

W. G. B. I.

AGENDA COVER MEMORANDUM

AGENDA DATE: July 27, 2005

PRESENTED TO: Board of County Commissioners

PRESENTED BY: Jennifer Inman, Management Analyst, County Administration on behalf of the Performance Measures Implementation Team

AGENDA TITLE: **IN THE MATTER OF AWARD OF BID FOR PURCHASE OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION SYSTEM SOFTWARE**

I. MOTION

MOVE TO ACCEPT BID FROM PERFORMANCESOFT FOR PURCHASE OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION SYSTEM SOFTWARE

II. ISSUE

On September 15th, 2005, the Board of Commissioners ordered [BO 4-9-15-2] that the County acquire, install, and implement performance measure data collection, tracking and reporting software. A competitive process was completed and a vendor selected. The bid must now be awarded.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Background

LCP2004-10, a Request for Proposal and Specifications for Lane County Performance Measures Information System Software was let for competitive bid on February 14th, 2005. Two vendors responded. The proposals were opened on March 21st, 2005 by IS Applications Manager, Scott Byler.

B. Analysis

An RFP evaluation committee reviewed the proposals and recommended on-site demonstrations by both vendors. Members of the Performance Measures Implementation Team (PMIT) and the evaluation committee scored the demonstrations of both vendors. Members of Lane County's Management Team also viewed the demonstrations and provided input into the selection. All scores from both the written proposal and on-site demonstration were tallied (see attachment) and considered by PMIT. Performancesoft scored higher overall on both the written proposal and on-site demonstration.

C. Alternatives/Options

1. Award bid to Performancesoft, the vendor with the highest overall scores, and proceed with performance measures implementation as planned in the Priority Strategic Objectives [BO 5-2-15-1]. Delegate authority to the County Administrator to execute a contract with Performancesoft in accordance with bid specifications.
2. Decline bid and software solution to performance measures data collection, tracking, and reporting needs at this time. Direct Performance Measures Implementation Team to alter timeline and/or develop alternatives for implementation of performance measures. This option implies a change of course from the current Strategic Plan and Priority Strategic Objectives.

D. Recommendation

PMIT recommends accepting the bid by Performancesoft for their pbviews software and proceed as planned with performance measures implementation.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION/FOLLOW-UP

Following Board action, the County will contract with Performancesoft for the purchase, implementation, and maintenance of the pbviews software. The contract will be forwarded to the County Administrator for execution.

V. ATTACHMENT

Board Order
Bid Cover Sheet
Performancesoft bid proposal
Scoring Matrix

IN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY, OREGON

ORDER 5-7-27-

) **IN THE MATTER OF AWARD OF BID**
) **FOR PURCHASE OF PERFORMANCE**
) **MEASURES INFORMATION SYSTEM**
) **SOFTWARE**
)
)
)

WHEREAS, on September 15, 2005, the Lane County Board of Commissioners ordered in BO 4-9-15-2 that Lane County acquire, install, and implement performance measure data collection, tracking and reporting software; and

WHEREAS, LCP2004-10, a Request for Proposal and Specifications for Lane County Performance Measures Information System Software was made public on February 14th, 2005 and at the duly authorized time and place on March 21, 2005, Scott Byler, Applications Manager, under authority of Lane Manual Chapter 21, opened proposals on LCP2004-10; and

WHEREAS, the highest scoring proposal and subsequent on-site demonstration was received from Performancesoft; and

WHEREAS, the Performance Measures Implementation Team recommends that the proposal be accepted; therefore it is hereby

ORDERED that the bid received from Performancesoft be accepted as recommended; and it is further

ORDERED that the County Administrator be delegated authority to execute a contract with Performancesoft in accordance with bid specifications.

Dated this 27th day of July, 2005.

Anna Morrison, Chair
Board of County Commissioners

APPROVED AS TO FORM
Date 7/13/05 lane county
Heidlen
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL

Attachment I
BID/RFP COVER SHEET

1. Project Title Performance Measures Software
Department: IS Division: Applications
2. Package Prepared: SBH x3682 2/4/05
(signature) (phone) (date)
- SBH a. Instructions SBH e. Contract Form
SBH b. Specifications SBH f. General & Spec. Conditions
SBH c. Bid Form SBH g. Performance Bond Provision
SBH d. Bid Security Provision SBH h. Other
3. Advertisement Prepared: SBH x3682 2/4/05
(signature) (phone) (date)

Name of Paper

Date(s) of Notice

a. Register Guard

b.

4. Legal Approval: J Laidlaw 3745
(signature) (phone) (date)
5. Risk Manager Approval: D Morgan 4569 2/8/05
(signature) (phone) (date)
6. Bids/Proposals Opened by: SBH 3682 3/21/05
(signature) (phone) (date)

Initial

- SBH a. Recap/Matrix Compilation Sheet Prepared and Attached
SBH b. All Bid Securities Sufficient
SBH c. All Bid Forms Complete

Remarks on Any Deviations:

7. Department Budget Review (Budgeted funds are available to fund this project.)

Budget Code \$
FO. ORG. ACCT. PGM.

Review: 1/1
(signature) (phone) (date)

8. Recommendation: 1/1
(signature) (phone) (date)

Software License

Configuration

Edition
User Licenses
Type of user (full access users)
Type of user
Type of user (read only users)

[1]

Option 1
Standard
14
Concurrent
Unlimited Read-Only Users via Internet Publishing Module
1
Yes
No
Yes
No
No
N/A
Yes
N/A
N/A
1
1

Optional Modules

Server license
Internet publishing
Audit Trail
Advanced Scheduling
Advanced Data Connectivity (includes Object Import)
Reporting Datamart
Open Database support
Advanced Authentication
Multiple Web Server support
Advanced Administration features
of Processors per Server
of Databases

License Cost

Server license
User licenses
Additional modules
Internet publishing
Advanced Scheduling
Advanced Authentication
Advanced Data Connectivity Module
SPECIAL DISCOUNT
Software License

US\$
25,000
56,000
20,000
5,000
10,000
10,000
(32,875)
93,125

Implementation Support

Implementation package
Implementation cost
SPECIAL DISCOUNT
Total implementation costs

Overview
14 days*
30,000
(23,000)
7,000

Annual Support

FIRST YEAR SUPPORT 20%
Upgrades / additional users (prorated to end of year) 20.0%
Next renewal (% of cumulative license fees purchased) 20.0%

TOTAL UPFRONT COST (Including one year support)

18,625
118,750

SECOND YEAR SUPPORT (due July 2006)
THIRD YEAR SUPPORT (due July 2007)

18,625
18,625

NOTES

- [1] Additional users may be added at this cost (plus pro-rated support cost)
[2] Please refer to the attached Product Comparison document for more information about the feature set of each Product Edition

(each)

4,000

* Includes expenses

LCP2004-10 Weighted Average Scores - Proposal Evaluations

Vendor Name	Performance	Cognos
Assigned Vendor Number	Vendor1	Vendor2
Matrix Scores Totals	516.003	452.697
Average Matrix Scores Weighted by Criterion		
Criterion 1 - Business Functionality - 30%	0.751	0.700
Criterion 2 - Technical Standards - 25%	0.616	0.541
Criterion 3 - Cost (Total Cost of Ownership) - 15%	0.379	0.311
Criterion 4 - Demonstrated Ability to Meet Commitments - 5%	0.144	0.098
Criterion 5 - Solution is Built, Installed and Proven - 15%	0.377	0.323
Criterion 6 - Technical Design Quality of Software and Hardware - 5%	0.113	0.081
Criterion 7 - Other: - 5%	0.140	0.125
Criterion Score Totals	2.519	2.178

LCP 2004-10 Demonstration - Average Scores

	Cognos	Performancesoft
Free Demo		
Ease of Use	3.08	4.04
Full Functionality	4.15	4.33
Complete Reporting	4.00	4.17
Integration	3.75	4.00
Features	4.17	4.25
I would use...	3.13	4.10
Free Demo Average	3.71	4.15
Task 1: Data Definition and Data Entry		
Step 1	5.00	5.00
Step 2	5.00	5.00
Step 3	5.00	4.00
Step 4	5.00	5.00
Step 5	5.00	5.00
Step 6	5.00	5.00
Step 7	5.00	5.00
Process Efficiency	2.90	2.94
Complete Functionality	3.80	3.88
Could Use on the job	3.00	3.43
Overall Score	3.25	3.36
Task 1 Average	4.36	4.33
Task 2: Using Data and Measures		
Step 1	5.00	5.00
Step 2	4.20	4.43
Step 3	5.00	5.00
Step 4	4.20	5.00
Step 5	4.20	5.00
Process Efficiency	3.67	4.00
Complete Functionality	3.67	3.71
Could Use on the job	3.67	4.08
Overall Score	3.25	4.00
Task 2 Average	4.09	4.47
Task 3: Reports		
Step 1	5.00	5.00
Step 2	5.00	5.00
Step 3	5.00	5.00
Step 4	5.00	4.50
Step 5	5.00	4.17
Step 6	5.00	5.00
Step 7	3.50	5.00
Process Efficiency	2.90	3.75
Complete Functionality	3.00	3.75
Could Use on the job	3.13	3.86
Overall Score	3.00	3.75
Task 3 Average	4.14	4.43
Task 4: Alters		
Step 1	5.00	4.71

LCP 2004-10 Demonstration - Average Scores

Step 2	5.00	5.00
Step 3	5.00	5.00
Step 4	5.00	5.00
Step 5	5.00	3.67
Step 6	5.00	5.00
Process Efficiency	3.40	3.88
Complete Functionality	4.25	3.69
Could Use on the job	4.25	3.86
Overall Score	3.80	3.88
Task 4 Average	4.57	4.37
Task 5: Export		
Step 1	5.00	5.00
Step 2	4.50	5.00
Process Efficiency	4.00	3.17
Complete Functionality	4.25	3.75
Could Use on the job	4.25	3.80
Overall Score	4.25	3.83
Task 5 Average	4.38	4.09
Task 6: Dashboard		
Step 1	5.00	3.00
Step 2	5.00	5.00
Step 3	5.00	5.00
Step 4	5.00	5.00
Step 5	5.00	5.00
Step 6	5.00	5.00
Step 7	4.00	5.00
Step 8	4.00	5.00
Step 9	4.00	5.00
Step 10	4.20	5.00
Process Efficiency	3.20	3.63
Complete Functionality	3.20	3.50
Could Use on the job	3.50	3.71
Overall Score	3.35	3.75
Task 6 Average	4.25	4.47
Task 7: Permissions		
Step 1	5.00	5.00
Step 2	5.00	5.00
Step 3	5.00	5.00
Step 4	5.00	5.00
Process Efficiency	3.40	3.75
Complete Functionality	3.60	4.25
Could Use on the job	3.75	3.86
Overall Score	3.60	4.00
Task 7 Average	4.29	4.48
Exercise 1: The Management User		
Process Efficiency	3.00	4.00
Complete Functionality	3.40	4.00
Could Use on the job	3.50	4.00
Overall Score	3.10	4.00
Exercise 1 Average	3.25	4.00
Exercise 2: PM Report for Budget Doc		
Process Efficiency	3.00	2.50

LCP 2004-10 Demonstration - Average Scores

Complete Functionality	3.20	2.60
Could Use on the job	3.75	2.70
Overall Score	3.20	2.80
Exercise 2 Average	3.29	2.65

Implementation Plan

Effectiveness	2.67	4.00
Efficiency	2.83	4.20
Vendor Receptiveness	3.00	4.20
I would like to use this plan	2.58	4.00
Implementation Plan Average	2.77	4.10

Technical Review

Effectiveness	4.00	3.00
Efficiency	4.00	4.00
Standards	4.00	3.00
I would like to use this technology	3.50	0.00
Technical Review Average	3.88	3.33

Overall Average

4.08 4.22