

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -**  
**TPSGC**  
**11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier**  
**Place du Portage, Phase III**  
**Core 0A1/Noyau 0A1**  
**Gatineau**  
**Québec**  
**K1A 0S5**  
**Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776**

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT**  
**MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**  
**Raison sociale et adresse du**  
**fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Informatics Professional Services - EL  
Division/Services professionnels en informatique -  
division EL  
4C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Informatics Professional Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 24062-130163/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 24062-130163	<b>Date</b> 2014-02-10
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$EL-633-26822	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 633el.24062-130163	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2014-03-03</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Mentor, Michel	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 633el
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-0230 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

## SOLICITATION AMENDMENT No. 003

### RFP No. 24062-130163/A

**The following amendment 3 is raised to:**

- 1 - provide answers to questions received from potential bidders;**
- 2 - replace the Attachment B - Bid Evaluation Criteria;**
- 3 - modify Part 4, article 4.4 - Basis of selection; and,**
- 4 - replace the Appendix 2 to Annex D - Resources assessment criteria and response table.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Q1** Reference: Attachment B –Definition Guide and its impact on Corporate Project References (1.0 - M1)

- a. “Large Heterogeneous Enterprise”: An organization with multiple locations (in excess of 20) nationally or internationally, with a large workforce (in excess of 75,000 employees) involved in the provision of a diverse range of services and or products (in excess of 10).*

Since the primary service offering is to provide individual resources in the National Capital Region to support the activities of the CIOB/TBS and by extension understanding of Government of Canada Departments and Agencies requirements, this corporate references does not seem to be aligned. There are many Canadian firms that are more than capable of servicing a contract of this size, without needing to have necessarily serviced clients of the size implied by the provided definition.

Since the geographical/size element is not relevant to an organization’s ability to provide qualified resources on an as-and-when-required basis, we request that the corporate project reference requirements remove the need for “large heterogeneous enterprise”. We propose instead that they be changed to reflect the more proven method of requiring respondents to prove that they have invoiced for professional services consistent with the requirement, but not necessarily identical to the requirement. A fair basis of evaluation would be to require three contracts whose total value exceeded twice the envisioned value of requirements. Since CIOB/TBS has estimated that approximately six (6) person years per year would be required, a value of \$3 million per contract would account for double the approximate service value, and for three (3) contracts would mean a cumulative value of \$9 million. To account for peak demand, the capability to handle a larger volume is worth considering, and to demonstrate that the capability to handle a contract that is at least \$5 million in value would be a viable parameter.

We therefore request that the Corporate Requirement M1 be changed to require “three (3) contracts in the last five (5) years where the total cumulative value invoiced within the five (5) year period exceeds \$9 million in professional services, and where at least one (1) contract has an invoiced value in excess of \$5 million in professional services invoiced within that five (5) year period”, with no requirement for any of them to have been for a “Large Heterogeneous Enterprise”.

**A1** *The crown will not change the definition of large heterogeneous enterprise as the Government of Canada is a large heterogeneous organization, therefore if the bidder has a client reference from a Government of Canada department or agency it would meet the criteria.*

**Q2** Reference: Attachment B – Definition Guide and its impact on individual resource Mandatory Requirements

- a. “Large Heterogeneous Enterprise”: An organization with multiple locations (in excess of 20) nationally or internationally, with a large workforce (in excess of 75,000 employees) involved in the provision of a diverse range of services and or products (in excess of 10).*

Each Role requires at least one instance of the resource having provided services to at least one “large heterogeneous enterprise”. Aside from the Department of National Defence and Canadian Arm Forces (DND), the number of public or private organizations within Canada that meet this requirement is very few. This would mean that there is likely to a very limited resource pool of consultants that are “local to Canada” and that can satisfy this requirement. We note the “local to Canada” in particular due to the requirement that all resources must hold a valid personnel security screening at the level of SECRET as granted/approved by CISD/PWGSC. While U.S. and International resources can be cleared, the process can take years. As such, in the combinations presented, the pool of potential resources is arbitrarily limited by the requirements in a way that might eliminate even world-recognized experts in their fields simply because they have not serviced clients that meet the provided definition.

We request that the definition of “large heterogeneous enterprise” be changed for each resource role requirement such that the referenced enterprise experience only needs to have at least 10,000 employees and have an IM/IT infrastructure that supports multiple national/international locations. The stipulation on number of locations and product/service offerings should be eliminated from the definition given that it is overly constraining and would be difficult to for the Crown to substantiate.

**A2**     *See A1*

**Q3.** Please confirm that the certification required by Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria R3 (Architect Resources) can be used to satisfy the professional certification requirement for Mandatory Resource Evaluation Criteria M2 for the Business Architect, Business Transformation Architect and Enterprise Architect (Levels 2 and 3).

**A3.** *There is no professional certification requirement for Mandatory Resource Evaluation Criteria M2 for the Business Architect, Business Transformation Architect and Enterprise Architect (Levels 2 and 3).*

**Q4**     **Under 1.2 Summary (f) it states:** SA Holders that are invited to compete as a joint venture must submit a bid as that joint venture SA Holder, forming no other joint venture to bid. Any joint venture must be already qualified under the SA #EN578-055605/E as that joint venture at the time of bid closing in order to submit a bid.

**On Page 11 of 56 (e) Joint Venture Experience it states:**

Except where expressly provided otherwise, at least one member of a joint venture Bidder must meet any given mandatory requirement of this bid solicitation. Joint venture members cannot pool their abilities to satisfy any single mandatory requirement of this bid solicitation. Wherever substantiation of a mandatory requirement is required, the Bidder is requested to indicate which joint venture member satisfies the requirement. Any Bidder with questions regarding the way in which a joint venture bid will be evaluated should raise such questions through the Enquiries process as early as possible during the solicitation period.

Example: A bidder is a joint venture consisting of members X, Y and Z. If a solicitation requires: (a) that the bidder have 3 years of experience providing maintenance services, and (b) that the bidder have 2 years of experience integrating hardware with complex networks, then each of these two requirements can be met by a different member of the joint venture. However, for a single requirement, such as the requirement for 3 years of experience providing maintenance services, the bidder cannot indicate that each of members X, Y and Z has one year of experience, totaling 3 years. Such a response would be declared non-responsive.

**Question**

Can our firm form a joint venture in order to submit a proposal response? Example, Company A is qualified as a Tier 2 Supplier with 70% of the Resource Categories under the Workstreams, Company B is a qualified Tier 2 Supplier and has the remaining 30% of the Resource Categories under the Workstreams. As long as the two companies form the

joint venture and sign and date it before bid closing, and attain a PBN will this be deemed complaint?

**A4** *Based on the solicitation, Part 1, General information, article 1.2 - Summary (f), to submit a proposal as a joint venture, it must be already qualified under the SA #EN578-055605/E as that joint venture at the time of bid closing.*

**Q5.** As a company associated with a number of TBIPS SA Holders currently holding a TBIPS SA for Tier 2, I have been approached by a number of companies to participate in their proposals. Will the evaluation process allow a resource to be proposed on more than one proposal for a given resource category? Or must a resource be exclusive to one proposal only?

**A5** *One resource can be proposed on more than one proposal for a given resource category.*

**Q6** I have resources that qualify under more than one resource category. In the same proposal, can a company propose a given resource for more than one resource category?

**A6** *Yes - As stated in attachment 'B' of the solicitation, 'individual resources can be submitted for more than one Resource Category'.*

**Q7** As it pertains to R3, can the TOGAF certification be completed by the contract award date or does it have to be at the time of bid closing?

**A7** *The TOGAF certification must be completed at the time of bid closing.*

**Q8** As it pertains to R3, would DND AF, The Department of National Defense Architecture Framework Certification, which has been approved by TBS be a valid substitute to the TOGAF Certification?

**A8** *The Crown will not accept any framework other than TOGAF for R3 as the work done in this area to-date has utilized TOGAF.*

**Q9** **Page 13 of Attachment B, 4.0 Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria.** Please confirm that this form needs to be completed for all 18 Resource Categories. IE One form for each Resource Category.

If this is correct then please confirm that the Max Points for R1 is 60 for each Resource Category. IE Total Maximum Points for R1 would be 60 points x 18?

Please confirm that R2 and R3 has to be completed for 14 resource categories. If this is correct, please confirm that overall Maximum Points for R2 would be 14 X15 points, and for R3 would be 14 X 5 points.

Given that R2 and R3 applies to Architect resources only, the Maximum Available Points of 95 shown at the bottom of page 14 is incorrect. Please indicate what would be the overall total available points for the Rated resource Evaluation Criteria and how this would be calculated.

**A9** *Please refer to the revised Attachment 'B' - Bid Evaluation Criteria*

**Q10** In Appendix 2 to Annex D - Rated Requirements, p. 7 (p. 98 of 104), the "Maximum available points" are 95. R2 and R3, however, at 15 points and 5 points respectively, apply only to "Architect resources." As written, the Maximum available points for non-Architect resources are 75. Respectfully, can we assume that the point allocation is in error? Can the government clarify the point allocation?

**A10** *Please refer to the revised attached B - Bid Evaluation Criteria*

**Q11** Re: 4.0 Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria. We would like to clarify the way that we should respond. Should we be proposing one exemplary resource against each rated criteria? For example: R4; an exemplary resource from one of the three categories with three relevant projects would score 15 points. Please confirm that for point rated evaluation purposes the Crown requires one representative Architect, one representative Business Re-engineering Consultant and one representative ERP Functional Analyst in total to respond to requirements R1 and R4 and that the Architect would be rated against requirements R2 and R3. Further, please clarify how the evaluation points would be distributed and aggregated across the proposed resources to the total of 95 rated points.

**A11** *Please refer to the revised attached B - Bid Evaluation Criteria*

**Q12** This question relates to criteria within the bid related to experience with TOGAF. Would Treasury Board accept similar or equivalent frameworks (DOGAF for example)? Can the Crown clarify why only TOGAF would be considered relevant and not equivalent methodologies as the evaluation criteria surrounding this requirement may restrict an adequate number of qualified bidders from providing a compliant response?

**A12** *See A8*

**Q13** In relation to TOGAF certification, our experience has been that certain resource categories within the larger Architecture roles generally do not use TOGAF; for example, a WEB Architect or a Software / Application Architect would not necessarily be using this framework, and would also not have a TOGAF certification. Please consider revising Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria R2 and R3 to include only relevant Architect roles instead of all Architect roles in order to allow a greater number of competitive responses.

**A13** *The Crown will not change the Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria R2 and R3. The Crown's experience is that TOGAF is used and there are TOGAF certified resources in all the listed Architect categories.*

**Q14** RE: Appendix 2 to Annex D Mandatory Requirements ERP Functional Analyst Level 2 and 3, Mandatory and Rated Requirements

While the grids in this section cross-reference Section 6.3 and 6.4 of the SOW, where the title indicates SAP and PeopleSoft, none of the criteria required relates to either SAP or PeopleSoft. This means that a Functional Analyst with absolutely no experience in either PeopleSoft or SAP could be 100% compliant with all mandatory elements and score 100% on the rated by demonstrating experience with other ERP systems i.e. Epicor (Supply Chain), Microsoft Dynamics (CRM) etc. It is important to note that there is a vast difference in rates for an ERP Functional Analyst specialized in SAP or PeopleSoft as opposed to other ERP solutions. Please consider revising the criteria to ensure that it aligns with TBS's actual needs.

**A14** *Please refer to the revised attached B - Bid Evaluation Criteria*

**Q15** The RFP articulates a requirement for expertise related to, for example, application rationalization and end-user devices rationalization. Standards for some but not all applications have already been set (e.g. SAP, PeopleSoft). It would seem that there might be a conflict of interest if the successful proponent is a vendor of existing application software - e.g. a bias towards creating an architectural evolution path that serves the interest of the particular vendor. Would companies be excluded from bidding if they have a vested interest in any current or end state solution?

**A15** *No companies will not be excluded from bidding if they have a vested interest in any current or end state solution, but the Crown will expect and demand that any successful bidder must provide it with the best advice and solution to meet the Crown's requirements.*

**Q16** In the recent amendment in response to Q1, the response was:

The Crown will not consider a less restrictive definition of large heterogeneous enterprise as the Government of Canada is a large heterogeneous organization, therefore if the bidder has a client reference from a Government of Canada department or agency it would meet the criteria.

Can you please clarify that a reference from ANY Government of Canada department or agency would meet the criteria? For example if the bidder has a suitable reference from DFO (i.e. An organization that does not have 75,000 employees) would this still qualify?

**A16** *Yes, a reference from ANY Government of Canada department or agency will meet the criteria.*

**Q17** Can you please confirm that the non-Architect categories (ERP Functional Analyst Level 2 and Level 3, and Business Processing Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant Level 2 and Level 3) will be evaluated on a total score of 75 and not 95? The 20 point difference pertains to scoring that only applies to the Architect Roles (Section 4.0 Rated Resource Evaluation Criteria R2 and R3).

**A17** *Please refer to the revised attached B - Bid Evaluation Criteria*

**Q18** Can the Crown please confirm that for M1, only one of the three projects must have been for a large heterogeneous organization?

**A18** *The Crown confirms that for M1, only one of the three projects must have been for a large heterogeneous organization.*

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **AT ATTACHMENT 'B' - BID EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

**DELETE:** In its entirety

**INSERT:** The revised Attachment B (Attached)

#### **AT PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, ARTICLE 4.4 - Basis of Selection - (b)**

**DELETE:** Maximum Technical Points (170 points)

**INSERT:** Maximum Technical Points (1705 points)

#### **AT APPENDIX 2 TO ANNEX 'D' - RESOURCES ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RESPONSE TABLE:**

**DELETE:** In its entirety

**INSERT:** The revised Appendix 2 to Annex 'D' (Attached)

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**



ATTACHMENT "B"  
BID EVALUATION CRITERIA

Technical proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the following evaluation criteria (mandatory and rated requirements).

Bidders must submit resources for both levels (2 and 3) of all nine (9) Resource Categories.

Individual resources can be submitted for more than one Resource Category as listed above; e.g. bidders can submit a qualified individual resource for the Business Architect, Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant and Business Transformation Architect Resource Categories.

It is currently anticipated that the maximum number of the above listed resources that would be required at any single time throughout the life of any resultant contract would be six (6). As such, Bidders must submit as a minimum six (6) different resources that are qualified for both levels (2 and 3) of all nine (9) Resource Categories. The maximum number of different resources a bidder can submit is eighteen (18), one resource per level per Resource Category.

**Definitions Guide:**

The following definition will apply for the evaluation of proposal submitted.

Application Rationalization: Standardization and consolidation of applications in support of transformation to reduce the complexity of IT, improve services and productivity, and achieve efficiencies.

Concept, Analysis and Development Phases

Concept Phase: Defining an initiative and / or project objectives, scope, purpose, approach and deliverables to address defined requirements.

Analysis Phase: Identifying potential solutions and assessing their capability to meet defined requirements.

Development Phase: Develop and build chosen solution.

Consolidation: The merging or alignment of elements to a standard for the purposes of performing a common or related function.

End-user Devices Rationalization: Standardization and consolidation of electronic devices used by the consumers of IM / IT services within an enterprise to reduce complexity and achieve efficiencies.

Enterprise: The highest level of description of a unit of economic organization typically covering all missions and functions, i.e. a business or government organization. An enterprise can span multiple organizations.

Enterprise Architecture Governance: A formal oversight program that increases information about and visibility into IT-enabled projects for the purpose of assessing project alignment to the enterprise's architecture.

Extensively Engaged: Engaged fulltime on the project for a minimum of 9 months throughout the concept, analysis and / or development phases.

Information / Data Interoperability: The exchange of information / data in machine-readable form between two or more systems or components.

IT Modernization Projects: IT projects whose objective is increased efficiency and productivity across an enterprise through the development of strategic direction and oversight capability in relation to achieving the objectives of standardization, consolidation and reengineering within IT domains. It includes but is not limited to the development of domain-specific strategies and roadmaps to optimize IT investments and enable effective and efficient program delivery, and policy instruments to support IT strategy and service delivery.

Large Heterogeneous Enterprise: An organization with multiple locations (in excess of 20) nationally or internationally, with a large workforce (in excess of 75,000 employees) involved in the provision of a diverse range of services and or products (in excess of 10).

Reengineering: The analysis of an entity and its redesign to allow for fundamental changes on how the entity works in order to improve performance and reduce costs.

Standardization: The condition in which a standard has been established.

TOGAF: TOGAF refers to "The Open Group Architecture Framework (TOGAF)", and is defined as the methods and tools for assisting in the acceptance, production, use, and maintenance of enterprise architecture.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS**

<b>1.0 Mandatory Corporate Evaluation Criteria</b>		<b>Bidder's Response</b>		
		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met /Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	<p>The Bidder must provide information for three projects where they provided Architect (enterprise, business, information, application, technology, business transformation or WEB), ERP Functional Analyst and/or Business Process Re-engineering Consultant professional resource services for the purpose of developing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capability related to information / data interoperability, application rationalization, end-user devices rationalization, enterprise architecture governance or other IT modernization projects within heterogeneous enterprises; and / or</li> <li>2. Capability in the development of an integrated enterprise design and architecture in support of IT transformation objectives of standardization, consolidation and reengineering.</li> </ol> <p>The above listed items 1 and 2 are referred to as work-packets.</p> <p>The Bidder must have been extensively engaged on at least one of the projects within the last twenty-four (24) months.</p>			

	<p>At least one of the projects must have been for a large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>At a minimum for each project the Bidder must provide :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A detailed description of the project;</li> <li>2. The Bidders role on the project in the provision of professional resource services as it relates to the above two work-packets; and</li> <li>3. That the Bidder was extensively engaged on the project.</li> </ol>			
--	---	--	--	--



<b>2.0 Mandatory Resource Evaluation Criteria:</b>				
		<b>Bidder's Response</b>		
<b>Applications / Software Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as an Application / Software Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Application / Software Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.1 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Applications / Software Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as an Application / Software Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Application / Software Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.2 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.3 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one-hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated			

	experience as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.4 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>WEB Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a WEB Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a WEB Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.5 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>WEB Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a WEB Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a WEB Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.6 of Annex B (SOW).			
<b>IM Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as an IM Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an IM Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.7 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>IM Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated</b>	<b>Insert</b>	<b>Met/</b>



		Experience (Bidders to insert Data)	page #	Not Met
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as an IM Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an IM Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise. The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.8 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Technology Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Technology Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Technology Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise. The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.9 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Technology Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Technology Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Technology Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise. The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.10 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Business Architect, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Architect, within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large			

	heterogeneous enterprise. The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.11 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Architect, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.12 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.13 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided			



	<p>professional services as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.14 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>Business Transformation Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Business Transformation Architect, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Transformation Architect, within the last ninety six (96) months.</p>			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Transformation Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.15 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>Business Transformation Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Business Transformation Architect, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Transformation Architect, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.</p>			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Transformation Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.16 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>Enterprise Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as an Enterprise Architect,</p>			



	within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Enterprise Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.17 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>Enterprise Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Bidders to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty months (120) demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as an Enterprise Architect, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.</p>			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Enterprise Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Bidder must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.18 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			

### 3.0 Rated Corporate Evaluation Criteria

3.0 Rated Corporate Evaluation Criteria				
Rated Criteria		Maximum Points	Bidder's Response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
R1	<p>For each of the three projects listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 the Bidder must clearly demonstrate which of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in which of the project phases (concept, analysis, development) of either of the two work-packets as listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p>20 points will be awarded for each project listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where all three of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for two of the two work-packets.</li> </ol> <p>10 points will be awarded for each project listed in Corporate Criteria M1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where all three of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for one of the two work-packets.</li> <li>Where all three of the listed</li> </ol>	60 Points		

	<p>resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for two of the two work-packets.</p> <p>3. Where less than all three of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for two of the two work-packets.</p> <p>5 points will be awarded for each project listed in Corporate Criteria M1:</p> <p>1. Where less than all three of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for two of the two work-packets.</p> <p>2. Where less than all three of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for one of the two work-packets.</p> <p>3. Where all three of the listed resource types (Architect, ERP Functional Analyst, Business Process Re-engineering Consultant) were extensively engaged in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) for one of the two work-packets.</p>			
<b>R2</b>	<p>For each of the three projects listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 where the Bidder provided Architect resources, the Bidder must clearly demonstrate if and how they used the industry recognized Enterprise</p>	<b>15 Points</b>		

	<p>Architecture methodology TOGAF to achieve project objectives.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p>5 points will be awarded for each project listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1:</p> <p>1. Where the industry recognized Enterprise Architecture methodology TOGAF was utilized on the project by the provided Architect resources.</p>			
<b>Maximum available points</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved (Corporate)</b>				



#### 4.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for all seven Architect categories – Level 2

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
R1	<p>For each Architect Resources - Level 2, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points per applicable project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> </ol> <p><i>10 points per applicable project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> <li>2. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> </ol> <p><i>5 points per applicable project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> </ol> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience through extensive engagement in projects for large heterogeneous enterprises utilizing the industry recognized Enterprise Architecture methodology TOGAF. How TOGAF was used by the proposed resource to meet project objectives must be clearly demonstrated.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>R3</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 2, the proposed resource must identify if they have TOGAF certification.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>5 points will be awarded if the Resource has TOGAF certification.</i></p>	<b>5 points</b>		
<b>R4</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for each proposed Architect Resources Level 2</b>		<b>95</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>66.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

**5.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for all seven Architect categories – Level 3**

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
<b>R1</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources - Level 3, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>2. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>3. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>4. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>2. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>60 points</b>		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience through extensive engagement in projects for large heterogeneous enterprises utilizing the industry recognized Enterprise Architecture methodology TOGAF. How TOGAF was used by the proposed resource to meet project objectives must be clearly demonstrated.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>R3</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 3, the proposed resource must identify if they have TOGAF certification.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>5 points will be awarded if the Resource has TOGAF certification.</i></p>	<b>5 points</b>		
<b>R4</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for each proposed Architect Resources Level 3</b>		<b>95</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>66.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				



# **6.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2**

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
<b>R1</b>	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>3. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>5. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>6. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>3. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>60 points</b>		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for ERP Functional Analyst Level 2</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

### 7.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
R1	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>4. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>7. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>8. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>4. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for ERP Functional Analyst Level 3</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

## 8.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for Re-engineering Consultant – Level 2

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
<b>R1</b>	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 2, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>5. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>9. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>10. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>5. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		



<b>R2</b>	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for Re-engineering Consultant Level 2</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

### 9.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for Re-engineering Consultant – Level 3

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
<b>R1</b>	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 3, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>6. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>11. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>12. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>6. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for Re-engineering Consultant Level 3</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

### **TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE**

<b>Total Points achieved (Corporate (3.0)) + (Resources (4.0 + 5.0 + 6.0 + 7.0 + 8.0 + 9.0))</b>	
<b>Maximum Technical Points (Corporate (3.0)) + (Resources (4.0 + 5.0 + 6.0 + 7.0 + 8.0 + 9.0))</b>	<b>1705</b>



## APPENDIX 2 TO ANNEX D

### RESOURCES ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RESPONSE TABLE

To facilitate resource assessment, Contractors must prepare and submit a response to a draft Task Authorization using the tables provided in this Annex. When completing the resource grids, the specific information which demonstrates the requested criteria and reference to the page number of the résumé should be incorporated so that the assessor can verify this information. The tables should not contain all the project information from the resume. Only the specific answer should be provided.

#### 1.0 MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

		Supplier's Response		
Applications / Software Architect – Level 2		Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)	Insert page #	Met/ Not Met
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as an Application / Software Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Application / Software Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise. The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.1 of Annex A (SOW).			
Applications / Software Architect – Level 3		Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)	Insert page #	Met/ Not Met
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as an Application / Software Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Application / Software Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise. The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.2 of Annex A (SOW).			
ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2		Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)	Insert page #	Met/ Not Met
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a SAP and/or Peoplesoft			

	<p>ERP Functional Analyst within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.3 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one-hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a SAP and/or PeopleSoft ERP Functional Analyst within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.4 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>WEB Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a WEB Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a WEB Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.5 of Annex A (SOW).</p>			
<b>WEB Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a WEB Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months			
<b>M2</b>	<p>The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a WEB Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.</p> <p>The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.6 of Annex B (SOW).</p>			
<b>IM Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not</b>



		to insert Data)		Met
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as an IM Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an IM Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.7 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>IM Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as an IM Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an IM Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.8 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Technology Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Technology Architect within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Technology Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.9 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Technology Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Technology Architect within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Technology Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in			

	section 6.10 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Business Architect, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Architect, within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.11 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Architect, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.12 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in			



	section 6.13 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Consultant within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.14 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Transformation Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as a Business Transformation Architect, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Transformation Architect, within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Transformation Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.15 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Business Transformation Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty (120) months demonstrated experience as a Business Transformation Architect, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as a Business Transformation Architect, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as a Business Transformation Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least			

	one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.16 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Enterprise Architect – Level 2</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect, or a minimum of thirty-six (36) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as an Enterprise Architect, within the last ninety six (96) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Enterprise Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.17 of Annex A (SOW).			
<b>Enterprise Architect – Level 3</b>		<b>Demonstrated Experience (Supplier to insert Data)</b>	<b>Insert page #</b>	<b>Met/ Not Met</b>
<b>M1</b>	The proposed resource must have a minimum of one hundred and twenty months (120) demonstrated experience as an Enterprise Architect, or a minimum of sixty (60) months demonstrated experience with a recognized professional certification as an Enterprise Architect, within the last one hundred and ninety two (192) months.			
<b>M2</b>	The proposed resource must have provided professional services as an Enterprise Architect within the last thirty-six (36) months for at least one large heterogeneous enterprise.  The Supplier must demonstrate that at least 50% of the tasks have been completed, as detailed in section 6.18 of Annex A (SOW).			

## RATED REQUIREMENTS

2.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for all seven Architect categories – Level 2			
		Maximum Points	Bidder's response
			<div>Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)</div> <div>Insert Page #</div>
R1	<p>For each Architect Resources - Level 2, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> </ol> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> <li>2. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> </ol> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</li> </ol> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points	



<b>R2</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience through extensive engagement in projects for large heterogeneous enterprises utilizing the industry recognized Enterprise Architecture methodology TOGAF. How TOGAF was used by the proposed resource to meet project objectives must be clearly demonstrated.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>R3</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 2, the proposed resource must identify if they have TOGAF certification.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>5 points</i> will be awarded if the Resource has TOGAF certification.</p>	<b>5 points</b>		
<b>R4</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for each proposed Architect Resources Level 2</b>		<b>95</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>66.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				



### 3.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for all seven Architect categories – Level 3

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
R1	<p>For each Architect Resources - Level 3, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>2. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>3. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>4. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>2. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience through extensive engagement in projects for large heterogeneous enterprises utilizing the industry recognized Enterprise Architecture methodology TOGAF. How TOGAF was used by the proposed resource to meet project objectives must be clearly demonstrated.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>R3</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 3, the proposed resource must identify if they have TOGAF certification.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>5 points will be awarded if the Resource has TOGAF certification.</i></p>	<b>5 points</b>		
<b>R4</b>	<p>For each Architect Resources – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for each proposed Architect Resources Level 3</b>		<b>95</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>66.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

#### 4.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
R1	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>3. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>5. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>6. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>3. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for ERP Functional Analyst Level 2</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				



### 5.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
<b>R1</b>	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>4. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>7. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>8. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>4. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>60 points</b>		

<b>R2</b>	<p>For an ERP Functional Analyst – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points per applicable project.</i></p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for ERP Functional Analyst Level 3</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				

## 6.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for Re-engineering Consultant – Level 2

		Maximum Points	Bidder's response	
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data)	Insert Page #
R1	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 2, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>5. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>9. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>10. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>5. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points		

R2	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 2, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	15 points		
<b>Maximum available points for Re-engineering Consultant Level 2</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				



7.0 Rated Evaluation Criteria for Re-engineering Consultant – Level 3			
		Maximum Points	Bidder's response
			Demonstrated Experience (Bidder to insert data) Insert Page #
R1	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 3, the proposed resource should have demonstrated experience in the work-packets listed in Mandatory Corporate Criteria M1 through extensive engagement in the phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>20 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>6. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>10 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>11. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>12. Demonstrated experience in two of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><i>5 points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>6. Demonstrated experience in one of the two work-packets through extensive engagement in less than all three phases (concept, analysis and development) within large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	60 points	

<b>R2</b>	<p>For a Re-engineering Consultant – Level 3, the proposed resource should demonstrate experience in planning, providing content for, making presentations at and facilitating workshops for large heterogeneous enterprises.</p> <p><b>Rating Score:</b></p> <p><i>Five (5) points</i> per applicable project.</p> <p>A maximum of three (3) projects will be considered. Only the first three (3) projects listed will be considered.</p>	<b>15 points</b>		
<b>Maximum available points for Re-engineering Consultant Level 3</b>		<b>75</b>		
<b>Minimum Points Required (70%)</b>		<b>52.5</b>		
<b>Points achieved</b>				