

State of Oregon



**Oregon Judicial Department
Business and Fiscal Services Division
Central Procurement
1133 Chemeketa Street NE
Salem, OR 97301**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
No. 198-1002-11**

IDENTITY & ACCESS MANAGEMENT SOLUTION

OFFEROR INFORMATION SHEET FOR RFP No. 198-1002-11

Offeror must:

- A) Provide all requested information in the space provided next to each numbered question, and Type or print response and include in Proposal.

1	Firm Name		
2	Street Address		
3	City, State, ZIP		
4	Telephone Number		
	Area Code:	Number:	Extension:
5	Facsimile Number		
	Area Code:	Number:	
6	Toll Free Number		
	Area Code:	Number:	Extension:
7	Offeror's state of residence		
8	Federal Tax Identification Number		
9	Dun & Bradstreet Number		
10	Contact Person for Questions/Contract Negotiations, including address if different than above		
	Name & Title:	Address:	Email Address:
11	Telephone Number for Contact Person		
	Area Code:	Number:	Extension:
12	Facsimile Number for Contact Person		
	Area Code:	Number:	
13	Name of Individual Authorized to Bind the Organization		
	Name:	Title:	
14	Signature (<i>Must be in ink and individual must be authorized to Bind the Organization</i>)		
	Signature:	Date:	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1 Introduction
SECTION 2 Definitions
SECTION 3 General Information/Offeror Instructions
SECTION 4 Background Information
SECTION 5 Program Scope, Minimum Requirements, Desirable Features
SECTION 6 Proposal Format and Contents
SECTION 7 Evaluation Committee and Evaluation Criteria

Appendices:

Appendix A Sample Contract
Appendix B Cost Proposal Form
Appendix C Response Checklist
Appendix D System Software Minimum Requirements
Appendix E System Software Desirable Features

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

OJD is soliciting Proposals from qualified firms to provide a complete Identity & Access Management (IAM) solution to support all OJD constituents for controlled access to OJD enterprise applications, portals, and services.

1.1 SOLE POINT OF CONTACT (SPC): All questions about the technical requirements, contractual requirements, or the procurement process shall be directed to the person listed below:

Bob Baxter
Procurement Manager
Oregon Judicial Department
Business and Fiscal Services Division
1133 Chemeketa Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301
Telephone: (503) 986-6410
Fax: (503) 986-7001
E-mail: robert.a.baxter@ojd.state.or.us

1.2 ADDENDA: Any change or modification to the specifications, terms and conditions, or the procurement process will be made in the form of an Addendum to the RFP and will be advertised on the Oregon Procurement Information Network (ORPIN) system.

1.3 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS:

RFP Issue/Release Date	10/13/11
Voluntary Pre-Proposal Conference	10/24/11
Deadline for Requests for Clarification and Requests for Changes of Contractual Terms and Specifications	10/27/11
Deadline for Submission of Proposals	11/14/11
Announcement of Competitive Range	TBD
Presentation/Demonstrations/Interviews from Offerors in the Competitive Range.	TBD
Notice of Intent to Award Issued	TBD
Contract Sign Date	TBD
Issue Notice to Proceed	TBD

NOTE: All dates listed above are subject to change.

1.4 POLICY APPLICABLE TO SOLICITATION: OJD is conducting this solicitation pursuant to the OJD General Procurement Policy effective December 1, 2010.

1.5 METHOD OF AWARD: OJD intends to award a single Contract for the Software and Services identified in this RFP to the highest ranking Responsive Proposal submitted by a Responsible Offeror. However, the OJD reserves the right at its sole discretion to award multiple Contracts as a result of this RFP.

SECTION 2 – DEFINITIONS

General Definitions

“**Addendum**” or “**Addenda**” means an addition or deletion to, a material change in, or general interest explanation of a solicitation document.

“**Closing**” means the date and time announced in a solicitation document as the deadline for submitting Proposals.

“**Contract**” means an agreement between parties for the purchase, lease, rental or other acquisition or sale or other disposal by the OJD of Software and Services.

“**Contractor**” means the Person with whom the OJD enters into a Contract.

“Effective Date” means the date on which the resulting Contract is fully approved and executed in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations and/or policy.

“Non-Resident Offeror” means an Offeror that is not a Resident Offeror.

“Firmware” means the combination of a hardware device and computer instructions and data that reside as read-only software on that device.

“OJD” means the Oregon Judicial Department.

“Offeror” means a Person who or entity that submits a Proposal in response to a Request for Proposals.

“ORPIN” means the on-line electronic Oregon Procurement Information Network administered by the Oregon Department of Administrative Services, State Procurement Office.

“Person” means an individual, corporation business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, governmental agency, public corporation or any other legal or commercial entity.

“Personal Services” means services involving specialized skill, knowledge, and resources in the application of technical or scientific expertise, or the exercise of professional, artistic or management discretion or judgment, including, without limitation, a Contract for the services of an accountant, physician or dentist, educator, broadcaster, artist (including a photographer, filmmaker, painter, weaver or sculptor), or consultant.

“Proposal” means a response to a Request for Proposal.

“RFP” or **“Request for Proposals”** means all documents, whether attached or incorporated by reference, used for soliciting Proposals using a sealed Proposal process in which award is based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to price.

“Resident Offeror” means an Offeror that has paid unemployment taxes or income taxes in this State during the 12 calendar months immediately preceding submission of the Proposal, has a business address in this State, and has stated in a Proposal whether Offeror is a Resident Offeror.

“Responsible Offeror” means meeting the standards identified in Section XII of the OJD General Procurement Policy.

“Responsive Proposal” means a Proposal that substantially complies in all material respects with applicable solicitation document requirements.

“**Services**” means supplies, equipment, materials and Services including Personal Services and any personal property, including any tangible, intangible and intellectual property and related rights and licenses.

“**Software**” means an all-inclusive term which refers to any computer programs, routines, or subroutines proposed by the Offeror, including COTS software, operating software, programming aids, application programs, and application programming interfaces. With respect to this RFP, the term Software includes Firmware.

“**SPC**” means single point of contact, which is the OJD employee identified in the introduction to this RFP.

SECTION 3 – GENERAL INFORMATION/OFFEROR INSTRUCTIONS

3.1 ORPIN SYSTEM:

3.1.1 ORPIN USAGE: Offerors unfamiliar with the ORPIN may contact the State Procurement Office at DAS/SSD/SPO, 1225 Ferry St. SE - U140, Salem, OR 97301-4285; telephone (503) 378-4642. Offerors may also look for updates on the following website: <http://procurement.oregon.gov/>

3.1.2 RFPs, SOLICITATION ADDENDA AND APPENDICES: RFPs, including all Addenda and most appendices, will be posted on ORPIN as part of the solicitation document and will not be mailed to prospective Offerors. Offerors without access to ORPIN may download copies at a Plan Center, or at DAS/SSD/SPO, 1225 Ferry St. SE – U140, Salem, Oregon. Hard copy documents are also available for purchase through OJD.

3.1.3 APPENDICES: Some exhibits and appendices cannot be viewed or downloaded through the ORPIN System. In these cases, the solicitation will include instructions on how to obtain these documents.

3.1.4 SOLICITATION ADDENDA: RFP Addenda are incorporated with the original solicitation and can be viewed and downloaded by registered Offerors in ORPIN.

To receive notice of Addenda, registered Offerors must express an in interest in the solicitation through ORPIN by selecting “Interested” from the left-hand menu of the document screen and following the instructions indicated.

3.1.5 PLAN HOLDER’S LIST: IN ORDER TO APPEAR ON THE PLAN HOLDERS LIST, SUPPLIERS MUST BE REGISTERED IN ORPIN. Suppliers can register in ORPIN at: www.orpin.oregon.gov

SUPPLIERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT THEIR REGISTRATION INFORMATION IS CURRENT AND CORRECT. OJD accepts no responsibility for missing or incorrect information contained in the Supplier's Registration information in ORPIN.

3.2 VOLUNTARY PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE: A voluntary pre-proposal conference has been scheduled for 1:30 PM Pacific Time on the date set forth in Section 1.3 "SCHEDULE OF EVENTS." The pre-proposal conference will be held in the Columbia Conference Room at 525 Trade Street SE, Salem, OR 97301. Offerors may participate in this conference either in person or via teleconference. Call-in information for participating via teleconference is as follows:

Conference Call Number: 1-800-910-3597
Conference Code Number: 28749418

The purpose of this conference is to provide an overview of the solicitation process, and provide prospective Offerors an opportunity to present questions and obtain clarifications relative to the solicitation. Offerors are encouraged to submit questions via email in MS Word format by 5:00 PM Pacific Time two days prior to the conference to the SPC to facilitate the question and answer portion of the conference. While participation in this conference is not a prerequisite to submitting a Proposal, Offerors who intend to submit a Proposal are *strongly* encouraged to have their proposed project team in attendance. Participants should have a copy of this RFP available for reference during the conference.

Prospective Offerors attending via teleconference are limited to one call in line (via teleconference). **Prospective Offerors shall provide the SPC with a list of their firm's participants not later than three (3) days prior to the conference. In addition, Offerors shall identify if they will be participating in person or via teleconference.**

NOTE: Statements made during the pre-proposal conference do not change the solicitation document unless the SPC confirms such statements with a written Addendum.

3.3 METHODS OF SEEKING MODIFICATIONS TO THE RFP PROVISIONS:

3.3.1 PROCEDURE: The appropriate means of seeking modifications to provisions of an RFP are through (a) requests for clarification; and (b) formal submission of requests for changes to contractual terms or specifications. Any Proposal that takes exception to the specifications or contractual terms of the RFP may be deemed non-responsive and may be rejected.

3.3.2 REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION: Any Offeror requiring clarification of any provision of the RFP may make a request for clarification to the SPC. To be considered, the request for clarification must be submitted to the SPC via email in MS Word format and

be received by **2:30 PM** Pacific Time on the date specified in Section 1.3 “SCHEDULE OF EVENTS.”

3.3.3 REQUEST FOR CHANGES TO CONTRACTUAL TERMS AND SPECIFICATIONS: Any Offeror may submit a request for change to contractual terms or specifications to the SPC. The request shall include the reason for requested changes, supported by factual documentation and any proposed changes. To be considered, the request for change must be submitted via email to the SPC in MS Word format and be received by **2:30 PM** Pacific Time on the date specified in Section 1.3 “SCHEDULE OF EVENTS.”

3.3.4 RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION OR CHANGE: OJD shall promptly respond to each properly-submitted written request for clarification and request for change. Where appropriate, OJD will issue revisions and clarify RFP provisions via Addenda announced on ORPIN. OJD may also informally respond to Offerors’ questions. **HOWEVER, INFORMAL RESPONSES DO NOT AFFECT THE PROVISIONS OF THE RFP. SPECIFICATIONS, CONTRACTUAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS, AND PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP CAN ONLY BE CHANGED VIA FORMAL ADDENDA ISSUED BY OJD AND ANNOUNCED ON THE ORPIN SYSTEM.**

3.3.5 REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OR CHANGE TO ADDENDA: Requests for clarification and requests for change of Addenda provisions shall be received by the SPC by the date/time specified in the Addendum, or they will not be considered. Requests of matters not added or modified by Addenda will not be considered.

3.4 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION:

3.4.1 NUMBER OF COPIES; SIGNATURE REQUIRED: Offerors shall submit one (1) printed original of the Proposal, including all applicable additional information/documentation submitted. THE PRINTED ORIGINAL PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY OFFEROR SHALL BEAR AN ORIGINAL SIGNATURE FROM AN AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE. FAILURE TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL BEARING AN ORIGINAL SIGNATURE MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF THE PROPOSAL. **In addition, Offerors shall submit ten (10) hard copies along with one (1) electronic copy (on CD) of the Proposal.** Failure to submit the proper number and type of copies may result in imposition of an administrative fee, which if imposed shall be paid before the Proposal will be evaluated.

3.4.2 SEALED ENVELOPE; ADDRESS AND COVER INFORMATION:

3.4.2.1 PROPOSALS: Proposals shall be submitted in sealed packages or envelopes. To ensure proper identification and handling, all packages and envelopes shall be clearly marked as follows:

RFP Number
Closing Date
Closing Time

OREGON JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT
BUSINESS AND FISCAL SERVICES DIVISION
CENTRAL PROCUREMENT
1133 Chemeketa Street, NE
SALEM, OR 97301

Proposals received after RFP Closing will not be considered.

3.4.2.2 PRICING INFORMATION: The pricing portion of the Proposal shall be submitted in a SEPARATE sealed package or envelope. **Only one (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic copy (on CD) of the pricing portion need be submitted.** In addition to the address and cover information specified in Section 3.4.2.1, the separately-sealed pricing portion shall be clearly marked “PRICING INFORMATION.”

3.4.2.3 DELIVERY FEES: Proposals shall be delivered postage or shipping pre-paid. OJD will not accept Proposal packages with shipping fees or postage due.

3.4.2.4 OJD will not be responsible for the proper handling of Proposals, including the pricing portion, not properly identified, marked and submitted in a timely manner.

3.5 PROPOSAL MODIFICATIONS: Modifications or erasures made to the Proposal shall be initialed in ink by the person signing the Proposal. Proposals once submitted may be modified in writing before RFP Closing. If it is necessary to modify the Proposal after the Proposal has been submitted to OJD, these modifications shall be identified in a written document prepared on Offeror’s letterhead, signed by an authorized representative of Offeror, and state that the new document supersedes or modifies the prior Proposal. Modification shall be submitted in a sealed envelope clearly marked “Proposal Modification” which identifies the RFP number and Closing date. Except as authorized in Section 3.17.1 below, Offerors may not modify their Proposal after RFP Closing and any Proposal modification received after RFP Closing will not be considered.

3.6 PROPOSAL WITHDRAWAL: Proposals may be withdrawn in writing on Offeror’s letterhead signed by an authorized representative and received by OJD prior to RFP Closing.

3.7 PAYMENT: Proposals which require payment in less than 30 days after receipt of an invoice may be rejected.

3.8 PRICE: All prices and any other significant factors contained in the Proposal shall be valid for 120 days from the RFP Closing. OJD may request that Offerors extend this 120 day period in writing.

3.9 ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS: Alternative Proposals will not be accepted.

3.10 PROPOSAL OPENING PROCEDURE: Proposals shall be opened at **2:30 PM** Pacific Time on the date listed in Section 1.3 “SCHEDULE OF EVENTS.”

3.11 PROPOSAL EVALUATION: Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section 7 of the RFP to identify the highest ranking Responsive Proposal submitted by a Responsible Offeror.

3.11.1 RESPONSIVENESS: To be considered responsive, the Proposal must substantially comply with all requirements of the RFP and all prescribed public solicitation procedures. In making such evaluation, OJD may waive minor informalities and irregularities.

3.11.2 RESPONSIBILITY: Prior to awarding a Contract, OJD may investigate Offeror and request information in addition to that already required in the RFP when OJD, in its sole discretion, considers it necessary or advisable in order to evaluate whether Offeror meets the applicable standards of responsibility identified in Section XII of the OJD General Procurement Policy.

3.11.3 DISCOUNTS: Cash or term discounts may be offered by Offeror in the pricing portion of its Proposal and will be binding upon Offeror in the event Offeror is awarded the Contract. However, such discounts will not be considered for evaluation purposes.

3.12 REJECTION OF PROPOSALS: The issuance of the RFP does not obligate OJD to select any of the Proposals. OJD reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals in accordance with Section XVI.A of the OJD General Procurement Policy.

3.13 INFORMATION/PROPOSAL AVAILABILITY: During the evaluation of Proposals, Offerors shall be available to respond to any request for clarification from the evaluation committee within 72 hours of request (Monday-Friday). Inability of the evaluation committee to reach an Offeror for clarification and/or failure of an Offeror to respond within the time stated above may result in rejection of that Offeror’s Proposal at OJD’s sole discretion.

3.14 PRIOR ACCEPTANCE OF DEFECTIVE PROPOSALS: Due to the limited resources of OJD, OJD generally will not completely review or analyze Proposals that on their face fail to comply with the requirements of this RFP or which clearly are not the best Proposals; nor will OJD generally investigate the references or qualifications of those who submit such Proposals. Therefore, neither the release of an Offeror’s bid bond (if requested), the return of a Proposal, or acknowledgment that the selection is complete shall operate as a representation by OJD that an unsuccessful Proposal was complete, sufficient, or lawful in any respect.

3.15 PUBLIC RECORDS: This RFP and one copy of each original Proposal received in response to it, together with copies of all documents pertaining to the award of a Contract, shall be kept by OJD and made a part of a file or record that may be open to public inspection. If a Proposal contains any information that is considered a trade secret under ORS 192.501(2), or is otherwise exempt from disclosure under the Oregon Public Records Law, ORS 192.410 through 192.505, if applicable, such information shall specifically be marked with the following legend:

“The data exempt from disclosure under ORS 192, if applicable, shall not be disclosed except in accordance with the Oregon Public Records Law, ORS 192.410 through 192.505.”

If applicable, the Oregon Public Records Law exempts from disclosure only bona fide trade secrets, and some exemptions from disclosure apply only “unless the public interest requires disclosure in the particular instance.” Therefore, non-disclosure of documents or any portion of a document submitted as part of a Proposal may depend upon official or judicial determinations made pursuant to the public records laws and requirements. If applicable, OJD may give Offeror notice of any required disclosure and cooperate with Offeror, at Offeror’s expense, in seeking reasonable protective arrangements. However, OJD shall not be required to act in a manner which would result in any sanctions or other penalties.

Typically, the above restrictions do not include cost or price information which shall be open to public inspection.

3.16 INVESTIGATION OF REFERENCES AND PAST PERFORMANCE: OJD reserves the right to investigate the references, which may include on-site visits, and the past performance of any Offeror with respect to its successful performance of similar projects, compliance with specifications and contractual obligations, its completion of service on schedule, and its lawful payment of suppliers, sub-contractors, and workers. OJD may postpone the award or execution of the Contract after the announcement of the apparent successful Offeror in order to complete its investigation.

3.17 ESTABLISHING THE COMPETITIVE RANGE

3.17.1 ESTABLISHING THE COMPETITIVE RANGE: OJD will initially evaluate all Proposals in accordance with Section 7.3.1 – 7.3.9 of this RFP. OJD may either choose to award to the highest ranking Offeror(s) based on that evaluation or rank the Proposals as a result of that initial evaluation to determine Offerors in the Competitive Range. The “Competitive Range” is the group of the three (3) highest ranked responsive, Responsible Offerors after the initial evaluation identified above. OJD reserves the right to increase or decrease the number of Offerors in the Competitive Range if OJD determines, in its sole discretion, that there is a natural break in the scores of Offerors. OJD shall provide written notice to all Offerors identifying Offerors in the Competitive Range. Once the Competitive Range has been developed, OJD at its sole discretion may either choose to conduct multiple rounds of negotiations with Offerors contained in the

Competitive Range, or evaluate Proposals in accordance with the final steps of evaluation as described in Section 7.3.10 with Offerors contained in the Competitive Range, or both.

NOTE: OJD reserves the right at its sole discretion to establish a Competitive Range of all Offerors who have made a good faith effort in submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP for the purpose of correcting deficiencies in Proposals for determining responsiveness.

3.17.2 MULTIPLE ROUNDS OF NEGOTIATIONS (IF NECESSARY):

OJD, if necessary, may conduct multiple rounds of the negotiations. During each round:

3.17.2.1 OJD may require Offerors to provide: (i) additional materials for clarifications regarding their initial or revised Proposals, (ii) new materials responsive to OJD's most recent request for revisions, which may concern matters relating to solicitation specifications, terms and conditions, evaluation criteria and weight, or price structure in order to best meet the OJD's needs.

3.17.2.2 The relevant criteria will be rescored if any of these submissions affects the scores in any of the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 7.

3.17.2.3 At each successive round, OJD may disregard its scoring of prior Proposals and commence new scoring for the new Proposals. OJD may eliminate any Proposal after a step because the Proposal did not meet a requirement, or the Proposal was not susceptible to award, and then proceed with a second step that requires additional Proposals based on the revision(s) brought about by the negotiation process. If any revision is made by OJD in any subsequent step, OJD reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to permit any Offeror whose Proposal was previously eliminated to submit a new Proposal, if the reason(s) for the elimination of the prior Proposal by that Offeror no longer applies.

3.18 PERMISSIBLE NEGOTIATIONS: Following the selection of a successful Offeror, OJD will negotiate the following:

3.18.1 The Statement of Work to Appendix A (Sample Contract)

3.18.2 The Contract price in Appendix A (Sample Contract) as it is affected by the results of negotiating the Statement of Work.

3.18.3 Exhibit I – Contractor Safety and Security Policies and Procedures (including Security Incident Response Procedures) to Attachment A – Sample Contract.

3.18.4 Exhibit J – Data Safeguards to Attachment A – Sample Contract.

3.18.5 OJD will also consider for negotiation and inclusion into the Contract appropriate supplemental terms and conditions from as applicable Offeror's Software license agreements, Software maintenance and support agreements, service level agreements and other similar documents (Supplemental Agreements) that do not materially conflict with this RFP, that would not materially change the nature of this solicitation, and that would not adversely affect competition. The proposed form of **those Supplemental Agreements that Offeror desires to be included as part of the Contract shall be submitted as part of the Proposal.** By accepting delivery of those Supplemental Agreements, OJD is not bound to accept them, and the acceptability of these Supplemental Agreements shall be determined in consultation with the OJD's legal counsel.

In the event OJD is unable to successfully negotiate a final Contract with the highest ranking Offeror, OJD, in its sole and exclusive discretion, may terminate negotiation with the highest ranking Offeror and commence negotiations with the second highest ranking Offeror. OJD may continue this process until it has successfully negotiated a final Contract.

3.19 INTENT TO AWARD ANNOUNCEMENT: OJD shall provide written notice to all Offerors of its intent to award the Contract. Identification of the apparent successful Offeror is procedural only and creates no right in the named Offeror to award of the Contract.

3.19.1 PROTEST OF INTENT TO AWARD ANNOUNCEMENT: An adversely affected Offeror may protest to the SPC in writing within seven (7) calendar days after issuance of the notice of intent to award the Contract. Protests received after this time SHALL NOT be considered. NOTE: If OJD receives only one (1) Proposal, OJD may dispense with the protest of intent-to-award announcement period and proceed with Contract negotiations and award.

An Offeror is adversely affected only if Offeror would be eligible for Contract award in the event the protest was successful. The only reasons for the protest must be that: all higher-ranked Proposals are nonresponsive; OJD failed to conduct an evaluation of Proposals in accordance with the criteria or process described in the RFP; OJD has abused its discretion in rejecting the protestor's Proposal as nonresponsive; or OJD's evaluation of Proposals or determination of award otherwise violates the OJD General Procurement Policy.

3.19.2 REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FILES: Offerors shall have five (5) business days following the intent to award announcement within which to view the Proposal files – by appointment with the SPC only.

3.19.3 PROTEST PERIOD EXPIRATION: At the conclusion of this protest period, OJD will consider all protests received, if any, and:

3.19.3.1 Deny all protests and proceed with final evaluation of the apparent highest ranking Offeror and, pending the satisfactory outcome of this final

evaluation, enter into negotiations for a Contract and for a Statement of Work with the named Offeror; OR

3.19.3.2 Sustain a meritorious protest(s) and reject the apparent highest ranking Offeror, if such Offeror is unable to demonstrate that its Proposal complied with all material requirements of the solicitation; thereafter, OJD may name a new apparent highest ranking Offeror; OR

3.19.3.3 Reject all Proposals and cancel the procurement.

3.20 INSURANCE: The apparent highest ranking Offeror shall provide proof of required insurance as identified in Exhibit B to Appendix A – Sample Contract to SPC within ten (10) calendar days of notification of intent to award. Failure to present the required documents within the ten (10) calendar-day period may result in Proposal rejection. Offerors are encouraged to consult their insurance agent(s) about the insurance requirements contained in Exhibit B prior to Proposal submission.

3.21 RECYCLABLE MATERIALS: Contractor shall use recyclable products to the maximum extent economically feasible in the performance of the Services.

SECTION 4 - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4.1 OREGON JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

This section provides an overview of the Oregon Judicial Department and includes information and organizational statistics.

4.1.1 OJD - Organizational Context

Oregon state courts include the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, and the Trial Courts (includes the Tax Court having statewide jurisdiction located in Marion County and 36 Trial Courts in 27 Judicial Districts). These state courts are part of the OJD. Each of the 27 districts includes one or more counties. Because some Oregon counties have relatively small populations and caseloads, the legislature has combined them into multicounty Judicial Districts. Each of Oregon's 36 counties has a trial court. In most counties, the court has its offices in the county courthouse. In a few counties, the court has offices and courtrooms in more than one location. Figure 1 below provides an illustration of how Oregon's 36 counties are assembled into 27 districts.




Figure 1

The Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court is the administrative head and chief executive officer of the OJD. The Chief Justice supervises the state court system, makes rules and issues orders to carry out the duties of the office, appoints the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals and the presiding judges of the state Trial Courts, adopts rules that

establish procedures for all state courts, and supervises the statewide fiscal plan and budget for all state courts.

The State Court Administrator (SCA) is the OJD's chief operating officer and assists the Chief Justice in administering and supervising the state courts through the various divisions of the OSCA.

In each Judicial District, the Chief Justice appoints a presiding judge. The presiding judge has general administrative authority and supervision over the district to apportion the workload, make rules, and issue administrative orders. The presiding judge appoints a professional trial court administrator TCA to help the presiding judge manage the court's operations and local budget. Trial Courts handle all case classes and types, including (but not limited to), all civil cases (e.g., small claims, probate, mental health, juvenile, domestic relations), all criminal cases (felony, misdemeanor, and violation, including traffic and parking).

4.1.2 Oregon Judicial Department

The Oregon Judicial Department's Mission Statement is the following:

“As a separate and independent branch of government, our mission is to provide fair and accessible justice services that protect the rights of individuals, preserve community welfare, and inspire public confidence.”

4.1.2.1 Divisions

OJD Administration has 6 divisions and 5 offices or programs:

- Executive Services Division:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/exec/index.page>
- Appellate Court Services Division:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/acs/index.page>
- Business and Fiscal Services Division:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/bfsd/index.page>
- Court Interpreter Services:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/cpsd/InterpreterServices/index.page>
- Enterprise Technology Services Division
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/etsd/index.page>
- Human Resource Services Division:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/hrsd/index.page>
- Internal Audit
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/ia/index.page>

- Juvenile Court Programs
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/cpsd/index.page>
- Legal Counsel Division:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/legal/index.page>
- Office of Education, Training and Outreach:
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/oeto/index.page>
- Security and Emergency Preparedness Office (SEPO)
<http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/OSCA/sepo/index.page>

Information on the divisions and the offices is available by clicking on the respective link and opening up a page on the OJD Web Portal.

4.1.2.2 Programs

OJD has a number of state judicial branch programs and activities to provide and improve our justice services. The Office of the State Court Administrator oversees and supports these and other programs. Information on programs is available at <http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/programs/index.page>.

Oregon eCourt Program will implement services to the public via the internet. In order to support those services, an enterprise IAM solution will be necessary to manage public identities, their roles and services/applications, authenticate identities and provide audit functions. Please click on the following link for further information about the Oregon eCourt Program: <http://courts.oregon.gov/oregonecourt/>

4.2 IDENTITY AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT (IAM)

4.2.1 OJD Drivers or Priorities

The OJD is implementing a new statewide electronic court application system (Oregon eCourt) to replace several legacy applications. This new application will be implemented in one pilot location in spring of 2012 and then subsequently across the state over the next 4 years.

OJD would like to implement IAM functionality that will manage internal and external identities and associated authentication for current OJD applications and Oregon eCourt (Odyssey) in preparation of the Spring 2012 implementation.

OJD has several directories for managing internal users and would like to realize administrative efficiencies by moving towards a single consolidated directory over the next 4 years as the legacy applications are retired. In the interim the use of federated

services would allow OJD to transition to a single internal directory. Please see the diagram titled 4.2.3.1 Infrastructure, platforms and directories below for further details.

OJD has three external directories today that could be consolidated to one directory to lessen the impact to our public stakeholders and users during the spring of 2012 implementation of Odyssey.

Additionally, in late 2012, OJD will provide more external facing services to the public that will increase the number of identities that OJD will need to manage. Having the self service or web access management functions available will improve customer service and lower operational costs necessary to support those external customer demands.

OJD has developed an Information Security Management Plan that includes a number of security initiatives including the IAM project. The IAM project will implement security controls to mitigate and lower OJD existing security risks including capabilities to monitor access to OJD information.

4.2.2 OJD IAM Business Needs

Administrative Efficiencies (and ‘Deployment, Maintainability, Operations):

Reduce Developer and Administrator effort; thus lowering costs, increasing efficiency:

- i. Each application or service is creating its own IAM functionality; thus creating a lot of redundancy. It is more efficient to create an enterprise wide solution that each application can utilize.
- ii. The help desk is currently the user interface for the public. With the anticipated growth in public users with Oregon eCourt services, alternatives to help desk support for the public will need to be obtained. (password resets and locked accounts, user registration and deactivation – Strategi, access privileges, delegated authority, create and edit profile, request access to privileged services)
- iii. Each application or directory service requires operational resources to administer its respective IAM solution. An enterprise solution would consolidate and minimize operational costs.
- iv. Reduce the potential workload to the local courts for administering public identities.

Information Security Risks: Protect OJD data according to associated security controls (factor authentication, access controls, data classification policy).

Identity Management: Establish accountability of identities and OJD credibility

- i. Create auditability for group accounts or administrative and super user accounts
- ii. Reduce the complexity around auditing identities across all applications and platforms (access rights, usage, user activities)
- iii. Reduce over provisioning of user access to systems
- iv. Create accountability and traceability for the actions of the users of our systems

- v. One identity per user who is then accountable for his or her actions within our systems, non-deniability of identities actions.
- vi. Reduce OJD risk associated with credibility or reputation as associated with public access to court records

Delegated Authority: Allow business partners to establish working relationships between identities that are under their purview (Government agency, lawyers, collection agencies)

- i. Establish roles that have delegated authority over other roles specific to business and government partners and lawyers (firms).
- ii. Establish administration functions that allow the owner to find subordinate identities assign them roles and administer all subordinate identities.

Access Rights: Increase uniformity of user access rights – enterprise wide

- i. Eliminate the adhoc management of internal identities and access rights
- ii. Improve manageability and uniformity of user identities by their role associated with OJD (including but not limited to Employees, Vendors, Lawyers, Public, Government Agencies, Business Partners)


Customer Self Service:

- i. Increase customer service to external users .

Single Signon: Reduce confusion and complexity around the number of userids and credentials for internal staff (associated with the number of platforms and applications within OJD)

4.2.3 OJD Current State

4.2.3.1 Infrastructure, platforms and directories



4.2.3.2 Internal Identities

OJD has approximately 2000+ employees, vendors and judges who access several different applications on several platforms across 27 judicial districts.

As the diagram above indicates, there is little federation between the directories and when there is, the applications each require that the user Signon to each respective application even within the same directory.

Each platform and directory structure has different userid and password policies that have been implemented.

4.2.3.3 External Identities

OJIN online or Strategi users are public identities and represent OJD business partner constituents by about 5,000 accounts. These accounts are sharing a userid and password and once delegated authority is available to them, then the number of identities would increase. Current ratio of accounts to individuals is 3 users for every 1 account.

OJD has a web portal that is the user interface to the public and provides our internal users access to the intranet content. Public users can register for the purpose of manipulating the user interface or My Portal feature, but no court services are offered currently through the portal. The number of public identities registered within the portal is around 500+.

Appellate eFiling is the other OJD directory of OJD public identities. That group represents Oregon lawyers who are pre-registered using an interface with the Oregon Bar Association. Approximately 619+ lawyers are represented in that OJD directory. Also, several of those identities are being used as group accounts where an attorney's staff or legal firm is using the attorneys' account. Approximately 50% more identities would be needed if delegated administration was available.

4.2.4 OJD Future State


OJD future state includes an enterprise solution made up of People, Process and Technology that will provide OJD with IAM functionality to reduce information security risks, improve customer service and is efficient to administer and operate.

The following IAM function sections describe the future state and are to be addressed by the technology solution proposed.

4.2.4.1 Directory Services

OJD internal environment is comprised of three directory service platforms with each local court administering their own respective rights. The future state is a consolidation of those directories moving towards active directory as the authoritative source. OJD wants to ease the burden of a complete consolidation and wants to take advantage of federated services to trust active directory as the authoritative source. As Oregon eCourt Program implements the Odyssey product throughout the state of the next several years, the iSeries platform will be eliminated.

External directories currently provide authentication for the web portal, the appeals portal and the OJIN subscription users. These three directories can be consolidated into one of the existing LDAP directories.



1 These applications have their own separate repositories. Login will be emulated for all users.
 2 There is one instance of Odyssey, but shown twice for the purposes of this diagram because public-facing services need to point to the public repository.

4.2.4.2 Single Signon

The consolidation and federated services will aid in the ability to provide single Signon capability to the internal and external users. Internal users are currently exposed to 7 different login screens and would like the end user experience to include logging into their desktop and once authenticated, their credentials shared amongst the other applications for access. Some applications have an additional level of authentication based on the level of the data they are accessing. This additional authentication will not be included within single Signon.

Externally, users who have access to all three web applications (web portal, appeals portal and OJIN subscription) will also experience the benefits of single Signon by logging into one of the existing three applications and their credentials will be shared to the other two applications when that subsequent application is launched.

4.2.4.3 Authentication

OJD has a data classification policy that outlines four levels with associated identity standards, authentication standards, and data handling standards.

The future state will include authentication standards that range from no authentication associated with published data and extend to the highest level requiring two factor authentications for internal and external users. The second factor must include a solution that is cost effective and easy for the end user to implement. The number of end users with second factor authentication requirements will range from 3000 to 6000 users.

Internally the number of users with elevated authentication requirements will be less than 1000 end users.

For single factor authentication, the technology solution must be able to support password rules that OJD wants to implement to mitigate information security risks. Characteristics of OJD password rules contain the following:

- Password length (minimum and maximum)
- Use of special characters (exclusion and inclusion)
- Password history & reuse.
- Use of number (exclusion and inclusion)
- Password expiration dates.

4.2.4.4 Auditing

Auditing today requires that each directory and application be queried to determine a user's activities. This is very time intensive and requires several resources to accomplish.

Auditing of the future will be more efficient with reporting available to determine who has access to what applications, when they were authenticated, and what activity was performed.

All directories for the external users will be combined into one directory.


Identity standards and authentication standards will be implemented based on the level of data that is being accessed.

4.2.4.5 Authorization and Provisioning

OJD has several legacy applications and new Oregon eCourt program applications that currently provide authorization or access to data embedded in their software. It will be cost prohibitive to pull that functionality out of the applications and into the IAM enterprise solution.

The IAM solution will provide role assignment for internal and external users. Internal users will be more generic in that the roles will represent OJD staff, OJD Judges, and vendors or contractors working with OJD. Externally, the default role is public or an identity may be representative of a Lawyer, Journalist, Education Provider, State Agency representative (Oregon State Police, Oregon Dept. of Human Services, Oregon Dept. of Corrections, District Attorneys, etc), Mental Health Provider, a party to a case or a private industry stakeholder or any combination of the foregoing. This is not an inclusive list of roles, rather an example. In addition, several roles may have subordinate roles that would be administered through delegated administration; for example, law firms and their staff.

The diagram below shows that the OJD applications have responsibility for determining what authorization or access to data and services a user has based on a user's identity status (internal / external), the user's associated IAM role, and identity verification status. The applications will tell the IAM system if the user is required to authenticate using a 2nd factor of authentication.



4.2.4.6 Privileged Account Management

OJD has several group accounts that administer infrastructure hardware, solution software, or both. To reduce information security risks, OJD would like to implement controls that would allow auditability of group account activities.

4.2.4.7 Web Access Management

OJD currently manages most of the external user needs through the OJD Help Desk. Anticipated growth of public identities is 40,000 per year with a cap of 400,000 – 500,000 over a ten+ year period. This is based on the Odyssey product implemented state wide and the additional Oregon eCourt services available via the web to file pro se (non-represented) filings.

An IAM technology solution will be able to provide external users with several self service functions that are currently manual:

- Create an Identity
- Create and Manage Profile data
- Reset Password
- Request forgotten userid
- Request a Role Assignment

The IAM solution will include workflows that will help automate the processing of role verification, identity verification and role assignments.

4.2.4.8 Delegated Administration

Delegated administration is a function that is used today for internal users as the local courts administer their own identities for some directories.

The future state would include delegated administration for external user groups. With the removal of group accounts, a gap will exist where one user is conducting activities within OJD systems on behalf of another identity and there is no relationship or link that ties the identities together. OJD wants to allow some identities the ability to administer subordinate identities for the purpose of establishing relationships between identities as in the case of a lawyer and his staff and for state agency partners who employ hundreds of users who have identities doing work on behalf of their organization. These delegated authority administrators will need to have access to the IAM solution to perform several functions to assign roles to subordinate identities and to manage their access to OJD systems within pre-determined parameters.

4.2.4.9 Identity Management

IAM technology solution will automate several administrative functions that include:

- archiving of inactive identities

- restoring archived identities
- identity verification
- re-verification of identities
- audit reporting
- monitoring of suspicious activities
- statistical reporting
- helpdesk functions to resolve problems

4.2.5 OJD – Infrastructure Environment

OJD currently houses a mixture of server infrastructure; this includes an HP blade server system with 24 blade servers, around 30 physical servers and a VMware ESXi 4.1 and 5.# infrastructure virtual environment. The overall server environment was designed and configured with high availability, reliability and capacity in mind. The virtual environment currently is hosting around 80 Virtual Servers from sandbox systems all the way up to production systems. The primary ESXi infrastructure consists of 3 x Dell R900 servers, 1 x R910 server and 4 x R810 servers. The environment sits on top of a Dell EMC SAN and Dell Compellent SAN that is fiber connected to a Brocade fabric. The ETSD server team closely monitors the environment to ensure stability while maintaining capacity for growth and fail over.

SECTION 5 - PROJECT SCOPE, MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS, DESIRABLE FEATURES

5.1 GENERAL PROJECT SCOPE


OJD is soliciting Proposals from firms qualified to provide an IAM Software solution, and the professional Services necessary to deploy that solution within OJD environment configured for OJD’s business requirements.

OJD’s intent is to acquire the knowledge and hands on experience to operate, maintain, and enhance the implemented solution. To this end, professional Services will include training, consulting and documentation to fulfill this intent.

5.1.1 OJD Project Approach

The diagram below describes the IAM project with several phases that will be executed to implement all the IAM functionality described in the future state section above. Currently, the broad scope planning portion of the project is coming to conclusion.

NOTE: As a result of this RFP, OJD intends to award a Contract for Phase 1 and 2 of the IAM Project. OJD intends to use the knowledge and skills acquired as a result of Phase 1 and Phase 2 to implement Phase 3 of the IAM Project.



Outlined in the following sections is an overview of the IAM phases:

IAM Phase 1 - Directory Management and Internal Stakeholders

The emphasis of the first phase is to implement IAM functionality affecting internal users prior to implementing IAM functionality affecting external identities. Included in this phase is the:

- Delivery, installation and configuration of the IAM technology Software and any third party products necessary to federate the internal directories
- Internal directories federated to active directory
- Single Signon implemented
- Authentication (2 factor)

IAM Phase 2 - Oregon eCourt Pilot Court Implementation and External Stakeholders

The emphasis of the second phase is to provide all the IAM functionality necessary to support the Oregon eCourt pilot implementation of Yamhill County Circuit Court scheduled for June 2012. Included in this phase is the:

- Consolidation of the external directories to one of the existing directories
- Web Access Management functionality available to external identities
- Delegated Administration
- Auditing
- Authentication (2 factor)

IAM Phase 3 - Oregon eCourt future service offerings

Phase 3 will include additional services offered through Oregon eCourt program. This new functionality will be implemented by OJD personnel who have been trained to configure the IAM solution. In addition, the remaining IAM function, Privileged Account Management, will be implemented.

5.1.2 RFP Scope of Work – Phase 1

1. The acquisition and delivery of an IAM technology suite that is comprised of modules that provide for all the following functionality:
 - a. Identity Management
 - b. Federated Services
 - c. Authentication
 - d. Auditing (non-repudiation)
 - e. Web Access Management
 - f. Provisioning (Role Based Controls)
 - g. Single Sign-on
 - h. Privileged Account Management, and
 - i. Delegated Authority.

2. The installation and configuration of the vendor solution within OJD’s development infrastructure. These Services include live, in-person, hands-on, knowledge transfer training of server administrators and any documentation necessary to install and

configure the vendor solution. Vendor shall provide a test plan and execute the test plan for validating the development deployment. Vendor shall provide coaching and oversight for OJD server administrators to deploy the IAM solution within OJD's QA and Production environments.

3. The Services necessary to federate the internal directories using active directory as the authoritative source. These Services include training of server administrators and any documentation necessary to install and configure the federated services.
4. The implementation of Single Signon functionality for internal users extended to the application represented in Diagram 4.2.3.1, Infrastructure, platforms and directories. Services to include any necessary software development required to implement single Signon within those internal applications.
5. The implementation of 2 factor authentication for internal users who are accessing more restricted data. Everyone will use single factor authentication as represented by a userid/password for initial login, only when access to restricted data is launched will the application request a user to authenticate using a second factor of authentication.

5.1.3 RFP Scope of Work – Phase 2

1. The Services necessary to consolidate the external directories. These Services include training of server administrators and any documentation necessary to install and configure the consolidated directory. In addition, the Services to develop workflow processes used by external identities can assist with consolidating their multiple identities.
2. The implementation of web access management functionality for end users to perform the following functions:
 - a. Create an identity
 - b. Reset their password
 - c. Recall userid workflow
 - d. Modify their profile data
3. The Services necessary to integrate the external applications with the IAM solution to provide web access management functionality. The external applications include the appeals portal, OJD Internet/web portal and the OJIN subscription user application (currently Stragegi).
4. The services necessary to implement the IAM function; delegated administration, for our external users who have subordinate identities that they govern. These Services include training of OJD IAM administrators who will be responsible for the IAM configuration and operation of the system once implemented. OJD will be responsible for training external identities to use the system once implemented.

5. The Services necessary to implement the following administrative functions within the IAM solution:
 - a. Define data validation policies for profile and registration data (phone number all numeric using a specific format, validating email address, validating physical address).
 - b. Define roles and subordinate roles
 - c. Define rules for what role can provision other roles.
 - d. Define workflows for Role requests
 - e. Define Identity Verification process.
 - f. Define default roles
 - g. Creating and editing an identity on behalf of someone else
 - h. Creating and editing an identity profile
 - i. Reset a password on behalf of someone else
 - j. Retrieve (search) an identity based on several methods (name, userid, when created or other profile data)
 - k. Merge two identities
 - l. Inactivate an Identity
 - m. Re-activate an Identity
 - n. Delete an Identity
6. The Services necessary to implement the automatic verification of an identity based on criteria to include, but not be limited to:
 - a. Name
 - b. Address
 - c. Phone number
7. The Services necessary to educate, and transfer all necessary information for OJD staff to provide ongoing support and operations of the IAM solution.
8. The Services necessary to train OJD staff on the development of additional web services that would be used by the applications to interface with the IAM solution. This would include queries, update and addition of data to the IAM solution.
9. The Services necessary to interface with the Oregon State Bar (Bar) directory for verification of the lawyer role. This interface would be verified at authentication time to ensure that lawyer is in good standing with the Bar before being granted access to applications.
10. The Services necessary to develop audit and monitoring reports of identity activities including administrator activities.
11. The implementation of 2 factor authentication for external users who are accessing more restricted data. Everyone will use single factor authentication as represented by a userid/password for initial login, only when access to restricted data is launched

will the application request a user to authenticate using a second factor of authentication.

12. Installation and configuration of the two 2 -factor authentication alternatives. OJD may want to implement one method as a preferred and the other as an alternative based on the constraints of the alternatives. Services will include training of server administrators and any documentation necessary to sustain and operate the second factor authentication methods after implementation.

5.2 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

5.2.1 CONTRACTOR'S FIRM MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

5.2.1.1 Offeror shall possess all licenses and certifications necessary to provide the Software and Services required in this RFP, to include if applicable a current registration with Corporation Division of the Oregon Secretary of State.

5.2.1.2 Offeror shall have a minimum of five (5) years experience in successfully providing Software and Services of similar scope, size and functionality to what is identified in this RFP.

5.2.2 OFFOROR'S PROPOSED SOLUTION MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

5.2.2.1 SYSTEM SOFTWARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

5.2.2.1(a) Offeror's proposed Software shall comply with the minimum requirements identified in Appendix D – System Software Minimum Requirements.

5.2.2.2 INSTALLATION AND CONFIGURATION SERVICES MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

5.2.2.2 (a) Offeror's proposed installation, configuration, and training Services shall be provided on site at OJD Enterprise Technology Services Division at 525 Trade Street, Salem, OR 97301.

5.2.2.2 (b) Offeror's proposed solution shall be deployed no later than May 1, 2012.

5.2.2.3 MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

5.2.2.3 (a) Offeror's proposed solution shall include support documentation for administrative and configuration functions (backup and restore).

5.2.2.3 (b) Offeror's proposed solution shall include OJD specific installation and configuration documentation for QA and Production environment.

5.3 OFFEROR'S PROPOSED SYSTEM SOFTWARE DESIRABLE FEATURES

5.3.1 It is desired Offeror's proposed system Software include the features identified in Appendix E – System Software Desirable Features.

5.4 OJD RESPONSIBILITIES

5.4.1 OJD will be responsible for all reasonable site preparation activities necessary for placement of the new solution.

SECTION 6 PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENTS

6.1 Proposals shall provide a concise description of Offeror's ability to satisfy the requirements of the RFP with emphasis on completeness and clarity of the content. To be considered responsive, the Offer must substantially comply with all requirements of the RFP. In making such evaluation, OJD may waive minor informalities and irregularities.

Pages should be numbered consecutively and a set of tabs inserted to identify the following sections of the Proposal:

- Cover Letter
- Response Checklist
- Offeror Information Sheet
- Response to Minimum Requirements
- Response to Desirable Features
- Understanding of the Project
- Methodology
- Management Plan
- Staffing Plan and Experience
- Proposed Solution Hardware Specifications
- Customer References
- Cost Proposal (in separate envelope)
- Additional Information Necessary for Evaluation (if any)
- Joint Venture/Partnership Information

All binders and any required information such as reference materials, manuals and other documents should be clearly labeled or otherwise identified and referenced in a clear and consistent manner throughout the Proposal. In a joint effort to save costs, reduce waste and produce energy savings, Offerors are encouraged to use standard 8-1/2" x 11" paper with 2-hole (top) fasteners and recyclable binders only when use of binders is indicated. Offerors are highly encouraged to refrain from using 3-ring binders, spiral bindings and other non-recyclable binders and presentation folders in submitting their Proposals.

Note: Failure by an Offeror to submit any of the components identified above may result in its Proposal being declared non-responsive.

6.2 EXPLANATION OF SECTIONS

6.2.1 COVER LETTER: Each Proposal shall contain a cover letter on Offeror's letterhead summarizing Offeror's proposed solution to include project approach, application features and functions, system architecture, interfaces, system administration, training, and maintenance - including any conclusions and recommendations. In addition, the cover letter shall include the following statements:

6.2.1.1 A statement indicating whether Offeror is a Resident Offeror or Non-Resident Offeror. If Offeror is a Non-Resident Offeror, Offeror shall provide their state of residency.

6.2.1.2 A statement that no attempt has been made or will be made by Offeror to induce any other person or firm to submit or not submit a Proposal in response to this RFP.

6.2.1.3 A statement that the Proposal constitutes a firm offer and shall remain valid for a minimum of one hundred twenty (120) days after the Closing or until a Contract is executed, whichever comes first.

6.2.1.4 A statement that Offeror agrees to be bound by all terms and conditions in the document attached as Appendix A - Sample Contract or as permissibly negotiated as may be, if at all, set forth elsewhere in this RFP.

6.2.1.5 A statement that Offeror will not, in awarding a subcontract, discriminate against a subcontractor who is certified under ORS 200.055 as a member of a minority group, as a woman, or as an emerging small business.

6.2.1.6 A signature in ink by an authorized representative of Offeror's firm. Offeror's signature and submission of a Proposal constitutes Offeror's affirmation that:

6.2.1.6 (a) Offeror has completely read and understands all the provisions of the RFP.

6.2.1.6 (b) The Proposal submitted is in response to the specific language contained in the RFP, and Offeror has made no assumptions based upon either (a) verbal or written statements not contained in the RFP, or (b) any previously-issued RFP.

6.2.1.6 (c) The Proposal was prepared independently from all other Offerors, and without collusion, fraud, or other dishonesty.

6.2.1.6 (d) OJD shall not be liable for any claims or be subject to any defenses asserted by Offeror based upon, resulting from, or related to, Offeror's failure to comprehend all requirements of the RFP.

6.2.1.6 (e) OJD shall not be liable for any expenses incurred by Offeror in either preparing and submitting its Proposal or in participating in the Proposal evaluation, selection or Contract negotiation process, if any.

6.2.2 RESPONSE CHECKLIST: Offeror shall provide a completed Appendix C - Response Checklist.

6.2.3 OFFEROR INFORMATION SHEET: Offeror shall provide a completed Offeror Information Sheet.

6.2.4 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS: Offeror shall respond to each minimum requirement in Section 5.2 with all information necessary to substantiate (support with factual evidence) their compliance.

Offeror's response to each minimum requirement shall be presented below a restatement of the minimum requirement in question.

6.2.5 DESIRABLE FEATURES: Offeror shall complete Appendix E – System Software Desirable Features in accordance with the instructions included in that appendix.

6.2.6 UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT: Offerors shall provide comprehensive narrative statements that illustrate their understanding of the requirements of the RFP.

6.2.7 METHODOLOGY: Offeror shall provide comprehensive narrative statements that set out the methodology that it intends to employ and illustrate how the methodology will serve to accomplish the Services and meet the project schedule. The methodology section of the Proposal should include information about the philosophy, methods, and procedures proposed to complete this project. This section should demonstrate that the Offeror has the resources and methodological expertise necessary to accomplish the Services, meet the project schedule and meet the requirements of the RFP. Included in Offeror's methodology statements shall be a detailed explanation of its security policies.

6.2.8 MANAGEMENT PLAN: Offeror shall provide comprehensive narrative statements that set out the management plan it intends to follow and illustrate how the management plan will serve to accomplish the Services. The management plan section of the Proposal should demonstrate that the Offeror has a plan to manage the resources outlined in the methodology section. The management plan serves to ensure that Services will be delivered in accordance with the resulting Contract.

6.2.9 STAFFING PLAN AND EXPERIENCE: Offerors shall provide an organizational chart specific to the personnel assigned to accomplish the work called for in this RFP (including subcontractors); illustrate the lines of authority; designate the individual responsible and accountable for the completion of the Services identified in this RFP.

Offerors must provide a narrative description of the organization of their project team consisting of management personnel, supervisors and team leads. Offeror shall also provide a personnel roster that identifies each person who will actually work on the Contract and provide the following information about each person listed:

Title
Resume
Location(s) where work will be performed
Estimated number of hours for each individual named above

Included in Offeror's response to the staffing plan and experience section shall be comprehensive narrative statements that illustrated the experience Offeror's firm has in provide Software and Services similar in scope and size to what is described in this RFP.

6.2.10 PROPOSED SOLUTION HARDWARE SPECIFICATIONS AND THIRD PARTY SOFTWARE: Offeror shall provide the optimal hardware specifications, broken out by module, necessary to support its proposed solution in a production environment. In addition, Offeror shall provide a listing of all necessary third party software necessary to support its proposed solution. Any required hardware and third party software will be purchased by OJD through contracts separate from any contract awarded as a result of this RFP. OJD reserves the right to purchase any required hardware and third party software through a State of Oregon statewide price agreement if available.

6.2.11 CUSTOMER REFERENCES: Offerors shall provide firm names, contact names, contact telephone numbers, contact fax numbers, and contact email addresses for four (4) references from current and former customers. These references should be able to provide meaningful and detailed support of Offeror's ability to comply with the requirements of this RFP. No more than one reference will be accepted from any one company. **OJD reserves the right to investigate any and all customer references, whether or not furnished by Offeror.**

6.2.12 COST PROPOSAL: Offeror shall provide its proposed cost for the Software and Services described in Section 5 above on the Excel spreadsheet attached as Appendix B - Cost Proposal in accordance with Section 3.4.2.2.

NOTE: OJD will identify the total cost for the hardware specifications and third party software proposed in response to Section 6.2.10 above and include that total cost in the overall total cost of ownership for evaluation purposes only.

6.2.13 OFFEROR'S PROPOSED AGREEMENT FORMS RELATIVE TO THIS RFP: Offeror shall provide with its Proposal proposed Supplemental Agreements forms (software license, software maintenance and support, service level relative to this RFP) as set forth in Section 3.18.3.

6.2.14 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NECESSARY FOR EVALUATION:

Offeror shall include all additional information and documentation necessary to aid in evaluation of the Proposal.

6.2.15 JOINT VENTURES/PARTNERSHIP INFORMATION: Partnerships and joint ventures shall supply, with Proposal submission, the name of the contact person for the partnership or joint venture. Prior to award, joint ventures and partnerships submitting Proposals shall provide a copy of the joint venture agreement or agreement evidencing authority to submit a Proposal and to enter into the resulting Contract to be awarded, together with corporate resolutions (if applicable) evidencing corporate authority to participate as a joint venture or partner. A contact person must also be designated for purposes of receiving all notices and communications under the Contract. All partners and joint ventures will be required to sign the Contract awarded.

SECTION 7 EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

7.1 EVALUATION COMMITTEE: A selection committee comprised of employees from OJD, and if deemed necessary by the SPC, other qualified representatives from the public and private sectors, will evaluate Proposals in accordance with the criteria outlined in this section. A summary of the evaluation process is as follows:

7.2 STAGE I – PROPOSAL INITIAL SCREENING:

In Stage I, Offeror’s Proposal components described in Section 6.2.1 – Section 6.2.4 will be evaluated: 1) for completeness, 2) to determine whether it is a Responsive Proposal submitted by a Responsible Offeror in accordance with Section 3.11 above, and 3) to determine whether Offeror and proposed solution meet the minimum requirements identified in Section 5.2 above.

In this stage Proposals will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. Proposals that fail any component in Phase I evaluation may be declared non-responsive and withheld from further evaluation.

NOTE: In accordance with Section 3.17.1, OJD reserves the right at its sole discretion to establish a Competitive Range of all Offerors who have made a good faith effort in submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP for the purpose of correcting deficiencies in Proposals for determining responsiveness during Stage 1.

7.3 STAGE II – PROPOSAL EVALUATION:

The committee will review, analyze, score, and rank all Proposals passing Stage I evaluation in accordance with the following criteria and process:

7.3.1 System Software Desirable Features (Total Available Points = 250)

Offeror’s response to Section 6.2.5 will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

- 1) To what degree does Offeror’s proposed system Software meet OJD’s desirable features “out of the box”?
- 2) To what degree does Offeror’s response to the questions identified serve to support OJD’s goals and objectives identified in the RFP?

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 250 = \text{Points Awarded}$

7.3.2 Understanding of the Project (Total Available Points = 100) Offeror's response to Section 6.2.6 will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

- 1) How well has the Offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the Services identified in this RFP?
- 2) How well has the Offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the Services identified in this RFP?
- 3) To what degree has the Offeror demonstrated an understanding of the Services the OJD expects it to provide?
- 4) How well has the Offeror demonstrated an understanding of the OJD's time schedule and can meet it?

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 100 = \text{Points Awarded}$

7.3.3 Methodology (Total Available Points = 150)

Offeror's response to Section 6.2.7 will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

- 1) How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?
- 2) How well does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?
- 3) How well does Offeror demonstrate they have the resources and methodological expertise necessary to accomplish the Services identified in the RFP?

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 150 = \text{Points Awarded}$$

7.3.4 Management Plan (Total Available Points = 150)

Offeror's response to Section 6.2.8 will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

- 1) How well does the management plan support all of the RFP requirements and logically lead to the successful delivery of the Services identified in the RFP?
- 2) How well is accountability completely and clearly defined?
- 3) To what degree is the organization of the project team clear?
- 4) How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?
- 5) To what extent does the Offeror already have the resources, including but not limited to: hardware, software, expertise and equipment, necessary to perform the Services identified in the RFP?
- 6) To what degree has the Offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?
- 7) To what degree is the Proposal practical and feasible?
- 8) To what extent has the Offeror identified potential problems?

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 150 = \text{Points Awarded}$$

7.3.5 Staffing Plan and Experience (Total Available Points = 250)

Offeror's response to Section 6.2.9 will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

Questions regarding the personnel:

- 1) To what degree do the individuals assigned to perform the Services have experience providing similar Services?
- 2) To what degree are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the Services identified in the RFP requires?
- 3) How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to perform the Services?

Questions regarding the firm:

- 1) How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar Services within the timeframes identified in the requirements of the RFP?
- 2) How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of similar Services?
- 3) If a subcontractor will perform work on the Contract, how well does the subcontractor measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 250 = \text{Points Awarded}$

7.3.6 Proposed Solution Hardware Specifications and Third Party Software (Total Available Points = 200)

Offeror's response to Section 6.2.10 will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

- 1) To what degree does Offeror's proposed solution hardware specifications demonstrate an economical approach to meeting OJD's goals and objective identified in this RFP?

- 2) To what degree do Offeror’s proposed solution hardware specifications support use of a virtual environment?
- 3) To what degree does Offeror’s proposed third party software demonstrate an economical approach to meeting OJD’s goals and objective identified in this RFP?

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 200 = \text{Points Awarded}$

7.3.7 Customer References (Total Available Points = 100)

References provided by Offeror in response to Section 6.2.11 shall be evaluated against the following:

Each reference contacted will be asked the same questions regarding Services provided by Offeror including but not limited to:

- (1) How successful was contractor at providing quality Services?;
- (2) If contractor encountered problems, did contractor contact customer in a timely manner to solicit input regarding solutions?;
- (3) How responsive was contractor to reported problems?;
- (4) To what degree did contractor provide a high level of customer service in performance of the contract?;
- (5) How well did contractor meet the terms and conditions of the of the agreement?; and

For the questions listed above, 5 points will be awarded for a response of “very satisfied”; 4 points will be awarded for a response of “satisfied”; 3 points for “adequate”, 2 points for “marginal”, and no points for anything less. Five questions times 5 points possible for each question equals a maximum of 25 points per reference with a maximum of 100 points for each Offeror.

The Proposal with the highest average score for this criterion will receive the maximum point allotted. The scores of the remaining Proposals for this criterion will be adjusted in accordance with the formula identified below:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Score of the Proposal to be Converted}}{\text{Highest Scored Proposal}} \right) \times 100 = \text{Pricing Points Awarded}$$

7.3.8 Pricing (Total Available Points = 200)

Offerors shall submit their proposed pricing on the form attached as Appendix B - Cost Proposal.

Cost Proposals will be evaluated utilizing the following formula:

Lowest Cost Proposal receives the maximum points allotted for cost.

All other Cost Proposals received will be converted to points by using the following formula:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Cost Proposal to be Converted}} \right) \times 200 = \text{Pricing Points Awarded}$$

7.3.9 TOTAL EVALUATION POINTS: A summary of the total points allotted for each of the aforementioned categories is as follows:

Category	Maximum Possible Points
System Software Desirable Features	250
Understanding of the Project	100
Methodology	150
Management Plan	150
Staffing Plan and Experience	250
Proposed Solution Hardware Specifications and Third Party Software	200
Customer References	100
<u>Pricing</u>	<u>200</u>
Total	1400

7.3.10 DEMONSTRATIONS/PRESENTATION/INTERVIEWS: OJD, at its sole discretion, may choose to establish a competitive range in accordance with Section 3.17, or award to the highest ranking Offeror based on the initial evaluation. OJD may elect to conduct and score presentations, demonstrations or interviews with those Offerors in the Competitive Range. In this case, OJD will post via Addendum to the RFP the procedures and points that will be used.