1 STAFF QUALIFICATIONS ..... VI-13
  - VI.3.2 BIDDER EXPERIENCE ..... VI-14
  - VI.3.3 PROJECT TEAM CHANGES..... VI-14
  - VI.3.4 OPERATIONS STAFF CHANGES PRIOR TO CUTOVER TO OPERATIONAL PHASE ..... VI-15
  - VI.3.5 [REDACTED] PROJECT STAFFING DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE..... VI-15
  - VI.3.6 ENERGY COMMISSION STAFFING DURING OPERATIONAL PHASE..... VI-16
- VI.4 BUSINESS SOLUTION REQUIREMENTS ..... VI-17
  - VI.4.1 TECHNICAL APPROACH..... VI-17
  - VI.4.2 FUNCTIONAL APPROACH ..... VI-21
  - VI.4.3 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH ..... VI-24
  - VI.4.4 SERVICE SUPPORT APPROACH..... VI-28

This page intentionally left blank.

## VI. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

### VI.1 INTRODUCTION

This Section explains the Technical Requirements necessary to deliver the proposed solution described in Section IV: Proposed Solution. In this Section, the Bidder is provided instruction on responding to the Technical Requirements presented within Requirements Response Matrices in Appendix F: Technical Requirements. This Section also describes mandatory scorable requirements related to the Bidder's experience and project staff qualifications. The Bidder's proposed approach to addressing Technical, Functional, Implementation, and Service Support Requirements is also solicited in this Section. This Section when combined with Section II: Rules Governing Competition, Section V: Administrative Requirements, Section VIII: Proposal Format, and Appendix J: Service Levels relays all requirements that must be met to be considered responsive to this RFP.

The State has determined that it is best able to define its own needs and desired operating objectives. The State will not tailor these needs to fit a solution a Bidder may have available; rather, the Bidder shall submit a Proposal to meet the State's needs as defined in this RFP. Bidders are to propose solutions for developing application and program software, and providing program and technical support as described in this RFP.

Responses to requirements in this Section must be stated in terms of the total system. Responses must not include descriptions of features and capabilities not available in the proposed system due to limitations imposed on one system component by another component. Proposed equipment and systems must be compatible for use with each other as well as the systems with which they must interface.

Before presenting the detailed information on the requirements, this Section first provides the Bidder with additional information on the nature of the WREGIS initiative. This information is provided in order to assist the Bidder to better understand the Energy Commission's needs.

#### VI.1.1 ABOUT SCOPE AND REQUIREMENTS – NEED FOR EXTENSIBILITY

As explained in Section I: Introduction and Overview of Requirements, the California-specific requirements for a renewable energy tracking and registry system led the [redacted] and the [redacted] to identify a more encompassing, policy-neutral solution envisioned to serve the western States and Provinces included within the Western Interconnection. [redacted] scope and requirements have been established in a series of stakeholder and definitional activities leading up to this RFP. While [redacted] is intended to be policy-neutral, the system's scope and requirements have been formulated so that the system will include the data and functionality needed to allow the industry participants to provide information needed by State and Provincial regulators to confirm compliance with their respective renewable energy programs and policies.

The stakeholder processes and [redacted] working groups identified requirements for those State and Provincial regulators that participated in the [redacted] definitional activities prior to the RFP to the extent that those regulators were able to identify how they would verify compliance. Not all western States and Provinces currently have formal [redacted] related policies defined

and not all of those with policies defined participated in the stakeholder and definitional activities. It is anticipated that, over time, more States and Provinces will become interested in utilizing data to evaluate compliance with their programs and policies. It is also expected that those States and Provinces whose requirements were incorporated into current scope and requirements will identify new or revised verification and policy needs in the future.

Because emerging and revised regulatory programs and policies are anticipated to require future enhancements, it is essential that be designed and developed in a manner that allows it to be easily extended and enhanced. Such extensions and enhancements may include changes in the functionality the provides, the business rules and logic that guide that functionality, and the data that maintains and reports. The Bidder's proposed solution should include explaining how its design and implementation is intended to support extensibility needs.

#### VI.1.2 KEY SUCCESS FACTORS DURING THE OPERATIONAL PHASE – QUALITY AND RELIABILITY

As noted previously in Section I.3.2 Characteristics of the Envisioned Solution, high volume user participation and low cost usage fees were among the core set of characteristics envisioned for . In order for to meet the objective of becoming financially self-sustaining within the first three years after implementation, these two characteristics must be present.

Although deploying a system that meets the specified technical and functional requirements is a necessary condition for success, it is not sufficient. The quality and reliability of the services and support delivered during the Operational Phase will be key success factors critical to maximizing participation (both in retaining participants and attracting more participants). Increased participation is anticipated to help to keep usage fees low.

The importance of the Operational Phase is reflected in the nature of the requirements specified in this Section of the RFP, the detailed requirements presented in Appendix F: Technical Requirements, and, in the performance targets included in Appendix J: Service Levels. Bidders should ensure that their Proposals demonstrate how their solution addresses the quality and reliability of continuing operations.

#### VI.1.3 IMPORTANCE OF CAPABILITY TO TRANSITION

As noted previously in Section IV.3.3.3 of this RFP and as covered in detail in the Implementation workbook contained in Appendix F: Technical Requirements, must have the capability of transitioning its continuing operation and maintenance to a party other than the Contractor should either the or the Contractor elect not to continue contracting for these services at the end of the contract period specified in this RFP, or should unforeseen conditions require these services be transitioned to another party prior to the expiration of the contract. The Contractor will be required to develop and document a Transition Out plan and, if required, to execute that plan. In support of this, the Contractor will also be expected to maintain thorough and up-to-date documentation on

the operations environment (data center) specifications, operational procedures, test libraries, user materials, and application program design and programming specifications.

Bidders may perceive that some of the requirements related to the data center's technical infrastructure (e.g., hardware, system software, and network specifications) included in this Section of the RFP and in Appendix F: Technical Requirements require that the be provided greater visibility into the technical infrastructure in which operates than might be expected for an application hosted at a data center. The seeks this visibility into the technical infrastructure and assurance that all operating procedures, documentation and program components are kept current so that, should the continuing operations and maintenance need to be transitioned to another party, the can have increased confidence that such a transition could occur quickly and with minimum disruption to the system users.

## VI.2 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

Technical Requirements are comprised of System, Functional, Implementation, and Service Support Requirements. Technical Requirements are organized into the following Sections:

### 1. System Requirements

- General Technical
- Application Architecture
- Database Architecture
- System Availability, Security, Audit, and Backups
- Data Volumes and Data Retention
- Data Interface

### 2. Functional Requirements

- Account Holder Registration and Updates
- Generating Unit Registration and Updates
- Establish And Maintain Subaccounts
- Create And Deposit Certificates
- Manage Certificates
- Access Assignments and Updates
- Report On Data and Related Features

### 3. Implementation Requirements

- Project Management
  - Quality Assurance
  - Design and Development
  - Testing
  - Training
  - Transition
  - Project Deliverables
4. Service Support Requirements
- Help Desk Support
  - System Maintenance and Operations
  - Application Modification and Upgrade
  - Performance Management

Information on the Technical Requirements that is presented in this Section serves as explanatory text only. Bidders must state compliance with each requirement by completing reference and response code information for each of the requirements included in Appendix F: Technical Requirements, and include the completed Requirements Response Matrices in their Proposal. Bidders must specify one of the response codes shown below in Section VI.2.1.5: Response Code for each requirement.

The Proposal Evaluation Team will score the responses to these requirements in accordance with the proposal evaluation methodology identified in Section IX: Proposal Evaluation. Any material deviation from these requirements in the Proposal will be cause for rejection of the Proposal as non-responsive.

#### **VI.2.1 REQUIREMENTS RESPONSE MATRICES**

The Bidder must complete and include in their Draft and Final Proposals the Requirements Response Matrices included in Appendix F: Technical Requirements. A description of each column and Bidder responsibilities for completing the Requirements Response Matrices and for referencing requirements within the Proposal are detailed in this Section.

##### **VI.2.1.1 REQUIREMENT NUMBER**

Each Technical Requirement has been provided a unique "Requirement Number." When referring to a specific requirement in Proposal materials, Bidders must use the appropriate Requirement Number. Bidders may not alter this column.

### VI.2.1.2 REQUIREMENT

Each Technical Requirement is fully described in the "Requirement" column. Bidders may not alter this column.

### VI.2.1.3 REQUIREMENT CATEGORY

Technical Requirements are identified under the "Requirements Category" column as being either mandatory or desirable. Bidders may not alter this column.

#### 1. Mandatory (M)

Requirements that indicate "M" must be satisfied. **Failure to meet any Mandatory Requirement will result in the rejection of the Proposal.** This category will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis.

#### 2. Desirable (D)

While requirements designated as "D" are requested by the [REDACTED], failure to meet Desirable Requirements will not result in the Proposal being rejected. These Desirable Requirements will be provided by the Bidder at no additional cost to the State. A positive response indicates that the Desirable Requirement will be included in the solution at the cost provided in the Final Cost Proposal. A "Will Not Provide" response will not negatively affect the evaluation of the business solution requirements (Section VI.4).

### VI.2.1.4 PROPOSAL REFERENCE SECTION

Any Technical Requirement may be explained by the Bidder, at the Bidder's option, so long as there is a cross reference from the Proposal Reference Section column back to the Proposal section where the requirement is addressed. Bidders are encouraged to take time to explain features and functions of their proposed solutions that provide additional value to the State.

### VI.2.1.5 RESPONSE CODE

The Requirements Response Matrices must be completed indicating the status of the requirement(s) at the time of submission of the Final Proposal, using a single response code that best describes how the Bidder's solution meets the requirement. Permissible response codes are listed in Table VI-1: Permissible Response Codes below:

Table VI-1: Permissible Response Codes

Response Code	Definition
E – Existing	Requirement or service will be met by existing software or processes that are installed and operational at other sites and can be incorporated within [REDACTED] as is or using the software's standard configuration mechanisms.
U – Under Development	Requirement or service will be met by software or processes that are currently under development, in Beta test, or not yet released.

State of California  
 Information System  
 System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
 RFP

Response Code	Definition
<b>M</b> – Minor Modification	Requirement or service will be met by proposed minor modifications to existing software or processes beyond using the software's standard configuration mechanisms.
<b>C</b> – Major Customization	Requirement or service will be met by major modifications to existing software or services or by new custom software programming.
<b>R</b> – Third Party Tool or Service	Requirement or service will be met by the use of integrated software tools, such as a report writer, query language, spreadsheet package, or through a third party service provider.
<b>X</b> – Will Not Provide (Desirable Requirements Only)	Bidder will not meet requirement or service. This response code is only acceptable for Desirable Requirements (Requirement Category = 'D'). <b>Use of this response code for Mandatory Requirements shall be cause for rejection of the Proposal.</b>

Bidders shall provide a response code for all Technical Requirements listed in Appendix F: Technical Requirements in the "Response Code" column on the matrices. No other response codes are allowed. Failure to provide a code may be cause for rejection of the Proposal. Responses of "E" may be subject to verification.

### VI.2.2 SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

This Section describes the System Requirements that pertain to the overall solution. The State has determined that it is best to define its own needs. The State will not tailor these needs to fit some solution a Bidder may have available; rather, the Bidder shall propose to meet the State's needs as defined in this RFP. Bidders should review Section IV: Proposed Solution to understand the concept of the future system. The requirements in this Section are further subdivided into the following system components:

- General Technical
- Application Architecture
- Database Architecture
- System Availability, Security, Audit, and Backups
- Data Volumes and Data Retention
- Data Interface

The specific System Requirements for which the Bidder must indicate a response of compliance can be found in the System Requirements workbook included in Appendix F: Technical Requirements.

### VI.2.3 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

This Section describes the Functional Requirements that pertain to the overall solution. The State has determined that it is best to define its own needs. The State will not tailor these needs to fit some solution a Bidder may have available; rather, the Bidder shall propose to meet the State's needs as defined in this RFP. Bidders should review Section IV: Proposed Solution to understand the concept of the future system. The requirements in this Section are further subdivided into the following functional components, as described in Section IV.2.5 Application Layer:

- Account Holder Registration and Updates
- Generating Unit Registration and Updates
- Establish and Maintain Subaccounts
- Create and Deposit Certificates
- Manage Certificates
- Access Assignments and Updates
- Report on Data and Related Features

The specific Functional Requirements for which the Bidder must indicate a response of compliance can be found in the Functional Requirements workbook included in Appendix F: Technical Requirements.

### VI.2.4 IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

This Section describes the implementation Requirements that pertain to the overall solution. The State has determined that it is best to define its own needs. The State will not tailor these needs to fit some solution a Bidder may have available; rather, the Bidder shall propose to meet the State's needs as defined in this RFP. Bidders should review Section IV: Proposed Solution to understand the concept of the future system. The requirements in this Section are further subdivided into the following implementation service components:

- Project Management
- Quality Assurance
- Design and Development
- Testing
- Training
- Transition
- Project Deliverables

The specific Implementation Requirements for which the Bidder must indicate a response of compliance can be found in the Implementation Requirements workbook included in Appendix F: Technical Requirements.

#### VII.2.4.1 ONE-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION PHASE REQUIRED

Timely deployment of [REDACTED] is crucial both because of the expectations set among regional stakeholders and the reality that California is severely constrained in its ability to perform its legislated compliance and verification activities while it attempts to do so without an electronic tracking system. The actual duration of the Implementation Phase reported for other systems similar to [REDACTED] and the results of a market survey conducted during the [REDACTED] Feasibility Study Report suggest that a 12-month Implementation Phase is reasonable for [REDACTED].

The Project Management worksheet within the Implementation workbook included in Appendix F: Technical Requirement includes a requirement that the Implementation Phase included in the Bidder's Proposal require no longer than 12 consecutive months to complete (see Requirement I-1.1.1). See Section VI.4.3.1, the high-level project schedule described in that Section and required for the Bidder's Proposal must demonstrate meeting this schedule requirement.

#### VI.2.5 SERVICE SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS

This Section describes the Service Support Requirements that pertain to the overall [REDACTED] solution. The State has determined that it is best to define its own needs. The State will not tailor these needs to fit some solution a Bidder may have available; rather, the Bidder shall propose to meet the State's needs as defined in this RFP. Bidders should review Section IV: Proposed Solution to understand the [REDACTED] concept of the future system. The requirements in this Section are further subdivided into the following service support components:

- Help Desk Support
- System Maintenance and Operations
- Application Modification and Upgrade
- Performance Management

The specific Service Support Requirements for which the Bidder must indicate a response of compliance can be found in Service Support Requirements workbook included in Appendix F: Technical Requirements. The Bidders should also see Appendix J: Service Levels to understand additional requirements related to service support.

#### VI.3 STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND BIDDER EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

The Bidder will be responsible for providing all staff persons required to design, modify, implement, and operate [REDACTED], and must possess the relevant background and experience to undertake this effort. The [REDACTED] Contractor's actual project team must, at a minimum, include the staff stipulated in the Final Proposal. The SD&TO Contractor's response must include details and qualifications for the anticipated team members during the Operational Phase of the contract,

**SYSTEM TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKBOOK)**

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
T-1.1	<b>System Usability</b>			
T-1.1.1	The system shall provide a web-based graphical user interface (GUI) that adheres to industry standards for desktop, screen and window behavior and that includes components such as pull-down menus, buttons, scroll bars, icons, and auto complete text. The auto complete functionality shall only be implemented to the extent practical and without compromising security (e.g., userid and password fields shall not use auto complete functionality).	M		
T-1.1.2	The system shall provide a user interface that is easy to learn and easy to use.	M		
T-1.1.3	The system shall provide the ability to print the screen image to a default or user-selected printer.	M		
T-1.1.4	The system shall provide look-up tables to provide selections for system user data entry wherever appropriate to reduce data entry errors. For example: a. Data fields with a limited universe of possible choices are treated as drop down list boxes to facilitate data entry b. The system auto-completes fields from a set of known values as they are entered based upon the first few characters typed c. Fields are edited against lists of acceptable values after they are typed and flagged for correction before the data input by the system user is actually stored into the system	M		

State of California  
**Information System**  
**System Development and Technical Operations Contractor**  
 Appendix F: Technical Requirements  
 RFP  
**System Technical Requirements Workbook**

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
	[See Requirements T-1.2.1 and T-1.2.2 for related requirements.]			
T-1.1.5	Where feasible, the system shall utilize tables containing the control values and reference data the system will automatically interrogate in performing calculations, validations, and other processing (in lieu of "hard coding" such values in the source code and requiring programming intervention when such values change).	M		
	[See Requirements T-1.2.1 and T-1.2.2 for related requirements.]			
T-1.1.6	In order to prevent duplicate data entry, when a private system user is entering data in a field containing unique identification information the system shall display an informational message to alert the user if matching information already exists within the system.	M		
T-1.2	<b>System Flexibility</b>			
T-1.2.1	The system must have the capability to be modified through control, reference, and look-up table updates as opposed to programming changes wherever feasible.	M		
T-1.2.2	The system shall provide the ability for the Administrator staff to update the data content in look-up, control and reference data tables with little or no assistance from the System Development and Technical Operations Contractor. [See Requirements T-1.1.4, T-1.1.5 and SS-2.6.4 for related requirements.]	M		

State of California  
 Information System  
 System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
 RFP  
 Appendix F: Technical Requirements

System Technical  
 Requirements Workbook

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
T-1.2.3	The integrity of the system data shall be maintained whenever any of the following types of system changes are implemented: third-party, commercial or application software modifications or upgrades; look-up, control or look-up table updates; and, telecommunication, power, and hardware re-configurations and upgrades.	M		
T-1.2.4	The system shall be designed, implemented, and documented in a manner such that its ongoing maintenance and operation could be transferred to a party other than the System Development and Technical Operations Contractor after the term of the contract (should the State or the Contractor elect not to establish a new contract). It is required that the bidder assert that all source code and system control data as well as all design, programming, operations, and other documentation needed for the continuing maintenance and operations of the system will be developed, secured, and kept current so that the maintenance and operation of the system could be transferred to a party other than System Development and Technical Operations Contractor at the end of the contract if required.  [See Requirements I-23.1 and SS-2.9 for related requirements.]	M		
T-1.2.5	The system shall be compliant with current industry open (technical) standards such as MAPI, SNMP, FTP, etc.  [See Requirement I-3.1.3 for a related requirement.]  [Note: The Bidder shall specify the particular standards and versions (if applicable) that will be applied in the proposed solution and include the rationale for proposing the specified standards over other possible standards.]	M		

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
T-1.2.5	The System Development and Technical Operations Contractor shall develop a Technology Architecture Plan that specifies the hardware, software, and network elements of the solution, including the application and all supporting infrastructure. The Contractor shall maintain this plan through both the Implementation and Operational Phases.  [See Requirement I-7.6 for a related requirement.]	M		
T-1.3	<b>System Accessibility</b>			
T-1.3.1	The system shall provide concurrent system user access to all modules/functions within the system (assuming appropriate system permissions).	M		
T-1.3.2	The system shall provide authorized access to all system components via the internet (web).	M		
T-1.3.3	The system shall be able to support concurrent system access and utilization by up to 2500 private system users.	M		
T-1.3.4	This system shall be able to support concurrent system access and utilization of the public website for up to 500 concurrent public system users.	M		
T-1.4	<b>System Scalability</b>			
T-1.4.1	The system shall be designed, configured, and implemented in such a way that doubling	M		

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b></p> <p>any of the estimated maximum numbers for any of the following would not require programming changes and could instead be accomplished with changes to hardware (addition of disk space, processors, memory, or telecommunications bandwidth):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Number of system users;</li> <li>b. Number of concurrent system users;</li> <li>c. Number of Accounts;</li> <li>d. Number of reporting entities submitting electricity generation data;</li> <li>e. Number of Certificates created; and,</li> <li>f. Number of certificate transfer transactions.</li> </ul> <p>[See the Data Volumes and Retention worksheet in this workbook for requirements providing information on estimated volumes.]</p>			
T-1.5	System Extensibility			
T-1.5.1	The system shall be designed, configured and implemented in such a way that it can be extended to register and track generation attributes in addition to those associated with renewable energy generation, eligibilities and certifications.	M		
T-1.5.2	The system shall be designed, configured and implemented in such a way that it can be extended to record, track, and report on additional data elements related to generating unit characteristics and generating unit eligibilities and certifications and eligibilities for state/provincial and other voluntary renewable energy-related programs operating within the Western Interconnection and the region covered by	M		

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
T-1.5.3	The system shall be designed, configured and implemented in such a way that it can be extended to receive information on additional types of [redacted] produced within the Western [redacted] (the region covered by [redacted]) and generate [redacted] Certificates on this [redacted], possibly up to and including all [redacted] produced.	M		
T-1.6	<b>Help Functionality</b>			
T-1.6.1	The system shall provide online, context sensitive help at the function/screen, and field level. Help information provided at the function/screen level shall briefly describe the general purpose of each function/screen and how to perform each function. The brief descriptions available via the online Helps shall include reference to and/or a "link" to locations where the system user will be able obtain more in-depth information such as that contained in the online user documentation.	M		
T-1.6.2	The system shall provide online help that displays data field definitions for all data fields eligible for system user data entry and defines each of the available selections (where the user is allowed to select among a list possible values to specify as input for a field). [See Requirement I-7.17.2 for a related requirement.]	M		
T-1.6.3	The system shall provide online user documentation that is indexed and searchable. [See Requirement I-7.17.1 for a related requirement.]	M		
T-1.6.4	The system shall provide the system user the ability to print individual Help displays as well as the complete system user documentation if desired.			

State of California  
**Information System ( )**  
 System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
 REP: ( )  
 Appendix F: Technical Requirements

System Technical  
 Requirements Workbook

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
	[See Requirements I-7.17.1 and I-7.17.2 for related requirements.]			
T-1.6.4	The system shall provide help functionality that is configurable and modifiable by the ( ) Administrator with little or no assistance from the System Development and Technical Operations Contractor and requiring no programming changes.	M		
T-1.6.5	In addition to the help functionality that will be available to all system users, the system will also provide supplements to the standard materials that will be accessible by the ( ) Administrator only and which will assist the ( ) Administrator in performing those system activities permitted only this special class of system user.	M		
T-1.7	<b>E-Government</b>			
T-1.7.1	The system should conform to those elements of the State of California style guidelines for all public Internet components that would be applicable from a "look & feel" and general style perspective but which would be practical for a web application <u>not</u> running within the state's technical environment and not intended to be a State of California website (see <a href="http://www.webmasters.ca.gov/styleguide/default.htm">http://www.webmasters.ca.gov/styleguide/default.htm</a> ).  [See Requirements T-1.2.4 and T-2.1.1 for related requirements.]  [Note: This requirement is specified in order to facilitate ( ) ongoing maintenance and operations moving to a State of California data center should that become necessary. It is not currently anticipated that this will occur; however, where possible efforts should be made to allow ( ) to be migrated to a State of California data center with	D		

Requirement Number	Requirement	Requirement Category	Proposal Reference Section	Response Code
T-1	<b>GENERAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (WORKSHEET)</b>			
	minimal work if such a migration should become necessary by considering any State of California requirements that may be relevant.]			

## IX. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### IX.1 INTRODUCTION

This Section presents the process the [REDACTED] will follow in evaluating proposals submitted by Bidders in response to this RFP. The evaluation process is a multi-step process comprised of a thorough review of each proposal to determine the responsive proposal that offers the "best value" to the State. The best value proposal is one that meets all requirements set forth in this RFP and offers the State the best combination of value and cost as determined through the evaluation process specified in this Section. The process includes reviews of the Draft Proposals, if submitted, with confidential feedback to each Bidder, followed by a detailed evaluation of Final Proposals. The point structure for evaluation of the final score is 50 percent (50%) for the proposed solution and 50 (50%) for cost with a maximum score of 1,200 points.

### IX.2 RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

Proposals must be delivered to the State Procurement Official specified in Section 1.7: Procurement Official at the time and place specified in Section 1.9: Key Action Dates. Draft and Final Proposals must be in the quantity and format specified in Section VIII: Proposal Format, or they may be deemed non-responsive. **Final proposals will be rejected as non-responsive if not included in a separate and sealed envelope and received by the date and time specified for final proposals as specified in Section 1.9: Key Action Dates.** Proposals must meet all requirements specified in Section VIII: Proposal Format and, if not, may be deemed non-responsive and rejected.

### IX.3 EVALUATION TEAM

The [REDACTED] will establish an Evaluation Team comprised of individuals selected from State management and staff who will be responsible for the review and evaluation of Bidder proposals. A representative from the Department of General Services (DGS) will provide guidance and oversight for the evaluation process. The State may engage additional qualified individuals, termed "Subject Matter Experts" (SMEs), during the evaluation process to assist the Evaluation Team in gaining a better understanding of technical, financial, legal, contractual, project, or program issues. The SMEs will not have voting privileges or responsibility for the evaluation process. The Evaluation Team will use consensus to determine pass/fail and to arrive at evaluation scores for each bid.

### IX.4 DRAFT PROPOSAL REVIEW

Bidder Draft Proposals will be reviewed by the Evaluation Team to identify and document areas in which a proposal appears to be non-responsive or defective, requires additional clarification, demonstrates lack of responsiveness, or introduces potential risk.

The Draft Proposal must contain the complete proposed Bidder solution, **without costs**. The main purpose of the Draft Proposal is to provide the State with a complete proposal (**except for cost figures**) in order for the State to identify any faulty aspects that, if not corrected, could cause the Final Proposal to be rejected. Confidential discussions, which follow submittal of a

State of California  
Information System  
System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
RFP

Draft Proposal, provide a forum for clarification of any issues or uncertainties that may exist on the part of the Bidder or State.

The Draft Proposal format and submission must follow the guidelines presented in Section VIII: Proposal Format. **NOTE: Cost information must NOT be included with the Draft Proposal. Inclusion of cost information will be basis for rejection.**

Draft Proposals received by the date specified in Section 1.9: Key Action Dates, will be opened and reviewed by the Evaluation Team for compliance with the complete set of RFP requirements. The State cannot guarantee review of Draft Proposals received after the date specified in Section 1.9: Key Action Dates. The Evaluation Team will review Draft Proposals to:

1. Identify "qualifiers" or conditions placed on the proposal (conditional proposals are not acceptable)
2. Document areas in which a proposal appears to:
  - Be non-responsive or defective;
  - Require additional clarification;
  - Demonstrate a lack of responsibility; and/or
  - Introduce unreasonable risk.

The Draft Proposal review will examine the Bidder's responses to requirements, along with any explanations provided by the Bidder to add substance and provide background on how requirements will be met. After the Draft Proposal has been reviewed, confidential discussions may be scheduled with each Bidder to discuss items that need clarification and any defects found by the State. Prior to the confidential discussion, the State will prepare a Confidential Discussion Agenda itemizing the points to be covered. The confidential discussions are intended to minimize the risk that the Final Proposal will be deemed defective; however such discussions will not preclude rejection of the Final Proposal if such defects are later found in the Final Proposal. The State does not warrant that all defects have been detected. These confidential discussions will allow the Bidder to request clarification or ask questions specific to its proposed solution without having to share those questions with the other participating Bidders, thus protecting the confidential nature of each unique solution.

Prior to each confidential discussion, the Evaluation Team (or member designee(s)) and the Bidder will jointly contribute to the development of a discussion agenda. The Evaluation Team will provide the Bidder with a tentative agenda of items to be discussed and ask that the Bidder identify additional questions or discussion items to be added to the agenda. Either the Bidder or the State may add other issues to the discussion agenda during the process. Bidders should notify the DGS Procurement Official as soon as possible if wishing to add items to the agenda. A Confidential Discussion Agenda itemizing the points to be covered will be distributed prior to the confidential discussion. The Bidder should bring to the discussion persons who can answer questions, provide clarification, and address reservations the State may have. The Evaluation Team will prepare a written summary of each confidential discussion. A copy of the summary will be provided to the Bidder.

State of California  
Information System  
System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
RFP

The State will identify 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. The Evaluation Team may identify aspects of the Draft Proposal that, in its judgment, potentially introduce unreasonable risk to the project. The Bidder will be informed of the State's concerns during the confidential discussions.

The Evaluation Team will not request changes or make counter proposals during discussion of Draft Proposals. It will only identify its concerns, ask the Bidder for clarification, and express reservations if a requirement of the RFP is not, in the opinion of the Evaluation Team, appropriately satisfied. The State admonishes Bidders that its review of Draft Proposals shall in no way imply a warranty that all potential defects in the Draft Proposals have been detected. Notification that the State did not detect any defects does not preclude rejection of the Final Proposal if defects are later found.

Oral communications are not binding on either party and only written communications are considered to be official. The Evaluation Team may identify issues/concerns in regards to the Draft Proposal. The Bidder will be informed of the Evaluation Team's concerns and any non-responsive proposal items during the confidential discussions. Refer to Section VI: Technical Requirements, for a description of responsiveness. The Bidder may do one of the following:

- Modify its proposal to eliminate these concerns to the satisfaction of the State.
- Propose a presentation of capability or proof of mitigation of issues/concerns in sufficient scope and detail to eliminate the State's concerns to the sole satisfaction of the State.
- Choose to leave its approach or response unchanged, even though doing so may adversely affect the State's evaluation of its Final Proposal or may result in proposal items being deemed non-responsive.

The State reserves the right to make a final determination with respect to the Bidder's resolution of such defects.

## **IX.5 FINAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

The Final Proposal review will consist of four (4) major steps. The Final Proposal must pass each phase of a step to proceed to the successive steps. First, all Final Proposals will be screened to determine if the Bidder has complied with appropriate Proposal Submission Requirements, Administrative Requirements and Technical Requirements. Second, all Final Proposals will be evaluated and scored for Bidder experience and qualifications. Third, each Bidder's proposed solution will be comprehensively evaluated and scored. Fourth, the Sealed-Cost Proposal will be opened and the Total Score will be calculated. Details of the Proposal evaluation criteria and process are described in this Section.

**NOTE: FAILURE TO MEET ALL MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED A MATERIAL DEVIATION AND RESULT IN THE PROPOSAL BEING DEEMED NON-RESPONSIVE. NON-RESPONSIVE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE SCORED AND SEALED COST PROPOSALS FOR NON-RESPONSIVE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE OPENED.**

**BIDDERS MUST ACHIEVE SEVENTY PERCENT (70%) OF THE MAXIMUM NON-COST SCORE (600 POINTS) FOR THEIR PROPOSAL TO BE DEEMED RESPONSIVE. SEALED COST PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE OPENED FOR BIDDERS OBTAINING LESS THAN SEVENTY PERCENT (70%) OF THE MAXIMUM NON-COST SCORE (600 POINTS).**

#### **IX.5.1 PROPOSAL SCREENING**

The first step in the Final Proposal evaluation consists of the screening of each Bidder's Final Proposal for compliance with Proposal Submission Requirements, Administrative Requirements, and Technical Requirements defined in the RFP.

##### **IX.5.1.1 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS REVIEW (PASS/FAIL)**

The Bidder will 'pass' this requirement if the required information is included in the proposal and will 'fail' if the required information is incomplete or missing. If a proposal fails to meet any of the Submission Requirements in Section VIII: Proposal Format, the Evaluation Team will determine if the deviation is material. If the deviation is determined to be material, the proposal will be considered non-responsive and excluded from further consideration.

##### **IX.5.1.2 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS REVIEW (PASS/FAIL)**

The Bidder will be given a 'pass' if the required information is included in the proposal and a 'fail' if the required information is incomplete or missing. If a proposal fails to meet any of the Administrative Requirements in Section V: Administrative Requirements, the Evaluation Team will determine if the deviation is material. If the deviation is determined to be material, the proposal will be considered non-responsive and excluded from further consideration.

##### **IX.5.1.3 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS RESPONSE REVIEW (PASS/FAIL)**

The Evaluation Team will review the Bidder's proposal to determine whether the proposal contains permissible responses to all of the Technical Requirements contained in Appendix F and meets all requirements identified in Section VI: Technical Requirements, of this RFP. **If a proposal does not meet all requirements identified in Section VI: Technical Requirements, or lacks a permissible response to any Technical Requirement in Appendix F, it may be considered non-responsive and rejected.**

#### **IX.5.2 EVALUATION OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND BIDDER EXPERIENCE**

(Maximum score = 200 points)

The second step in the Final Proposal evaluation consists of the review and evaluation of all subsections in Section VI.3: Staff Qualifications and Bidder Experience Requirements. The Evaluation Team will assess and score the qualifications of the Bidder's proposed staff and its relevant experience to perform the work defined. Awarding of points will be based on consensus of the Evaluation Team. The maximum points available for this step are 200. The evaluation of Staff Qualifications and Bidder Experience includes two components:

- Project Team Organization and Staffing Assessment (100 Points)
- Bidder Experience and References Assessment (100 Points)

For each of these components, the State will assign an overall score as described in Table IX-2: Summary of Overall Evaluation Scoring Process.

#### IX.5.2.1 PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING ASSESSMENT

(Maximum score = 100 points)

Scoring of the Bidder's responses to each of the project team organization and staff qualifications requirements of the RFP will be based on the consensus of the Evaluation Team. **The project team organization and staffing items to be evaluated include responses to specific criteria identified in Section VI.3.1: Staff Qualifications.** Factors to be considered in evaluating the project team organization and staffing include the evaluation criteria outlined in Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements.

#### IX.5.2.2 BIDDER EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES ASSESSMENT

(Maximum score = 100 points)

Scoring of the Bidder's responses to each of the Bidder experience requirements of the RFP will be based on the consensus of the Evaluation Team. **The Bidder experience items to be evaluated include responses to specific criteria identified in Section VI.3.2: Bidder Experience.** Factors to be considered in evaluating Bidder experience include the evaluation criteria outlined in Table IX-2: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements.

#### IX.5.3 EVALUATION OF BUSINESS SOLUTION

(Maximum score = 400 points)

Proposals that comply with the mandatory "pass/fail" evaluation elements discussed above will then move on to the Technical Requirements Assessment portion of the evaluation and be given an overall score. The maximum score possible for a single proposal is 1,200 points (600 points maximum for the Technical Requirements Assessment and 600 points maximum for the Cost Assessment), which will be awarded based on a consensus of the Evaluation Team. The scoring model to assess Bidders' proposals was developed in adherence to the business objectives and the overall goals of the project. Written proposal responses will be evaluated to determine the level of responsiveness to the business solution requirements enumerated in Section VI: Technical Requirements.

The State will review and evaluate the Bidder's responses to all subsections in Section VI: Technical Requirements. The Evaluation Team will assess and score the Bidder's proposed business solution in terms of meeting the Technical, Functional, Implementation, and Service Support Requirements. Awarding of points will be based on consensus of the Evaluation Team. The maximum points available for this step are 400. The evaluation of Business Solution includes:

- Technical Approach (100 points)
- Functional Approach (150 points)
- Implementation Approach (50 points)

- Service Support Approach (100 points)

The Evaluation Team will review the individual evaluated elements to ensure consistency between Bidder responses and related requirements. For the Technical Approach, Functional Approach, Implementation Approach, and Service Support Approach, the State will assign an overall score as described in Table IX-2: Summary of Overall Evaluation Scoring Process. The Raw Score for each group of requirements will be determined by adding together the raw scores for the requirements in each category.

**Proposals that fail to earn 50 percent (50%) or more of the maximum points to be awarded for any segment of the Technical Requirements (System Requirements, Requirements, Functional Requirements, Implementation Requirements, or Service Support Requirements) will be considered non-responsive and excluded from further consideration. Also, any proposal that fails to earn 50 percent (50%) or more of the combined maximum points (400) for all Technical Requirements will be likewise considered non-responsive and will be excluded from further consideration.**

#### IX.5.3.1 TECHNICAL APPROACH

(Maximum Score = 100 points)

Scoring of the Technical Approach contained in the Bidder's proposal will be based on the consensus of the Evaluation Team. **The technical approach items to be evaluated include responses to specific criteria identified in Section VI.4.1: Technical Approach.** Factors to be considered in evaluating the Technical Approach include the evaluation criteria outlined in Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements.

#### IX.5.3.2 FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

(Maximum Score = 150 points)

Scoring of the Functional Approach contained in the Bidder's proposal will be based on the consensus of the Evaluation Team. **The functional approach items to be evaluated include responses to specific criteria identified in Section VI.4.2: Functional Approach.** Factors to be considered in evaluating the Functional Approach include the evaluation criteria outlined in Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements.

#### IX.5.3.3 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

(Maximum Score = 50 points)

Scoring of the Implementation Approach contained in the Bidder's proposal will be based on the consensus of the Evaluation Team. **The implementation approach items to be evaluated include responses to specific criteria identified in Section VI.4.3: Implementation Approach.** Factors to be considered in evaluating the Implementation Approach include the evaluation criteria outlined in Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements.

#### IX.5.3.4 SERVICE SUPPORT APPROACH

(Maximum Score = 100 points)

Scoring of the Service Support Approach contained in the Bidder's proposal will be based on the consensus of the Evaluation Team. **The service support approach items to be evaluated include responses to specific criteria identified in Section VI.4.4: Service Support Approach.** Factors to be considered in evaluating the Service Support Approach include the evaluation criteria outlined in Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements.

**IX.5.4 EVALUATION OF COST PROPOSAL**

**NOTE: Sealed cost information will not be opened until the Evaluation Team has completed the previous steps in the evaluation process.**

(Maximum Score = 600 points)

Sealed Cost Proposals will only be evaluated for responsive bids. If a Bidder's proposal has been determined to be non-responsive during the earlier steps, its Cost Proposal will not be opened. The cost assessment will incorporate costs defined in Section VII: Cost Proposal, and provided by the Bidder in Appendix E: Cost Workbook. The evaluation will assess the total cost of the proposed solution for the duration of the contract.

Each Bidder's cost score will be calculated as the ratio of the total cost of the lowest responsive proposal to the Bidder's cost multiplied by the maximum number of cost points (600), as shown below.

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Cost Assessment} \times 600}{\text{Bidder Cost Assessment}} = \text{Bidder Cost Score}$$

To help illustrate this process, refer to Table IX-1: Example of Cost Assessment Evaluation and Scoring Methodology, for an example of the cost score calculation process. Cost Assessment figures in the example below explain the calculations and have no other significance.

Table IX-1: Example of Cost Assessment Evaluation and Scoring Methodology

Bidder	Bidder's Total Cost	Calculation	Cost Points Awarded
A	\$500,000	$\frac{\$500,000 \times 600}{\$500,000}$	600
B	\$1,000,000	$\frac{\$500,000 \times 600}{\$1,000,000}$	300
C	\$1,500,000	$\frac{\$500,000 \times 600}{\$1,500,000}$	200

### **IX.5.5 EVALUATION OF SMALL BUSINESS PREFERENCE**

Bidders must submit the completed Small Business Preference Form (Form 5.9.1) in Appendix C: Bidder Response Forms, to be eligible for small business preference. Small Business Preference will be applied as required by law with the total preference amount not to exceed \$50,000.00.

For Bidders applying and qualifying for the new Small Business Preference as a non-small business claiming twenty-five percent (25%) California certified small business subcontractor participation (see 5.9.2 New Information Regarding Small Businesses in Appendix C) will have Small Bidder Preference applied as required by law with the total preference amount not to exceed \$50,000.00

### **IX.5.6 SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR**

The Evaluation Team will determine which Bidder's proposal has the highest combined score for all evaluation factors, up to a maximum of 1,200 points. This Bidder will be declared the "selected contractor" pending final authorization by the State.

**IX.5.7 SUMMARY OF OVERALL EVALUATION SCORING PROCESS**

Table IX-2: Summary of Overall Evaluation Scoring Process, presents a summary of the overall evaluation process and illustrates how the Evaluation Team will score each Bidder's proposal.

Table IX-2: Summary of Overall Evaluation Scoring Process

Overall Evaluation Scoring Process	Maximum Score	Bidder's Score
<b>STEP 1: PROPOSAL SCREENING</b>		
<b>BID OPENING and CONTENT VALIDATION</b>		
Proposal Submittal Requirements Met?	N/A	Yes/No
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS</b>		
Administrative Requirements Met?	N/A	Yes/No
<b>TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS RESPONSE</b>		
All Responses Provided?	N/A	Yes/No
<b>STEP 2: EVALUATION OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND BIDDER EXPERIENCE</b>		
<b>PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING ASSESSMENT</b>		
1. Project Team Organization and Staffing	100	
<b>BIDDER EXPERIENCE ASSESSMENT</b>		
1. Bidder Experience and References	100	
<b>STEP 3: EVALUATION OF BUSINESS SOLUTION</b>		
<b>TECHNICAL APPROACH</b>		
1. General Technical Approach	30	
2. Architectural Solution Approach	10	
2. Database Architecture and Design	20	
3. System Availability, Security, Audit, and Backups	20	
4. Data Volumes and Retention	10	
5. Data Interfaces	10	
<b>FUNCTIONAL APPROACH</b>		
1. Base Product—Existing System Proposed in Solution	10	
2. Account Holder Registration and Updates	10	
3. Generating Unit Registration and Updates	30	
4. Establish and Maintain Subaccounts	10	
5. Create and Deposit Certificates	35	
6. Manage Certificates	30	
7. Access Assignments and Updates	10	
8. Report on Data and Related Features	15	

Overall Evaluation Scoring Process	Maximum Score	Bidder's Score
<b>IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH</b>	<b>50</b>	
1. Project Management Approach	10	
2. Quality Assurance Approach	10	
3. Design and Development Methodology	10	
4. Testing Approach	10	
5. Training Approach	5	
6. Transition/Deployment Approach	5	
<b>SERVICE SUPPORT APPROACH</b>	<b>100</b>	
1. Help Desk Support Approach	30	
2. System Maintenance and Operations Approach	30	
3. Application Modification and Upgrade Approach	30	
4. Performance Management Approach	10	
<b>STEP 4: EVALUATION OF COST INFORMATION</b>		
<b>NOTE: BIDDERS MUST ACHIEVE SEVENTY PERCENT (70%) OF THE MAXIMUM NON-COST SCORE (600 POINTS) FOR THEIR PROPOSAL TO BE DEEMED RESPONSIVE. SEALED COST PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE OPENED FOR BIDDERS OBTAINING LESS THAN SEVENTY PERCENT (70%) OF THE MAXIMUM NON-COST SCORE (600 POINTS).</b>		
<b>COST ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>600</b>	
1. Cost Assessment	600	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>1,200</b>	

State of California  
 Information System  
 System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
 RFP

**IX.5.8 SUMMARY OF DETAILED EVALUATION ELEMENTS**

Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements, presents a summary of the detailed evaluation criteria for each of the scorable requirements within the RFP. A definition of the Evaluation Criteria terms is provided in the next Section, Table IX-4: Definition of Specific Evaluation Terms.

Table IX-3: Summary of Detailed Evaluation Elements

Scorable Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Available Points
<b>PROJECT TEAM ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING ASSESSMENT (100 points)</b>		
<b>Project Team Organization and Staffing</b>	Project Team organizational structure	100
	Project Manager depth and similarity of experience	
	Project Manager certifications	
	Project Team depth and similarity of experience	
<b>BIDDER EXPERIENCE ASSESSMENT (100 points)</b>		
<b>Bidder Experience and References</b>	Similarity of project experience	100
	Scope and scale of project experience	
	Demonstrated ability to implement desired solution	
<b>TECHNICAL APPROACH (100 points)</b>		
<b>General Technical Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	30
	Proposed methodology (including system design, features)	
	Maturity, flexibility, scalability and extensibility of proposed technologies	
	Ease of use for system maintenance and operations	
<b>Architectural Solution Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Integration of components	
<b>Database Architecture and Design</b>	Proposed methodology	20
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>System Availability, Security, Audit, and Backups</b>	Proposed security and audit methodology	20
	Maturity of technologies	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Data Volumes and Data Retention</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Maturity of technologies	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Data Interfaces</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Maturity of technologies	
	Scope of the solution	

Scorable Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Available Points
<b>FUNCTIONAL APPROACH ((150 points))</b>		
<b>Base Product—Existing System Proposed in Solution</b>	Years in production use	10
	Number of customer installations	
	Description of how product meets base system requirements and alignment with functional requirements	
<b>Account Holder Registration and Updates</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Generating Unit Registration and Updates</b>	Thoroughness of approach	30
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Establish and maintain WREGIS Subaccounts</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Create and Deposit Certificates</b>	Thoroughness of approach	35
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Manage Certificates</b>	Thoroughness of approach	30
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Access Assignments and Updates</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Report on Data and Related Features</b>	Thoroughness of approach	15
	Proposed methodology	
	Demonstrated knowledge	
	Scope of the solution	

State of California  
 Information System  
 System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
 RFP #

Scorable Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Available Points
<b>IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH (50 points)</b>		
<b>Project Management Approach</b>	Thoroughness of plan (including project schedule)	10
	Proposed methodologies (e.g., project management, communication, change management, risk management)	
	Demonstrated knowledge including use of best practices	
<b>Quality Assurance Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodologies (e.g., change control, issue resolution, performance reporting, documentation)	
	Demonstrated knowledge including use of best practices	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Design and Development Methodology</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodology	
	Maturity of approach	
	Demonstrated knowledge and use of best practices	
	Scope of solution	
<b>Testing Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodology	
	Maturity of technology	
	Demonstrated knowledge and use of best practices	
	Scope of solution	
	Impact to existing operations	
<b>Training Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	5
	Proposed methodology (including but not limited to training methods and media)	
	Scope of solution	
	Impact to existing operations	
<b>Transition/Deployment Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	5
	Proposed methodology (including but not limited to deliverables based implementation phasing)	
	Scope of solution	
	Impact to existing operations	

Scorable Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Available Points
<b>SERVICE SUPPORT APPROACH (100 points)</b>		
<b>Help Desk Support Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	30
	Proposed methodology (including but not limited to approach to customer service, use of software tools, problem resolution strategy, event and escalation management approach)	
	Demonstrated knowledge (including but not limited to use of best practices)	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>System Maintenance and Operations Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	30
	Proposed methodology (including but not limited to use of performance metrics, automated tools, reporting and communications approach, and corrective action approach)	
	Demonstrated knowledge in meeting service level agreements	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Application Modifications and Upgrade Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	30
	Proposed methodology (including but not limited to use of performance metrics, automated tools, reporting and communications approach, and corrective action approach)	
	Demonstrated knowledge in meeting service level agreements	
	Scope of the solution	
<b>Performance Management Approach</b>	Thoroughness of approach	10
	Proposed methodology (including but not limited to use of performance metrics, automated tools, reporting and communications approach, and corrective action approach)	
	Demonstrated knowledge in meeting service level agreements	
	Scope of the solution	

State of California  
 Information System  
 System Development and Technical Operations Contractor  
 RFP

**IX.5.9 DEFINITION OF SPECIFIC EVALUATION TERMS**

The following Evaluation Criteria terms are further defined in Table IX-4: Definition of Specific Evaluation Terms below.

Table IX-4: Definition of Specific Evaluation Terms

Term	Definition
<b>Maturity</b>	A market based perspective on the specific technologies being proposed that indicates present and future viability of the given technology.
<b>Thoroughness of Approach or Plan</b>	The level of detail and completeness the Bidder provides in response to specific requirements.
<b>Demonstrated Knowledge</b>	The extent to which the Bidder demonstrates present capabilities to perform the services required by the solicitation, including use of best practices.
<b>Scope of the Solution</b>	The extent or scale of the Bidder's response to specific requirements.
<b>Proposed Methodology</b>	The steps and tasks that comprise the implementation approach that the Bidder describes in response to specific requirements.
<b>Impact to Existing Operations</b>	This includes any identified impact or effect on [REDACTED], including technical infrastructure, business operations, and level of [REDACTED] staff participation required to implement the solution.
<b>Maturity, flexibility, scalability and extensibility of proposed technologies</b>	See "Maturity."
<b>Ease of use for system maintenance and operations</b>	The effort (and cost) required to maintain the system and perform routine operations.
<b>Integration of components</b>	The extent that separately produced components or subsystems are combined and problems in their interactions are addressed. Ideally, all components are designed together at the same time with a unifying purpose and/or architecture (they are designed with the same larger objectives and/or architecture).
<b>Proposed security and audit methodology</b>	The systematic evaluation of the security of an information system by measuring how well it conforms to a set of established criteria. A thorough audit typically assesses the security of the system's physical configuration and environment, software, information handling processes, and user practices.
<b>Maturity of technologies</b>	See "Maturity."
<b>Years in production use</b>	The number of years the system has been used in a production environment (as opposed to initial release and testing).
<b>Number of customer installations</b>	The number of customers (past and present) who have used the system in a production environment.
<b>Description of how product meets base system requirements and alignment with WREGIS functional requirements</b>	The degree to which the product as currently deployed meets WREGIS functional requirements, as well as those areas where the product would require modifications to meet requirements, or new development would be required to meet requirements.

This page intentionally left blank.