

REQUEST FOR OFFER (RFO)
11-409.00-004

**APPLIANCE PROGRAM DATABASE MODERNIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY
REPORT**

Date: October 25, 2011

You are invited to respond to this California Multiple Award Schedule (CMAS) Request for Offer (RFO) to write a Feasibility Study Report (FSR) and Information Technology Procurement Plan (ITPP) for a project to modernize and enhance the system currently used by the California Energy Commission's Appliance Efficiency Program. The services required are described in the following Scope of Work (SOW). By submitting an offer, your firm agrees to the terms and conditions stated in this RFO and your proposed CMAS contract. Selection will be based on best value using the criteria listed in this document.

Please read this document carefully. The RFO response including supporting documents, if any, as well as one (1) copy of the complete CMAS contract including the associated price list is due **at 12 noon, Tuesday, November 15, 2011**. Offer may be submitted electronically as long as it is smaller than 5 MB by the due date (and time) to Lhoffman@energy.state.ca.us. If the response is mailed (including but not limited to U. S. Postal Service or overnight services) or hand delivered it must include one original and three copies as well as one (1) copy of the complete CMAS contract including the associated price list and be received by **12 noon, Tuesday, November 15, 2011**. Any questions regarding this RFO should be directed to Ms. Hoffman.

Linda Hoffman
1516 9th Street, MS-7
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
(916) 651-6179
Lhoffman@energy.state.ca.us

Table 1 provides the Key Dates concerning activities related to this RFO.

Table 1: Key RFO Dates

Release of RFO	Tuesday, October 25, 2011
Questions Due	Tuesday, November 1, 2011, 12 noon
State Responses to Questions	Thursday, November 3, 2011, 4 p.m.
RFO Response Due Date	Tuesday, November 15, 2011, 12 noon
Anticipated Contract Award	Thursday, December 15, 2011

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	3
APPLIANCE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM BACKGROUND	3
PROJECT INFORMATION	4
RFO RESPONSES	5
SELECTION CRITERIA	6
SCOPE OF WORK.....	8
ATTACHMENT A: REFERENCE FORM.....	14

OVERVIEW

The California Energy Commission (Energy Commission) is responsible for collecting and managing data from manufacturers of consumer appliances and making it available to the public in a manner that allows them to make informed energy efficient purchasing choices. To do so, the Appliance Efficiency Program uses a database system and website that have been developed and modified over the years. Part of the current operation involves manual processes.

The purpose of this contract is to evaluate the current operations and develop a FSR to recommend a plan that improves the existing operations and accommodates a list of new requirements. The final FSR must adhere to the State's SIMM standards for format and content, etc. If the approved recommendations result in another contract to build the system, the winning FSR Contractor will not be eligible to participate in that contract or work effort.

Pursuant to GC 19130 (b) (3): The services contracted are not available within civil service, cannot be performed satisfactorily by civil service employees, or are of such a highly specialized or technical nature that the necessary expert knowledge, experience, and ability are not available through the civil service system.

- The maximum amount of this contract is \$200,000.**
- The start date is estimated to be January 4, 2012.**
- The work requested under this contract must be completed by June 30, 2012.**

APPLIANCE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Energy Commission's *Appliance Efficiency Regulations* were established in 1976 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. These regulations, including requirements for manufacturer submittal of model specific data, first took effect in late 1977, and have been updated more than two dozen times since the initial adoption (most recently in 2008).

The Energy Commission's Appliance Efficiency Database currently contains data on more than 50 appliance types, comprising data on roughly 300,000 active models and more than 1,300,000 historical models. This database is constructed entirely from data submitted to the Energy Commission by manufacturers of regulated appliances. As the number of regulated appliances has grown, and as more companies have entered the market to satisfy the needs of California's growing population, the number of data transactions and submittals, applications for approval as a test laboratory or third party certifier, and requests for data by enforcement agencies have grown dramatically.

The Energy Commission is required in its regulations to respond to these requests within 30 calendar days. Meeting this obligation at current staff levels is becoming a

challenge. While the Appliance Efficiency Program has moved toward greater use of electronic communications, there still is a reliance on printed forms and hard-copy materials and no way to interact directly with either external databases or data submitters.

The Appliance Efficiency Program currently relies on email exchanges with these parties and on scanned electronic copies of the forms specified and required in Title 20, Sections 1601 - 1608 of the California Code of Regulations accompanied by Excel-based data files matching an import template supplied by the Energy Commission. This process results in needing to maintain:

- A hand-written paper log file recording when data submittals were received and if/when they have been responded to
- A database of over 1,500,000 listings of appliances (of over 60 separate categories) and their associated efficiency data in Microsoft SQL Server 2000
- A database recording approved test laboratories and third-party certifiers in Microsoft Access 2007
- A collection of files recording submitted manufacturer contact information in Microsoft Excel 2003
- Two separate web-based interfaces, for staff and public use respectively, and associated tools developed in Visual Basic, AJAX, Java, and other languages

PROJECT INFORMATION

High-level Business Requirements to incorporate in the recommended solution include:

- Allow electronic data submittals of files from appliance manufacturers that has data validation and correction as part of the process.
- Improve the system's ability to import newer formats of files.
- Automate the internal manual process of receiving, logging and tracking of a variety of process-related materials.
- Provide the capability for the system to communicate with other industry and Federal appliance-related databases, including engaging in some automated transactions.
- Design a comprehensive data system to allow for data mining.
- Integrate all the separate systems that manage appliance certification data and related materials.

- Provide gateways for consumers to find appliances that are eligible for rebates, for manufacturers to submit and update their data and for staff to carry out administrative tasks.

Technical recommendations must be in line with the Energy Commission's Information Technology Services Branch (ITSB) Development and Environment Standards which are Microsoft-based and include SQL Server and .NET framework.

The FSR and ITPP must:

- Meet all requirements of the State Administrative Manual ([SAM](#)) relating to FSRs, including those found in Sections 4819.35, 4927, and 4928
- Meet all the requirements of the Statewide Information Management Manual ([SIMM](#)) relating to FSRs, including sections 5, 10, 17, and 20
- Describe implementation of a system, as discussed above, in sufficient depth and detail to be used as the basis of a subsequent contract for development and implementation
- Describe which of the Six Strategic Concepts in the [2011 Statewide IT Capital Plan](#) would be met by this solution and how they would be met
- Describe how pursuing the described enterprise solution carries out the mission and vision of the [2011 California Information Technology Strategic Plan](#)
- Use the DGS Procurement Division's ITPP Template (a link to the template can be found in the [State Contracting Manual, volume 3](#), Chapter 2, page 46)

For more details about the work to be done and the deliverables, please see the Scope of Work section of this document.

RFO RESPONSES

Responses to this RFO must include a complete copy of the CMAS contract, including the price list the response is based on, and must be received no later than 12:00 (noon) PST on November 15, 2011. To expedite this process clarification questions must be submitted no later than 12:00 (noon) PST on November 1, 2011. Responses to the questions will be sent by 4 p.m. PST on November 3, 2011.

Responses must include resumes of the Consultant(s) and three (3) references for each. Please use forms in Attachment A. Interviews and reference checks will be at the discretion of the Energy Commission. To clarify terminology, the Contractor is the responding firm or company, while the Consultant is any specific individual who will perform the work. If the Consultant is also the Contractor, the Consultant's references may also be used as the Contractor references.

SELECTION CRITERIA

The following chart lists how received offers will be compared:

	Item	Section Total	Individual Item
1	Completeness	Pass/Fail	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers received as required; date/time <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor References (3) <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant References (3) <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant Resumes <input type="checkbox"/> CMAS Contract and price list <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant classifications and hourly rates		Responses must "Pass" to be eligible for further evaluation
2	Experience		
	COMPANY EXPERIENCE (Qualitative)	25	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Company Curriculum Vitae – brief profile of the company's past successful projects similar to this RFO. Please include work projects you were involved in that were of similar type, size/scope, and complexity. An ideal response should show a history of at least three years, and most recent project should be within the past two years.		15
	<input type="checkbox"/> Example of completed Feasibility Study Report (e.g., overall organization, grammar, presentation, meets California Technology Agency requirements)		5
	<input type="checkbox"/> Example of completed Information Technology Procurement Plan (e.g., overall organization, grammar, meets DGS requirements and follows their template)		5
	INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE	35	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience in designing/evaluating data management systems (two points per year of experience, to a maximum of ten points)		10
	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience in designing/evaluating business processes (two points per year of experience, to a maximum of ten points)		10
	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience in writing FSRs (two points per year of experience, to a maximum of ten points)		10
	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience in writing ITPPs (one point per year of experience, to a maximum of five points)		5

3	Quality of Proposal Response	20	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Content of proposal response (completeness of the response in addressing the RFO, clear understanding of the work being solicited)		15
	<input type="checkbox"/> Technical quality of proposal response (e.g., overall organization, grammar, presentation, professionalism, clear ability to communicate)		5
4	Cost	10	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost – See Cost Evaluation below		10
5	References	10	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation of calls - References will only be checked and scored for responders whose non-reference scores are within 10 points of the highest score, or are the highest score.		10

Cost Evaluation

It is anticipated that all offers will come in at or near the total of \$200,000.00; the cost evaluation will be based on Consultant's hourly rates. If the offer includes more than one Consultant, the cost evaluation will be based on the Consultants' average hourly rates.

Cost evaluation will be based as follows:

$\frac{\text{Lowest Received Offer}}{\text{Contractor's Offer}} \times \text{Maximum Cost Score} = \text{Cost Score}$

Resource	Contractor #1	Contractor #2	Contractor #3
Contractor Offer	\$175,000	\$185,000	\$200,000
	$\frac{175K}{175K} \times 10 = 10$	$\frac{175K}{185K} \times 10 = 9.5$	$\frac{175K}{200K} \times 10 = 8.8$

SCOPE OF WORK

Task Number	Description
1	Status Reports & Meetings
2	Project Plan – Initial and Updates
3	Information Gathering Meetings
4	Prepare Draft Feasibility Study Report
5	Prepare Draft Information Technology Procurement Plan
6	Prepare Final FSR, ITPP and Final Materials
---	Estimated Schedule and Deadlines

Task 1 - Status Reports & Meetings

Description

The Contractor will provide regular scheduled status reports in a format as agreed upon by the Contract Manager and the Contractor.

The Status Reports, as a whole, are expected to succinctly record the narrative of the project workflow including current status on the overall progress of the effort in terms of percentage of milestones completed, a list of issues or risks and mitigation steps as well as contract administration items including budget and invoice questions.

The Contractor will also conduct face-to-face administrative meetings onsite with the Contractor Manager at least once per calendar month to discuss contract administration and project progress, unless the Contractor requests and receives approval via email from the Contract Manager to do so according to a different schedule.

In addition to the above, two specific meetings are required to be organized and attended by the Contractor:

1. The Contractor will coordinate with the Contract Manager to set up an initial kick-off meeting at the beginning of the project. The goal of this meeting will be to establish communication and consensus between the Contractor and the Energy Commission staff involved in this project (Appliance Efficiency Program, Web Team, ITSB).
2. The Contractor will also set up a concluding meeting to discuss all final materials and to otherwise debrief staff on any outstanding issues or questions relating to the final version of the FSR. The Contractor will be expected to give an in-person presentation to Energy Commission regarding the Final FSR as a part of the debriefing. These deliverables are described below (see Task 6).

Finally, invoices will be considered a deliverable under this contract. Complete and accurate invoices covering all work performed by the Contractor must be received in a timely manner.

Deliverables

- Status reports
- Monthly face-to-face meetings
- Kickoff and concluding meetings, as specified
- Invoices

Acceptance Criteria

By its nature, Task 1 cannot be considered complete until all reports are received, meetings are conducted, and all other contract work is considered completed. The meetings and reports under this task will be considered complete and acceptable as each is received or completed and found to be sufficient for completing the work of the contract.

Task 2 – Project Plan – Initial and Updates

Description

For overall management of the FSR effort, the Contractor will create and maintain a MS Project file format project plan. It should provide a list of tasks, the timeframe for each, the dependencies among them and the resources needed which should include those from the Energy Commission (e.g., meeting time with Appliance Efficiency Program staff). The project plan will also be used as a communication tool to let Energy Commission staff be aware of activities that involve them. Updates should be provided along with the Status Reports in Task 1 to the Contract Manager via email in an agreed to file format.

Along with the project plan, the Contractor will provide a short narrative describing the status of tasks, notably any deviations and risks. The narrative is intended as an additional communication tool to enhance the monitoring of both progress and potential problems and to better ensure a successful outcome.

Deliverables

- Initial project plan that lists project tasks and illustrates timelines and dependencies
- Updated project plans and narrative which are due in an agreed to manner

Acceptance Criteria

The project plans and narratives will be considered acceptable by the Contract Manager if they are delivered on a timely basis and contain the requested information.

Task 3 – Information Gathering

Description

The Contractor will conduct meetings with Energy Commission staff to gather information about the project. This includes meeting with the Appliance Efficiency Program (Office) to learn about existing processes and systems to be able to formulate a recommendation and with ITSB to understand the technical requirements of any solution. The timing of the meetings will be determined by the approved project plan the Contractor develops and will take place prior to beginning work on the later Tasks.

Meetings should take place onsite to best understand operations, in particular manual processes. If warranted, web conferencing meetings can be conducted to remotely view and discuss topics that do not have to be covered in person. In addition, the Contractor will be expected to acquire relevant information from other available resources such as information published online by the Energy Commission.

The Contractor will be expected to compile this information into an outline document describing the Energy Commission's current business and process requirements. This report will establish a common understanding of the business needs of the Energy Commission, and will provide a basis for the discussion of options and approaches in the Draft FSR.

Deliverables

- Attendance of onsite and remote meetings as agreed upon and as determined by the project plan's tasks
- A draft summary report (two to three pages) of the information gathered about the Energy Commission's current operations and its business, IT, and process requirements
- A final summary report that incorporates feedback from the Energy Commission

Acceptance Criteria

This Task will be considered complete and acceptable when the Contract Manager and the Contractor have agreed that the contents of the summary report accurately describe the process needs of the Energy Commission.

Task 4 – Prepare Draft Feasibility Study Report

Description

The Draft FSR will propose a comprehensive approach to improve the Appliance Efficiency Program's operations in line with current operations and new business requirements.

The Draft FSR will need to meet all requirements of the State Administrative Manual relating to FSRs, including those found in Sections [4819.35](#), [4927](#), and [4928](#) of the Manual. Further, the Draft FSR must describe which of the Six Strategic Concepts in the [2011 Statewide IT Capital Plan](#) would be met by this project and how they would be met, and also describe how the project carries out the mission and vision of the [2011 California Information Technology Strategic Plan](#).

Deliverables

- Draft Feasibility Study Report based on the completed report in Task 3

Acceptance Criteria

This Task will be considered complete and acceptable when all involved staff, the Contractor and the Contract Manager agree that the elements of a FSR are appropriately covered.

Task 5 – Prepare Draft Information Technology Procurement Plan

Description

The ITPP is a stand-alone document that provides information to assess a project's readiness for procurement. The ITPP describes the overall strategy necessary to accomplish and manage an IT acquisition by formally documenting the proposed approach and how the acquisition satisfies State requirements.

Deliverables:

- A Draft ITPP for procurement related to the proposed recommendation in the Draft FSR. (Please see Chapter 2 of the State Contracting Manual (SCM), Volume 3 (Information Technology) at: <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/pd/Resources/publications/SCM3.aspx> and the DGS/PD ITPP Template at: <http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/pd/poliproc/itpp2006template.doc>)

Acceptance Criteria

This Task will be considered complete and acceptable when the Contractor, Contract Manager and IT Procurement Staff agree that the elements of the ITPP are appropriately covered.

Task 6 – Prepare Final FSR, ITPP and Final Materials

Description

This Task is a compilation of both the final FSR along with all other items that are to be delivered to the Energy Commission at the conclusion of the project.

Final Documents - The Energy Commission will, after approving the Draft FSR and Draft ITPP, review and compile feedback for the Contractor on these draft documents. The Contractor will integrate these comments with the Draft documents to produce completed final documents.

Final Invoice – The Energy Commission will only review the final invoice once all prior invoices are received and considered acceptable per Task 1. If any issues are identified in the prior invoices, review and correction of these invoices will be required to take place and corrected invoices submitted prior to or alongside the final invoice.

Deliverables

- Final Feasibility Study Report – The Final FSR will be an updated copy of the Draft FSR that incorporates all comments delivered to the Contractor after Energy Commission staff have reviewed the Draft FSR
- Final ITPP - The Final ITPP will be an updated copy of the Draft ITPP that incorporates all comments delivered to the Contractor after Energy Commission staff have reviewed the Draft ITPP, and will reflect the contents of the Final FSR
- Final Invoice

Acceptance Criteria

This task will be considered complete and acceptable when staff are satisfied with the final state of all deliverables. This means:

- The Final Feasibility Study Report must be a complete and comprehensive FSR incorporating all feedback received from staff review of the Draft FSR, and of a level of quality acceptable to the California Energy Commission.
- The Final Information Technology Procurement Plan must be a complete and comprehensive ITPP incorporating all feedback received from staff review of the Draft ITPP and reflecting the Final FSR, of a level of quality acceptable to the California Energy Commission.
- The Final Invoice will be considered acceptable when the Energy Commission determines that the invoices for this contract accurately account for all work performed on the contract without any internal inconsistencies, discrepancies, or unbilled periods. Any inconsistencies or omissions present in any invoices must be corrected before this deliverable will be considered acceptable.

Estimated Schedule and Deadlines

Kickoff Meeting: Within three weeks of award of purchase order
Estimated Date: No later than **January 6, 2012**.

Delivery of Initial Project Plan: Within one week following the Kickoff Meeting
Estimated Date: **January 13, 2012**.

Delivery of Draft Summary Report: Within three weeks of approval of initial project plan
Estimated Date: **February 9, 2012**

Delivery of Final Summary Report: Within one week of Contractor's receipt of Draft Summary Report comments
Estimated Date: **February 21, 2012**.

Delivery of Draft FSR & ITPP: Within six weeks of approval of Final Summary Report
Estimated Date: **April 2, 2012.**

Delivery of Final FSR & ITPP: Within three weeks of Contractor's receipt of Draft FSR
comments
Estimated Date: **April 30, 2012**

ATTACHMENT A: REFERENCE FORM

Please complete three (3) reference forms for the Contractor and each Consultant.

REFERENCE #		
1. Contractor or Consultant Info		
Name:	Primary Contact Phone Number:	
Reference is for: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant <input type="checkbox"/> Both (if same)		
2. Client info		
Client Name:	Contact Name:	
Address:	Contact Phone :	
3. Project/ Work info		
Name of Project:	Dates Served on Project (from/to):	
Project Description:		
Contractor or Consultant Involvement on the Project:		
Deliverables Prepared By Contractor or Consultant:		
4. Project Measurements and Results		
Original estimated hours on project:	Actual hours on project:	
	YES	NO
Was the project or contract terminated prior to successful conclusion? If "yes," please explain the reason.		
Were your work products reviewed and approved by any agency outside the client? If "yes", please list the approving agencies.		