

STATE OF ALASKA  
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS REPLACEMENT PROJECT

RFP 2010-0200-9388

EVALUATION PROCESS  
SUMMARY

The purpose of this document is to describe the evaluation process the State undertook relating to RFP 2010-0200-9388.

# Procurement Activities 2010-2011

## Summary

- RFP 2010-0200-9388 was issued on August 2, 2010
- Nine amendments were issued
- 116 questions from potential Offerors were answered after the RFP was issued (34 questions were answered under the DOF website's FAQs prior to the RFP issuance)
- Deadline for receipt of proposals was 1:30pm, October 15
- Received five proposals, DGS contracting officer and procurement officer reviewed for minimum responsiveness; all were responsive and forwarded to the PEC for evaluation
- PEC completed evaluation on October 22
- Procurement officer reviewed proposal score sheets and verified scores against the electronic spreadsheet-October 22-26
- Three vendors were determined to be susceptible for award and, on 10/27/10, were invited to proceed to Filter 3, Client Demonstrations and Interviews
- Client Demonstrations were held November 3, 4, and 5
- Interviews were held December 1, 2 and 3
- Procurement officer reviewed demonstration and interview score sheets and verified scores against the electronic spreadsheet-December 4-20
- Procurement officer notified the Pre-award vendor-December 21
- January-June 2011-Pre-award phase

## Proposal Evaluation Committee

The PEC was comprised of a cross section of State employees to represent the different administrative functional areas:

Brook Larson	Finance Officer, Department of Revenue
Cheryl Shakespeare	Accountant, Division of Finance
Dan Spencer	Administrative Services Director, Dept. of Public Safety
Marlys Hagen	Procurement Specialist, Department of Natural Resources
Stacie Bentley	Human Resource Manager, Division of Personnel
Tom Mayer	Contracting Manager, Division of General Services

## Evaluation Process

The State evaluated proposals using a step-by-step approach as stipulated in the RFP. The table below presents the overall evaluation criteria and the associated filters that were used to identify the best value Offeror, based on the State's overall evaluation criteria. At the end of each filter, only proposals that met the criteria identified in the filter advanced to the next filter and continued to be evaluated. The State invited one Offeror to participate in Filter 4.

Filter	Points	Percent	Section	Evaluation Criterion	Scoring Method
<b>1</b>	Pass/fail	n/a		Administrative Requirements	
<b>2</b>	50	5%	7.03	Past Performance Information (PPI)	Offerors submitted PPI scores using rating sheets completed by prior clients; Raw data used in analysis
	250	25%	7.04	Cost	Offeror cost proposals provided data used to calculate cost score in accord with State guidelines
	200	20%	7.05	Project Approach 150 points-Risk Assessment and Value Added Plan 50 points-Work Plan	Proposals cleansed of names and identifying information and scored by blindly by the PEC
	50	5%	7.06	Strategic Fit Considerations	Proposals cleansed of names and identifying information and scored by blindly by the PEC
	65	6.5%	7.07	Alaskan Offeror's Preference	Qualified Offerors received preference points in accord with State guidelines
<b>3</b>	300	30%	7.08	Interviews	Scored by PEC
	50	5%	7.09	Client Demonstrations	Scored by PEC
	35	3.5%	7.07	Alaskan Offeror's Preference	Qualified Offerors received preference points in accord with State guidelines
<b>4</b>	Pass/fail	n/a		Pre-award Phase	
	1,000	100%		<b>TOTALS</b>	

## BEGIN FILTER 1

### Evaluation of Administrative Requirements - Pass/Fail

Offerors had to acknowledge a set of statements, conditions, and information by having a duly authorized representative sign Exhibit A. This ensured that each Offeror acknowledged:

1. The original RFP;
2. All amendments issued;
3. Proposal conditions;
4. Disclosure of all potential conflicts of interest (if any exist);
5. Minimum requirements were met;
6. Qualification requirements for all applicable preferences; and

7. Proposal checklist

**Criteria for advancing to Filter 2**

Administrative Requirements were scored on a pass/fail basis and only Offerors that met all of the Administrative Requirements advanced to Filter 2. There was no limit on the number of Offerors that could advance to Filter 2.

**END OF FILTER 1**

**ALL FIVE PROPOSALS ADVANCED TO FILTER 2**

**BEGIN FILTER 2**

NOTE: As described in the RFP, proposal responses for RFP Sections 7.05, Project Approach (included Risk Assessment and Value Added Plan, Work Plan) and 7.06, Strategic Fit Considerations, were cleansed of the Offeror names and any other identifying material. The cleansed proposals were color coded and provided to the PEC for evaluation. The cleansed proposals, demonstrations, and interviews were evaluated by the PEC and rated, with each PEC member assigning a score of 1, 5, or 10 (with 10 representing an outstanding response, 5 representing an average response, and 1 representing an inadequate response). Responses that were similar or lack dominant information to differentiate the Offerors from each other received the same score. All PEC members' scores were added together and averaged, then the highest scoring Offeror received the highest allotment of points and the others received a statistical percentage of points based on the ratio of their score to the highest Offeror's score and the overall weight assigned to each component.

**Evaluation of Past Performance Information - 50 Points**

As described in the RFP, the Past Performance Information was not evaluated by the PEC, but instead, the PPI scores were calculated using the reference responses submitted each Software Offeror and the System Implementation Offeror. Survey responders (previous clients) evaluated each question on a scale of 1 to 10. The scores for each question from each responder were added together to determine the question's total score.

The following table presents the PPI calculations.

Blue-CedarCrestone  
 Golden Rod-CIBER  
 Purple-Tyler Technologies  
 Salmon-CGI  
 White-CherryRoad Technologies

Raw Score based on responses in proposals

Final Score = raw score divided by 'Best', then multiplied by 'Available Points'

CRITERIA	Available Points	Blue	Golden Rod	Purple	Salmon	White	BEST	Blue	Golden Rod	Purple	Salmon	White
PPI Final								47.11	44.83	49.81	48.18	43.49
PPI - Software Firm - Product's ease	2.63	8.20	8.50	9.50	9.00	8.33	9.50	2.27	2.35	2.63	2.49	2.31
PPI - Software Firm - Product's ability to meet your functional needs	2.63	8.10	9.50	9.40	8.90	8.11	9.50	2.24	2.63	2.60	2.47	2.25
PPI - Software Firm - Product's	2.63	7.90	9.13	9.50	9.20	8.00	9.50	2.19	2.53	2.63	2.55	2.22
PPI - Software Firm - Company's ongoing maintenance and support	2.63	7.80	8.75	9.90	9.20	8.11	9.90	2.07	2.33	2.63	2.45	2.16
PPI - Software Firm - Overall satisfaction with software product	2.63	8.00	9.06	9.50	9.20	8.11	9.50	2.22	2.51	2.63	2.55	2.25
PPI - Software Firm - Number of different projects	2.63	10.00	8.00	10.00	10.00	9.00	10.00	2.63	2.11	2.63	2.63	2.37
PPI - Software Firm - Number of different people that responded	2.63	10.00	8.00	10.00	10.00	9.00	10.00	2.63	2.11	2.63	2.63	2.37
PPI - Implementer Firm - Satisfaction with project's actual	2.63	9.50	9.00	10.00	9.20	8.20	10.00	2.50	2.37	2.63	2.42	2.16
PPI - Implementer Firm - Project's duration and adherence to schedule	2.63	9.40	9.40	9.80	9.20	9.40	9.80	2.52	2.52	2.63	2.47	2.52
PPI - Implementer Firm - Management, completion, and	2.63	9.40	9.60	9.60	9.40	9.40	9.60	2.58	2.63	2.63	2.58	2.58
PPI - Implementer Firm - Management of risks and potential	2.63	9.40	9.20	9.50	9.40	9.20	9.50	2.60	2.55	2.63	2.60	2.55
PPI - Implementer Firm - Use of best practices during implementation	2.63	9.10	8.80	9.20	9.10	9.00	9.20	2.60	2.52	2.63	2.60	2.57
PPI - Implementer Firm - Satisfaction of business	2.63	9.40	9.20	9.40	9.10	9.20	9.40	2.63	2.58	2.63	2.55	2.58
PPI - Implementer Firm - Business process reengineering	2.63	9.13	9.60	9.20	8.75	8.33	9.60	2.50	2.63	2.52	2.40	2.28
PPI - Implementer Firm - Product	2.63	8.70	9.00	9.20	8.38	8.80	9.20	2.49	2.57	2.63	2.40	2.52
PPI - Implementer Firm - Working relationship with team	2.63	9.60	9.80	9.80	9.70	9.80	9.80	2.58	2.63	2.63	2.60	2.63
PPI - Implementer Firm - Contract with this firm again	2.63	9.80	10.00	9.80	9.60	9.60	10.00	2.58	2.63	2.58	2.53	2.53
PPI - Implementer Firm - Number of different projects	2.63	10.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	2.63	1.32	2.63	2.63	1.32
PPI - Implementer Firm - Number of different people that responded	2.63	10.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	2.63	1.32	2.63	2.63	1.32

50

**PPI FINAL SCORES:**

VENDOR	CedarCrestone	CIBER	Tyler Technologies	CGI	CherryRoad Technologies
Final PPI Score	47.11	44.83	49.81	48.18	43.49

**Evaluation of Cost - 250 Points**

Offerors itemized all costs for application software, system software, professional services by required deliverable, other one-time expenses, and annual maintenance. The cost of each module, regardless of its implementation date, included ten years of licensing and maintenance pricing. Cost was evaluated based on the ten-year total cost proposed by Offerors.

**Scoring of Cost**

The lowest cost proposal received the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals were determined through the method set out in Sections 2.13 and 2.14 of the RFP, including applicable Alaskan Bidder Preference as described therein.

**COST FINAL SCORES:**

VENDOR	CedarCrestone	CIBER	Tyler Technologies	CGI	CherryRoad Technologies
Cost	\$46,862,936	\$34,282,573	\$49,855,031	\$35,684,136*	\$56,763,778
Cost to Points Conversion	182.89	250.00	171.91	240.18	150.99

\*After applying the 5% Alaska Bidder Preference

**Evaluation of Project Approach - 200 Points**

The Project Approach submitted by Offerors addressed scope, requirements, quality needs, risks, and time/budget constraints. The Project Approach provided Offerors an opportunity to demonstrate that they understood the scope and services requested in this RFP and served as a mechanism for the Offeror to express their vision for the project. The Project Approach was comprised of a Work Plan and a Risk Assessment/Value Added Plan (RAVA). The State’s PEC evaluated and scored the Project Approach as two components, 50 points were assigned to the Work Plan and 150 points were assigned to the RAVA Plan. As previously described, Project Approach proposals were cleansed of identifying names or information and other than the color coding, the PEC members did not know who the Offerors were.

**Work Plan 50 Points**

The Work Plan demonstrated the Offeror’s ability to provide a concise summary of the approach to delivering the requested services. The Work Plan addressed:

1. The Offeror’s methodology for managing project scope, schedule, and implementation of the project.
2. The Offeror’s approach to system initialization, system installation, business process design/reengineering, system configuration, system tailoring, interface design and development, data conversion, testing, and post-implementation stabilization.
3. The Offeror’s plan to transition from existing systems to the proposed systems.
4. The Offeror’s plan to educate and train State employees on the proposed systems.
5. The Offeror’s plan to monitor performance throughout the contract term.

**WORK PLAN - PEC MEMBERS’ INDIVIDUAL SCORES**

Evaluator	Blue CedarCrestone	Golden Rod CIBER	Purple Tyler Technologies	Salmon CGI	White CherryRoad Technologies
Brook Larson	5	5	5	10	10
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	5	5	10	5
Dan Spencer	5	5	5	5	5
Marlys Hagen	5	5	10	10	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	1	10	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5	10	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.17</b>	<b>9.17</b>	<b>5.83</b>

**WORK PLAN FINAL SCORES**

The Offeror with the highest raw score received the maximum number of points for the evaluation category. Each subsequent Offeror’s score was divided by the highest score and then multiplied by the maximum number of points available (50) to equal the number of points awarded.

<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>Tyler Technologies</b>	<b>CGI</b>	<b>CherryRoad Technologies</b>
<b>Raw Score</b>	5.0	5.0	5.17	9.17	5.83
<b>Final Work Plan Score</b>	<b>27.27</b>	<b>27.27</b>	<b>28.19</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>31.79</b>

**RAVA Plan 150 Points**

The RAVA Plan had two major components; a Risk Assessment Plan and a Value Added Plan. The RAVA provided Offerors the opportunity to demonstrate its expertise on the specific project/service being proposed.

Offerors listed and prioritized major risk items it identified as being unique to this service. This included areas that may cause the service to not be completed within budget, or within schedule, generate any financial cost increases, or may be a source of dissatisfaction for the State. Risks included things that the Offeror controls and things that the Offeror does not control. The risks were non-technical, but contained enough information to describe to an evaluator why the risk is a valid risk. The Offeror explained how the Offeror planned to avoid or minimize the risk. All identified risks and solutions were included in the base proposal cost.

The purpose of the Value Added Plan was to provide Offerors with an opportunity to identify any Value Added options or ideas that may benefit the State. Value Added items were not included in the base cost proposal. During the Pre-award Phase the State determined which Value Added items were accepted or rejected.

**RAVA-PEC MEMBERS’ INDIVIDUAL SCORES**

**Risk Assessment**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Blue CedarCrestone</b>	<b>Golden Rod CIBER</b>	<b>Purple Tyler Technologies</b>	<b>Salmon CGI</b>	<b>White CherryRoad Technologies</b>
Brook Larson	5	5	5	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	10	5	5	10	5
Dan Spencer	5	10	1	10	5
Marlys Hagen	5	10	5	10	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	1	10	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5	10	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.83</b>	<b>6.67</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>9.17</b>	<b>5.00</b>

### Value Added

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Blue CedarCrestone</b>	<b>Golden Rod CIBER</b>	<b>Purple Tyler Technologies</b>	<b>Salmon CGI</b>	<b>White CherryRoad Technologies</b>
Brook Larson	5	5	1	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	5	5	10	5
Dan Spencer	5	1	1	5	5
Marlys Hagen	5	5	5	5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	1	5	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>5.83</b>	<b>5.00</b>

Risk Assessment and Value Added scores were then added together and divided by two to arrive at the average raw scores.

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Blue CedarCrestone</b>	<b>Golden Rod CIBER</b>	<b>Purple Tyler Technologies</b>	<b>Salmon CGI</b>	<b>White CherryRoad Technologies</b>
Brook Larson	5	5	3	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	7.5	5	5	10	5
Dan Spencer	5	5.5	1	7.5	5
Marlys Hagen	5	7.5	5	7.5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	1	7.5	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5	7.5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.42</b>	<b>5.50</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>7.50</b>	<b>5.00</b>

### RAVA FINAL SCORES

The Offeror with the highest raw score received the maximum number of points for the evaluation category. Each subsequent Offeror's score was divided by the highest score and then multiplied by the maximum number of points available (150) to equal the number of points awarded.

<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>Tyler Technologies</b>	<b>CGI</b>	<b>CherryRoad Technologies</b>
<b>Raw Score</b>	5.42	5.50	3.33	7.50	5.00
<b>Final RAVA Score</b>	<b>108.41</b>	<b>110.00</b>	<b>66.60</b>	<b>150.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>

### Evaluation of Strategic Fit Considerations - 50 Points

The State's PEC used the following information provided by the Offerors to evaluate Strategic Fit Considerations:

1. Exhibit D – Strategic Fit Considerations

2. Exhibit F – Software Functionality and Technical Requirements

The State’s PEC evaluated and scored Exhibits D and F as a whole, assigning a single score to the combined components. The PEC evaluated the qualifications of the Software Offeror’s and System Implementation Offeror’s personnel and experience. Consideration was given to how well they met the State’s operational, business, and strategic goals. In addition, impacts to State resources were considered, as were the Offeror’s exceptions to the State’s terms and conditions. As previously described, Strategic Fit components were cleansed of identifying names or information and other than the color coding, the PEC members did not know who the Offerors were.

**STRATEGIC FIT-PEC MEMBERS’ INDIVIDUAL SCORES**

**Strategic Fit**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Blue</b> CedarCrestone	<b>Golden Rod</b> CIBER	<b>Purple</b> Tyler Technologies	<b>Salmon</b> CGI	<b>White</b> CherryRoad Technologies
Brook Larson	5	5	1	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	5	5	5	5
Dan Spencer	1	1	5	5	5
Marlys Hagen	5	5	1	5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	5	5	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>

**STRATEGIC FIT FINAL SCORES**

The Offeror with the highest raw score received the maximum number of points for the evaluation category. Each subsequent Offeror’s score was divided by the highest score and then multiplied by the maximum number of points available (50) to equal the number of points awarded.

<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>Tyler Technologies</b>	<b>CGI</b>	<b>CherryRoad Technologies</b>
<b>Raw Score</b>	4.33	4.33	3.67	5.0	5.0
<b>Final Strategic Fit Score</b>	<b>43.33</b>	<b>43.33</b>	<b>36.70</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>

**Criteria for advancing to Filter 3**

The scores within Filter 2 (Past Performance Information, Cost, Project Approach, Strategic Fit Considerations, and the first 65 points of the Alaskan Offeror’s Preference) were summed to create a total score for this filter.

## Short List Scores

CRITERIA	Total Points Available	CedarCrestone	CIBER	Tyler Technologies	CGI	CherryRoad Technologies
<b>Cost</b>	<b>250</b>	182.89	250.00	171.91	240.18	150.99
<b>Alaska Preference</b>	<b>65</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	65.00	0.00
<b>RAVA Plan Rating</b>	<b>150</b>	108.41	110.00	66.60	150.00	100.00
<b>Work Plan Rating</b>	<b>50</b>	27.27	27.27	28.19	50.00	31.79
<b>Strategic Fit</b>	<b>50</b>	43.33	43.33	36.67	50.00	50.00
<b>PPI</b>	<b>50</b>	47.11	44.83	49.81	48.18	43.49
	<b>615</b>	<b>409.01</b>	<b>475.43</b>	<b>353.18</b>	<b>603.36</b>	<b>376.27</b>

**Susceptible for Award Determination:** 350 points were still available in Filter 3, Interviews and Demonstrations as well as the rest of the Alaska Offeror's Preference of 35 points. After analysis, three Offerors were determined to be within the competitive range.

### END OF FILTER 2

**THREE PROPOSALS WERE CONSIDERED TO BE SUSCEPTIBLE FOR AWARD AND ADVANCED TO FILTER 3: CedarCrestone, CIBER, and CGI.**

### BEGIN FILTER 3

#### Evaluation of Interviews - 300 Points

The State conducted interviews with the Offerors that were invited to Filter 3. The State interviewed the following individuals for each of the short listed firms:

- Project Manager
- Technical Lead
- Finance/Procurement Functional Lead
- Business Process Reengineering Lead
- Training Lead

The State interviewed each of the above individuals separately. No other individuals from the Offeror's organization were allowed to sit in or participate during the interviews. Similar to a job interview, the questions were not disclosed prior to the interview. All proposed team members were required to be available in person for interviews on the date specified. No substitutes, proxies, phone interviews, or electronic interviews were allowed. All interviews were video recorded, and if awarded the contract, all interview statements will become part of the final contract.

**INTERVIEWS-PEC MEMBERS' INDIVIDUAL SCORES**

**Training Lead**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>CGI</b>
Brook Larson	5	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	5	5
Dan Spencer	5	5	5
Marlys Hagen	5	5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>

**Technical Lead**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>CGI</b>
Brook Larson	5	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	1	5	5
Dan Spencer	5	5	10
Marlys Hagen	5	5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	5
Tom Mayer	5	5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.83</b>

**Project Manager**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>CGI</b>
Brook Larson	5	1	10
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	1	10
Dan Spencer	5	1	10
Marlys Hagen	5	1	10
Stacie Bentley	5	1	10
Tom Mayer	5	1	10
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>10.0</b>

**Business/Change Management Lead**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>CGI</b>
Brook Larson	1	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	1	1	5
Dan Spencer	1	1	10
Marlys Hagen	1	1	5
Stacie Bentley	1	5	5
Tom Mayer	1	5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>5.83</b>

### Financial Lead

Evaluator	CedarCrestone	CIBER	CGI
Brook Larson	5	5	5
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	5	5
Dan Spencer	5	5	10
Mariys Hagen	5	5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	10
Tom Mayer	5	5	10
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>7.50</b>

The PEC's scores were averaged for each interviewed individual, resulting the following raw scores.

AVERAGE INTERVIEW RATINGS			
	CedarCrestone	CIBER	CGI
Training Lead	5	5	5
Technical Lead	4.33	5	5.83
Project Manager	5	1	10
Business/Change Management Lead	1	3	5.83
Financial Lead	5	5	7.5
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>6.83</b>

### INTERVIEWS FINAL SCORES

The Offeror with the highest raw score received the maximum number of points for the evaluation category. Each subsequent Offeror's score was divided by the highest score and then multiplied by the maximum number of points available (300) to equal the number of points awarded.

VENDOR	CedarCrestone	CIBER	CGI
<b>Raw Score</b>	4.07	3.8	6.83
<b>Final Interview Score</b>	<b>178.77</b>	<b>166.91</b>	<b>300.00</b>

Links for each Offerors' proposed individuals' video interviews are located online at the Division of Finance's Administrative Systems Replacement Project website.

## Evaluation of Client Demonstrations - 50 Points

The State required Offerors to identify one past client for which the proposed software system has been successfully implemented. The Offeror coordinated the past client's system demonstration for the State's PEC. The purpose of this two-hour demonstration was to have an end user demonstrate the installed and fully operational system. The demonstration was also used to identify the end users' satisfaction with the product, the system, the installation, and the service provided by the Offeror.

Scenarios to be demonstrated included:

1. Financial – Invoice a citizen for a license renewal fee; track the receivable; and liquidate it upon receipt of the money. Show how the receipt is reflected in the revenue journal and general ledger.
2. Procurement – Create a purchase requisition; track the requisition approval process; create the purchase order resulting from the requisition, track the purchase order approval process through at least two separate approvers; issue the purchase order to a vendor, receive the products, approve the invoice, and track the payment process.
3. Human resources/payroll - Appoint a new employee with setup of employee/employer charges, labor distribution, pay, leave, benefits, and demographic information.

### CLIENT DEMONSTRATIONS-PEC MEMBERS' INDIVIDUAL SCORES

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>CGI</b>
Brook Larson	5	5	10
Cheryl Shakespeare	5	5	10
Dan Spencer	5	1	5
Marlys Hagen	5	5	5
Stacie Bentley	5	5	10
Tom Mayer	5	5	10
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>8.33</b>

### DEMONSTRATIONS FINAL SCORES

The Offeror with the highest raw score received the maximum number of points for the evaluation category. Each subsequent Offeror's score was divided by the highest score and then multiplied by the maximum number of points available (50) to equal the number of points awarded.

<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>CedarCrestone</b>	<b>CIBER</b>	<b>CGI</b>
	<b>Demo'd City of Milwaukie</b>	<b>Demo'd OmniTrans</b>	<b>Demo'd State of Wyoming</b>
<b>Raw Score</b>	5.00	4.33	8.33
<b>Final Demo Score</b>	<b>30.01</b>	<b>25.99</b>	<b>50.00</b>

## FINAL SCORE SUMMARY FOR SHORT LISTED OFFERORS

VENDOR	CedarCrestone	CIBER	CGI
Cost	182.89	250.00	240.18
Ak Offeror's Pref.			100
PPI	47.11	44.83	48.18
Work Plan	27.27	27.27	50.00
RAVA	108.41	110.00	150.00
Strategic Fit	43.33	43.33	50.00
Interviews	178.77	166.91	300.00
Demo	30.01	25.99	50.00
<b>FINAL SCORES</b>	<b>617.79</b>	<b>668.33</b>	<b>988.36</b>

### Cost Reasonableness:

To ensure the optimum use of public funds, the State reviewed the cost reasonableness of the prioritized Offerors in the following manner:

1. If the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost was within the State's means and within 5% of the next highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost, the State would invite the highest ranked Offeror to the Pre-award Phase.
2. If the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost was within the State's means, but was more than 5% greater than the second highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost, the State reserved the right to invite the next highest ranked Offeror to the Pre-award Phase.
3. If the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost exceeded the State's means, the State reserved the right to invite the next highest ranked Offeror whose ten-year total cost fell within the State's means.

Highest Ranked Offeror: \$35,684,136  
 Second Ranked Offeror: \$34,282,573

Highest Ranked Offeror cost was within the cost reasonableness factor of 5% at 4.09% higher than the Second Ranked Offeror and was deemed to be within the State's means.

### FINAL SCORES FOR ALL OFFERORS:

CedarCrestone	CIBER	Tyler Technologies	CGI	CherryRoad Technologies
617.79	668.33	353.18*	988.36	376.27*

\*Deemed not susceptible for award at the end of Filter 2 and did not advance to the Interview and Demonstration scoring components.

**END OF FILTER 3**

**THE HIGHEST RANKED OFFEROR, CGI, WAS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PRE-AWARD PHASE.**