

AMP Proposal Evaluation Committee Score Form

Vendor: _____
Scorer: _____
Date: _____
Score: _____
Max Score: _____ 300

Sec. 5.05

Understanding of the Project

1) How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

Notes:

2) How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

Notes:

3) To what degree has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the state expects it to provide?

Notes:

4) Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the state's time schedule and can meet it?

Notes:

5) Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the OCSE certification

Notes:

Section Score:

Max Score:

50

Sec. 5.06

Proposed Solution

1) Does the Offeror's proposed solution appear to be feasible?

Notes:

2) Does the Offeror's proposed technical solution comply with the State's current IT security standards?

Notes:

3) If a COTS solution was proposed, did the Offeror identify a process for obtaining customized enhancements beyond the implementation timeframe? Is this process practical and feasible? Does it meet CSSD's needs? What are the benefits of the proposed system (i.e., operations and maintenance, etc.) vs. customer low-code software development.

Notes:

4) Does the Offeror's proposed solution meet the business process requirements outlined in the document, AMP DDI RFP Requirements (Attachment 4)?

Notes:

5) Does the Offeror's proposed solution identify the skills and resources required by the state to maintain the system beyond the initial implementation?

Notes:

6) Does the Offeror's proposed solution include all of the system environments required to support the replacement system (development, testing, training, production, disaster recovery and business continuity)?

Notes:

7) Does the Offeror's proposed solution include a technical performance measurement toolset?

Notes:

8) To what extent does the Offeror's approach address the need for detailed data analysis of the WinSTAR system? Did the Offeror's approach include a process for pre- and post-conversion data validation?

Notes:

9) Did the Offeror's proposed solution include a detailed data conversion plan?

Notes:

10) Did the Offeror's proposed solution provide an approach for change management? Did this approach address requirements management for the project? Did this approach address managing and controlling system change requests for the DDI and Operations & Maintenance timeframes?

Notes:

11) Did the Offeror's proposal include an approach for creating a plan to back-up environments for Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Planning?

Notes:

12) Did the Offeror's proposal include an approach for providing the technical support team with procedures for recording and responding to trouble calls? Did the solution include a trouble-ticketing component that would seamlessly integrate with a requirements management system?

Notes:

13) Did the Offeror's proposal acknowledge the need to develop a Site Preparation Completion Report? Did the Offeror acknowledge the requirements to develop this report prior to constructing the WinSTAR replacement system?

Notes:

14) Did the Offeror's proposal acknowledge a reasonable consideration for User Acceptance Testing and potential re-work that could result from software deficiencies?

Notes:

15) Did the Offeror's proposal outline an implementation strategy? Did the proposal address areas of accountability and responsibility for implementation tasks?

Notes:

16) Did the Offeror's proposal include an Operations & Maintenance transition strategy? Did this strategy recognize the requirement to provide Operations & Maintenance Activities Reports? Did this strategy include Turnover Activity Reports? Did this strategy incorporate testing of system back-up and recovery processes per the department's most current Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Plan?

Notes:

17) Did the Offeror's proposal acknowledge the need to provide detailed system and technical documents for this project? Did the proposal recognize the documentation should include system design specifications, internal workflow of the replacement system, and system functionality? Did the Offeror acknowledge the documentation should be focused on the following audiences:

- System and Software Designers and Developers;
- Database Administrators;
- IT Support Staff;
- Operations Support Staff;
- Trainers (technical and operational).

Notes:

Section Score:

Max Score:

100

Sec 5.07

Methodology Used for the Project

1) How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

Notes:

2) How well does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Notes:

3) Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the RFP?

Notes:

4) To what extent is the Offeror's approach to managing project timelines clearly explained and reasonable?

Notes:

5) Did the Offeror present a proposed schedule for accomplishing the work of the project? Did this schedule include major project milestones and gate reviews?

Notes:

6) How reasonable is the Offeror's approach to data conversion and installation services?

Notes:

7) Did the Offeror acknowledge the requirement to integrate its project management plan with the state's project management plan? Did the Offeror account for updating the project management plan?

Notes:

8) To what extent did the Offeror explain its approach to managing communications for this project? Did this approach provide bi-weekly project status reports? Did this approach include a bi-weekly project status meeting with the state?

Notes:

9) To what extent did the Offeror explain its approach for integrated change control for this project?

Notes:

10) To what extent did the Offeror explain its requirements gathering approach for this project?

Notes:

11) Did the Offeror's proposal address the need for a Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM)? Did the approach include describing the forward and backward traceability through the plan? Did the approach address how potential updates to the plan will be made? Did the approach address technical and functional requirements?

Notes:

12) To what extent has the Offeror clearly identified potential risks and offered reasonable risk mitigation strategies for the project?

Notes:

13) How well has the Offeror explained its approach to configuration management?

Notes:

14) Has the Offeror identified a project management methodology that will conduct activities in parallel to ensure milestones for this project are met?

Notes:

15) To what extent did the Offeror explain its approach to working with the PM and QA Contractors?

Notes:

16) To what extent has the Offeror explained its ability to utilize project management tools that will integrate with the state's project management tools?

Notes:

17) How reasonable is the Offeror's approach to transitioning technical support to the state's technical support staff?

a. Were specific tasks identified to transition to the State's staff?

b. Were potential risks identified with the transition?

c. Did the proposal include an explanation of how transition activities would occur?

d. Did the transition recognize the importance of conducting a transition without degradation to the maintenance and support of WinSTAR operations?

Notes:

18) How reasonable is the Offeror's approach for meeting the training requirements associated with the project? Did this approach recognize the requirement to train technical staff, functional staff, and end-users?

Notes:

19) To what extent did the Offeror address the need for test plans for all of the system environments for this project (development, testing, training, production, disaster recovery, and business continuity)?

Notes:

20) Did the Offeror's proposal acknowledge the requirement for a security plan? Did the Offeror's proposal acknowledge the state will provide a security plan template upon award of the contract?

Notes:

21) Did the Offeror's proposal include the requirement for a Readiness Review Report to document the results of the Readiness Review prior to the operational cut-over to the WinSTAR replacement system? Did the Offeror's proposal include basic components of the report such as:

- Status of all components/modules;
- Status of testing;
- Status of technical support readiness;
- Completeness of procedures and processes;
- Coordination with the QA Contractor;
- Summary of outstanding issues and the impact; and
- Recommended approach for addressing any outstanding issues.

Notes:

22) Did the Offeror's proposal acknowledge the role of the Operational Readiness Assessment along with the Readiness Review Report prior to the operational cut-over to the WinSTAR replacement system? Were the basic components of the report acknowledged, such as:

- Site preparation assessment;
- Status of equipment to be used;
- Staff readiness;
- Inventory of supplies;
- Completeness of procedures and processes; and
- Review of prior implementations (where applicable).

Notes:

23) Did the Offeror's proposal recognize the requirement for a formal Project/Contract Closeout event in which materials will be turned over to the state?

Notes:

Section Score:

Max Score:

50

Sec 5.08

Management Plan for the Project

1) How well does the management plan support all of the project requirements and logically lead to the deliverables required in the RFP?

Score:

Notes:

2) How well is accountability completely and clearly defined? Was the accountability outlined in a matrix (or other visual) format?

Notes:

3) To what extent has the Offeror identified lines of communication regarding issues that might arise with this project?

Notes:

4) To what extent has the Offeror identified a means to escalate potential problems that might rise with this project?

Notes:

5) To what extent did the Offeror identify its staff management plan for the project? Did it include a complete personnel roster with position titles? Were key personnel and their level of commitment identified? Were resumes provided for key personnel? Were the work locations of the personnel clearly identified?

Notes:

6) Is the organization of the project team clear?

Notes:

7) How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?

Notes:

8) To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessary to perform the contract?

Notes:

9) Does it appear that the offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

Notes:

10) Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

Notes:

11) To what degree is the proposal practical and feasible?

Notes:

12) To what extent has the offeror identified potential problems and solutions?

Notes:

Section Score:

Max Score:

50

Sec 5.09

Experience and Qualifications

1) Questions Regarding Personnel

a) Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

Notes:

b) Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the project requires?

Notes:

c) How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

Notes:

d) Did the Offeror provide evidence of professional certifications held by personnel who will be working on this project? Are the credentials relative to the expertise required to perform the work of this project?

Notes:

e) Did the Offeror provide current references for the personnel that were proposed for this project?

Notes:

f) Does any of the Offeror's key staff have prior or current experience working with the Department?

Notes:

2) Questions regarding the firm (if used):

a) Has the firm successfully completed one child enforcement system replacement project within the past three years for a state-level government, or comparable entity?

Notes:

b) How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

Notes:

c) How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

Notes:

d) Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

Notes:

f) Does the firm's proposed technical approach provide evidence of past experience that included successfully overcoming the unique technical considerations posed by Alaska?

Notes:

g) Does the firm's proposed functional approach appear to be realistic and based upon experience? Does the experience of the firm appear to be sufficient to meet the business requirements outlined in the project?

Notes:

h) To what extent does the firm have past experience integrating its proposed solutions with existing IT strategies and roadmaps? Does this experience include leveraging existing software technologies and licenses to implement the proposed solution?

Notes:

i) To what extent has the firm's past experience as an integrator supported the organization change associated with the implementation of an eligibility information system?

Notes:

Section Score:

Max Score:

50