



Seattle City Light

COMPLEXITIES OF IT SOFTWARE PROCUREMENT & DELIVERY

Mike Little and Patrick Campbell

Customer Energy Solutions (CES)

October 16, 2018

TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- Procurement from a business unit's perspective
- Our experience leading up to Accelerated RFP
- Our experience on two recent IT Software Projects:
Demand Side Management and Building Analytics
 - Scoping/RFI
 - Evaluations
 - Pre-Award Clarification
 - Project Assurance



ABOUT CUSTOMER ENERGY SOLUTIONS (CES)

- A division in Customer Care, Communications, and Regulatory Affairs Business Unit
- Primary responsibility: save electrical energy
- Growing responsibility: Electric Vehicles & Small-Scale Renewables
- 80 employees
- Annual budget: \$55 million
- Incentive budget: \$25 million
- Consultant budget: ~\$5 million



A BUSINESS UNIT'S PERSPECTIVE

- Need consultants to support and supplement our staff.
- RFP/RFQ primary method for securing services.
- Support for:
 - Technical support for planning, implementation, and evaluation
 - Marketing & communication
 - Software design & implementation



A BUSINESS UNIT'S PERSPECTIVE

- What is a “worst case” scenario?
 - Scope, proposal format, level of proposal details, and evaluation criteria are misaligned, or are in conflict
 - Proposals prepared by sales/marketing
 - Evaluators overwhelmed with material and struggle to find relevant details to make a decision
 - Forge ahead and establish contract
 - Project has potential to go sideways



A BUSINESS UNIT'S PERSPECTIVE

- Several lessons learned from similar experiences:
 - Work diligently to define evaluation criteria and scope in parallel
 - Involve others to craft the evaluation criteria
 - Share evaluation criteria in RFP
 - Think about how to require proposals to:
 - be aligned with **your** evaluation criteria
 - provide information at appropriate level of detail
 - in a format that translates to your evaluation criteria



SAMPLE EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING

Seattle City Light Proposal Scoring Sheet

Your Name:

Proposal:

Firm Name:

Date:

Area of Service:

On Call Technical Services (RFQ
#16197)

Scoring Legend

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| 1 | weak |
| 2 | needs improvement |
| 3 | good |
| 4 | outstanding |
| 5 | exceptional |

INSTRUCTIONS: Score the proposal by giving the appropriate number of points (see Scoring Legend above) for each of the criteria below. For finalists, adjust the number of points for each criteria as more information becomes available (reference checks and the interview.)

Overall qualifications and experience of the firm

Firm qualifications, resources, and electric utilities experience
Team qualifications, education, and professional affiliations
Sample of work products
Project management skills
Local focus (Northwest, Washington, Puget Sound, Seattle)

POINTS

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

WEIGHT

| |
|------------|
| 10% |
| 10% |
| 20% |
| 5% |
| 5% |
| 50% |

Overall Quality of Proposal

Quality of the proposal
Completeness and clarity of proposal

Sub Total

| |
|-----|
| |
| |
| 0.0 |

| |
|------------|
| 10% |
| 10% |
| 20% |

Overall approach and strategy

Creative approach to overall strategy

Sub Total

| | |
|--|-----|
| | |
| | 0.0 |

| |
|------------|
| 20% |
| 20% |



WRAP UP: OUR PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

- Use a more deliberate alignment of scope, proposals, and evaluation criteria.
- Limit the number of pages in a proposal.
- Ask for proposals that you can evaluate.
- Do not accept any marketing materials.
- Move towards evaluating the Consultant Project Manager role as part of the overall delivery of a scope.



TWO RECENT IT SOFTWARE PROCUREMENTS

- **Demand Side Management (DSM)**
 - A single platform to: manage customer and program information; store documents; expedite business workflow; and implement tracking/reporting tools.
 - Used primarily by CES Division
- **Building Analytics (BA)**
 - A single database to house building-related data within the service territory.
 - Used across the entire utility and potentially other City Departments



SCOPING FOR 2 COMPLEX IT PROJECTS

PART #3 – CURRENT CONDITIONS

Preparing a 'perfect' scope of work about the current conditions or environment. This information can be just a known conditions (as reasonably possible).

1. CRITICAL DATA:

- What critical data do you have a picture of your current environment service expectations. Third number of stakeholders, v

There are 80 current users no active stakeholders b

- Our project tracking critical source of data database.
- Another source of data projects is the Conse 15,000 project record in October 2016 but accessed.
- Our final tracking system myriad of excel spreads current focus of the multifamily buildings 2,100 records
- The attached Excel c for data and where t



Our project tracking database, and the main r about 14,000 project spe half of CES—utilize this d extracting information fo

Another source of data f is the Conservation Acq records and is linked to c but is currently the only

We house our residential in a series of Excel spread house information for the Neighborhoods program

Critical data

- Cu
- Co
- Pr
- Me
- Pr
- Ke

CES as a di roughly ha system. O our entire benchmark processing would help

- What critica vendors?

- We lack or in CES.
- His bill th
- Ra
- Bu
- Int
- Ext
- Po
- De
- Te

Additional slice and d project, bu meaningfu

2. BACKGROUND

- Provide a su

The busin process wa various tra

3. CONSTRAINTS:

- Identify any current constraint
 - One of the most pressing c with other systems. It rema and what level of access v CCB/MDM for billing inform
- Is there anything that is di challenging for vendors)?
 - Unlikely.
- Are there any future or relate
 - Yes. There are several upco that would ideally be connec AMI data infrastructure soo will also be procuring a utili and pull data from to create

Within CES, we are releasin Analytics system, and we wa

Finally, the City will be cond City Departments. While we this future system, City Light customer experience strateg tracking system.

4. "DAY IN THE LIFE OF..." [OPTIONAL]

- Provide a brief "Day in the Life"
 - Typically recommend encouraged.

Energy Advisor (EA): As an interested in our incentive p that will best meet their ne the DSM system when answ potential program offerings. populate a project lead que all basic customer and proje envisioned scope for the pos the system to the appropriat data to for analysis purpose what attributes might be pr

Energy Management Analy or more of CES' programs. I efficiently process their ince the commercial/industrial sp our billing system.

PART #4 – DESIRED OUTCOMES

1.) PROJECT/SERVICE GOALS:

- Identify the major goals, expected outcomes, and key performance indicators.
 - A-1 Replace the current suite tracking solutions with a SoS (COTS) system that provides architecture and lessens IT offerings.
 - A-2 Provide a holistic view of tracking and reporting the b
 - A-3 Streamline and automa Division, lowering the overh productivity, decreasing ave effectiveness.
 - A-4 Perform data analysis of investment of programs/car
 - A-5 Deliver recurring reports ad-hoc analysis.
 - A-6 Organize and store prog with state auditor requirem documentation.
 - A-7 Streamline program and meaningful information tha
 - A-8 Establish strict version c measures; track version hist
 - A-9 Establish a flexible and new and unique program w
 - A-10 Eliminate redundant d accurate data collection.
 - A-11 Provide secure service City Light's enterprise system accounting system.
 - A-12 Capabilities to offer se start a project, submit proje
- What must the project/service achieve?
 - Project scope and objectives

PART #5 – SCOPE OF WORK

1.) DETAILED LIST OF REQUIREMENTS:

- Provide all of is the base ca
 - DSM Require 20170711

- Describe each scope of work
 - Fully functi production into the ne
 - Test enviro
 - User Accep
 - Historical p
 - Vendor sup

- What are the to meet the g
 - See manda
- Are you prov
 - Specific
 - No add
- Provide all re
 - See manda

2.) SPECIAL/UNIQUE REQUIREMENTS:

- Identify any projects that other project
 - Program m messages.
- Are there any
 - Possible co or finance
- Is there anyt
 - This system

PART #6 – PROJECT RISKS

1.) POTENTIAL RISKS TO THE PROJECT:

- Identify any items that may cause the project to not meet expectations.
- Identify the main concerns that you have.
- Identify any outcomes/approaches/issues you want to be 100% sure we can avoid.

(Include any potential items that are beyond the current control of the Owner, Vendor, or Design Professional; and any risks that are otherwise unforeseen/undefinable/unknowable at this time)

- Seattle IT resources and stage gate processes/support.
- CES Resources and adoption.
- Vendor Contracting and availability.
- Potential integration with third-party systems.
- Migration of multiple data sources.
- New billing system and IT staff availability for integration.
- Additional functionality/requirements surfacing during implementation.
- Software is not easily able to integrate with existing City and City Light architecture
- Failure to provide ongoing maintenance and support, and upgrades that meet future needs
-
-



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) PROCESS

- Released the Draft SOWs to the vendor community
 - July 14, 2017
- Information Session for interested vendors
 - July 20, 2017
- Received vendor responses
 - Aug 1, 2017



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) PROCESS

Key feedback we wanted from the vendors:

- Is our SOW achievable and realistic (as drafted)?
- What information should be added to enable vendors to provide an accurate proposal?
- Are there other options, innovations, or technology updates missing from our SOW?
- What can City Light begin working on now to be ready for implementation?

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) PROCESS

- **Building Analytics**

- 6 vendor responses
- 27 pages of content beyond the original RFI

- **Demand Side Management**

- 13 vendor responses
- 67 pages of vendor feedback on draft SOW



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) PROCESS

SECTION 4: Request for Information RESPONSE FORM

Please respond to the questions in Section 3. You are encouraged to be open & candid in your responses.

1. Is the Scope (as drafted in Appendix A) achievable? Please provide feedback if the Scope is realistic or not, or what changes you would recommend and why?
(1-page maximum – please indicate Yes/No to the questions).

| | | AEG | Aiqueous | ANB | EnergySavvy | ESG | Nexant |
|---|---|-----|----------|--|-------------|-----|--------|
| B | The draft Scope of Work provided in APPENDIX A is clear for Software Vendors to prepare an accurate proposal with minimal cost contingency. | Yes | No | Yes. The draft scope of work is quite clear. The number and types of programs with program manuals would be helpful additional information. | Yes | No | No |
| C | The description of City Light's existing/current systems, documents, templates, and procedures is clear. | No | No | Yes. The information is well written and sufficient. | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| D | The roles and responsibilities of the selected Software Vendor are clear regarding the initial discovery and implementation phases of the project. | Yes | Yes | Yes. The information is clear | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| E | City Light is planning to interview the following individuals during the RFP Evaluation stage. The intent is to interview the key personnel from each Software Vendor's project team that would be assigned to work with City Light | No | No | Yes. However, in small organizations like ours the same individual will have multiple roles. | No | Yes | Yes |

2. What information should be included in the final Scope of Work to enable your firm to submit an accurate proposal (with minimal uncertainty and contingency included in the cost)?

Please be as specific as possible. You are encouraged to provide a bullet point list of information requested. City Light intends to fulfill as many of these requests as is possible.









(2-pages maximum)

- List of reports and dashboards, with examples of each (if not available, provide examples of current reports that the solution will be responsible for replacing with systematized reports and dashboards). If no examples are available, provide a short description of each report in the list.
- List of programs to be implemented in the solution, what external implementers run them if they are outsourced, and/or whether they are run in-house. If reported programs are different from marketed programs, please provide mapping on how this works (for example, regulators may require C/I programs to be reported under "C/I Prescriptive" and "C/I Custom", but the programs are actually tracked and marketed as "C/I Large Prescriptive", "C/I Small Prescriptive", "C/I Retro Commissioning", "C/I Performance Lighting", "C/I SBDI", etc.)
- Provide Program documentation including program manuals, copy of latest TRM, workflow diagrams, application forms, measure lists and calculations, etc.
- Integration diagrams or descriptions: What systems will be integrated with the solution, what data is required to be passed, and in which direction will the data flow, for each system. Describe use cases for the integration (for example "CC&B account data will flow into the solution so that applications will auto-validate account number and pre-fill customer contacts data".)
- Interval meter data: is there a requirement to store interval meter read data? If so, for what program participants, customers, and period?
- Historic Data: What time period of historic data will be imported into the system? What programs will be included in the historic data? What programs have data that is consistent across the historic period vs what programs have data elements that changed over the historic period? Is it acceptable to have aggregated historic data for any component of the historic load?
- Key milestone dates: Contract Start Date; Contract Period, in years; Anticipated system go-live date; Phases and associated dates, if the implementation will be phased.
- If the solution is being implemented during the transition from one program biennial to the next, what date will final program requirements, measure calculations, etc. be available.

NOTE: Integration with the new SCL Account System due to go live 1/2/18 is the largest risk for delivery of this solution. It is imperative that vendors understand when the Accounting System will be implemented to the point where detailed solution requirements can be documented; when SCL IT resources become freed up enough to dedicate a percentage of their time to the integration project; and when the Accounting System will be ready to produce and accept data integration test files.



EVALUATIONS

| Evaluation Criteria | Weight | Blind? | Committee Score | Numerical Score |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|---|---|
| Pricing Response | 15 | No | |  |
| Inclusion Plan | 10 | No |  | |
| Execution Methodology | 5 | YES |  | |
| Risk Assessment | 15 | YES |  | |
| Value Assessment | 10 | YES |  | |
| Past Performance Surveys | 05 | YES | |  |
| Functional Tech. Req. | - | No | | |
| Project Team | - | No | | |
| List of Subcontractors | - | No | | |
| Interviews | 20 | No |  | |
| Software Verifications | 20 | No |  | |



EVALUATION OVERVIEW

- Proposals
 - Distilled memos – 8 pages in total
 - Simple high, medium, low scoring
 - Look for the best *team*
 - Onus on vendors to distinguish themselves
 - Forces vendors to forgo the marketing angle
- Interviews
 - Meet with actual team we will work with
 - Great insight from non-sales team



EVALUATION OVERVIEW, CONT.

- Demonstrations
 - Software treated like another team member
 - Scripted demo, ideally run by an actual user of the system rather than the company itself
 - Made for a more honest portrayal of software operation
- Overall Take:
 - Refreshingly straightforward
 - Yet, also challenging; mental adjustment to finally click
 - Remember this mantra: you're looking for the best team



EVALUATION HIGHLIGHTS

- Lucid approach to grading proposals; no room for fluff or chicanery from vendors
- Ability to evaluate the actual team you'll be working with was a huge boon
 - E.g., conversed with a system architect who provided genuine insight into technical specifics
- Far faster and more effective than other technical RFPs I've participated in



PRE-AWARD CLARIFICATION

- One-to-two month period to work with vendor prior to signing contract clarifying scope and objectives
- Clarification document is the cornerstone for tracking all activities and outcomes
- Ultimate intent: Reduce risk and uncertainty of project
- Critical to ensure alignment between the vendor and client-side project teams
- Clarification summary meeting ties everything together



PRE-AWARD CLARIFICATION

• Example of the clarification process in action:

Scope Clarifications (what's in vs. what's out)

During Pre-Award Clarification, the intent is to have a clear understanding of all assumptions contained within Carahsoft's proposal. City Light and City IT request a transparent review of major assumptions and description of items that Carahsoft considers to be "in vs. out" of the scope.

- Storing electronic documents. Detail on how this is in scope and what the details are and cost. Types of docs, amount of storage, location, permissions, access, and retention. Based upon the licenses provided for the proposal, the SCL/CES database would have 1.62 GB of data storage (i.e., data stored in records) and 162 GB in file storage (i.e., attachments of all types - images, PDFs, Microsoft Office docs).
- Licenses. What is the process for this? End User licenses to Single-Function licenses, what are the differences for these and how many are included? To be provided in a separate license glossary.
- Plugin/integration with Adobe Sign. Is this incorporated in the scope? Implementation of the Adobe Sign connector (see <https://appexchange.salesforce.com/appxListingDetail?listingId=a0N300000016ZmCEAU>) is in scope for the project, because it is free with an Enterprise Level Adobe Sign package. Carahsoft has not included pricing for the Enterprise-Level Adobe Sign package.
- ESRI's ArcGIS platform. Can this be incorporated for some users since this was in the value assessment however not in the scope of RFP? ArcGIS online can be integrated with Salesforce.com via the MapAnything and MapAnything Connector for ArcGIS Salesforce apps. Carahsoft did not include the cost of these applications and the labor required to configure them with the SCL / CES Salesforce.com instance. Pricing can be obtained from Carahsoft based on the number of CES users who want access to the ArcGIS platform, with a labor estimate for configuration.
- How much does the ongoing technical support cost? Is this in scope of the licenses we purchase? What type of license? What type of support, web, phone, in-person? Are there different costs for these aspects listed: Quarterly mandatory system improvements and upgrades, 3rd party native App patches and updates, custom one-off report and/or dashboard creation, troubleshooting assistance, etc.? The annual technical support cost is included in the Hosted Software Costs supplied by Carahsoft. All items identified in the above list are included assuming no more than 400 hours per year in support.
- What kind of training documentation is in scope? In-person training, training manuals, and standard operating procedure (SOP) guides are included in Scope.
- What content does Carahsoft intend to cover in a training document/resource? User interface and architecture, "how to" perform activities, tasks, and workflows associated with specific roles, understanding dashboards, and using plug-ins. Specific third-party application training will be provided to the CES Administrators.
- CES Communication plan. What is included in a communication plan for the total CES Division regarding this project as it is taking place? Types of communication, quantity, Q&A references...? Defined in greater detail in revised Execution Methodology narrative.

Execution Methodology

During Pre-Award Clarification, the intent is to expand upon the Execution Methodology section of the proposal to describe the major project phases, activities, and deliverables from contract award to "Go Live" (along with anticipated timelines and sequencing).

- Do we need to modify our schedule? There was concern that we might need more time up front for the requirements gathering. Yes, to be discussed on July 11th Execution Methodology Call.
- In the interviews you mentioned that the system will allow us to improve our processes rather than replicate existing inefficient processes. What do we need to provide now to ensure we have this process improvement work included in the scope? Do we need to identify where we hope to improve processes, or will that be embedded in the process? This will be part of the requirements gathering process. 'Current' swim-lane diagrams and 'Future-state' will be mapped out (by program). One SCL/CES Action Item is to provide a "CES Program Portfolio Inventory" listing programs, staff (e.g., manager, process manager, other staff, and third parties involved), as well as process maps.
- At what point do we need to determine the number of trade ally users for the licensing and training? If we underestimate, how is adding users handled? During the pre award clarification. Trade Ally licensing pricing will be set from the outset. Additional training/re-training for new programs/trade allies that are not defined in the original scope would incur additional costs.
- At what point do we need to identify what custom workflows we will need? This will be part of requirements gathering, but likely implemented in the last phase of the project.
- With the waterfall-sprint process plan, how do you envision the programs/workflows to be phased? Do you prioritize small, easy processes first, or largest ones that impact the most programs? Large/complex then Small/simple processes
- During Configuration stage how much training will CES Admins get to learn how to independently buildout dashboards, reports, comm emails, and workflows? This will happen during UAT, but there is also training via Salesforce Trailhead if users want additional training materials. Getting users familiar with basic functionality before taking on more complex tasks is how we typically approach user on-boarding.
- Will training references for new staff members be created for CES for onboarding? What if members are unable to attend a hands-on training, what training will be provided to them? Yes, training will also be recorded.
- Expand upon testing and the UAT plan - what is the plan to ensure the system effectively fits into workflows that users will need? The UAT process will be built based upon testing out specific program workflows and functions that were built from input provided by program staff. Participants will have specific scripts. We have built in time to make revisions based upon feedback.
- Describe anticipated schedule roughly assuming contract award in August. See updated schedule on SmartSheets and revised Execution Methodology narrative.

PRE-AWARD CLARIFICATION

- Example of the clarification process in action:

| Completed Action Items - | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|---------|--|----------|------------|----------|
| VENDOR | | | | | | |
| Assigned To | Status | At Risk | Task Name | Duration | Start Date | End Date |
| | | | Carahsoft Action Items | | | |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Guidance document on license types, costs, and uses | 10d | 07/06/18 | 07/19/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Description of who is on the team and where they're located and their role | 5d | 07/06/18 | 07/12/18 |
| | In Progress | 🚩 | Description of actual time onsite | 10d | 07/06/18 | 07/19/18 |
| | Not Started | 🚩 | Discovery process checklist for CES to prepare for kickoff meetings | 5d | 08/13/18 | 08/17/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Estimate of data storage based upon proposed user count | 5d | 07/06/18 | 07/12/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Add discussions from kickoff meeting into the Execution Methodology narrative | 5d | 07/06/18 | 07/12/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Clarify / specify the number of training sessions and timing | 5d | 07/06/18 | 07/12/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Schedule / provide Lunch & Learn on document management app and retention mgt (DocuVault Spri | 10d | 07/11/18 | 07/24/18 |
| | In Progress | 🚩 | Provide rate card for additional development labor | 5d | 07/11/18 | 07/17/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Provide SLA documentation in Execution Methodology | 5d | 07/11/18 | 07/17/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Identify desirable features that will and will not come along with the Mandatory Requirements | 10d | 07/11/18 | 07/24/18 |
| | Not Started | 🚩 | Schedule Einstein Analytics Lunch & Learn | 10d | 09/10/18 | 09/21/18 |
| | Not Started | 🚩 | Provide information on how / whether Constant Contact can integrate with Salesforce or Campaigns | 10d | 09/10/18 | 09/21/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Provide Master Services Agreement and End User License Agreement | 1d | 07/13/18 | 07/13/18 |
| | Complete | 🚩 | Revise Implementation Plan and explicitly identify SCL deliverables in Execution Methodology | 5d | 08/13/18 | 08/17/18 |



PRE-AWARD CLARIFICATION

- Example of the clarification process in action:

| Completed Action Items - SCL | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------|---|----------|------------|----------|
| Assigned To | Status | At Risk | Task Name | Duration | Start Date | End Date |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | CES Action Items | | | |
| | Complete | | Send Data Architecture - Column headings / sample rows for CITS, CATS, the Excel Jungle | 6d | 07/06/18 | 07/13/18 |
| | Complete | | Send Data Architecture - Documentation (e.g., network diagrams) created by consultant on CITS, CA | 6d | 07/06/18 | 07/13/18 |
| | Complete | | Send Data Architecture - Documentation on CCB data extracts | 6d | 07/06/18 | 07/13/18 |
| | Complete | | Send CES Program Portfolio Inventory (include supplemental info to help prioritize - \$\$, kWh, # of an | 15d | 07/06/18 | 07/26/18 |
| | Complete | | Develop SCL user count and high level description of user functionality | 12d | 07/06/18 | 07/23/18 |
| | Not Started | | Set up two "hot desks" for Carahsoft team member presence | 21d | 07/06/18 | 08/03/18 |
| | Complete | | Set up C&I measure calculator meeting | 6d | 07/06/18 | 07/13/18 |
| | Complete | | Set up BA/DSM integration meeting & "user stories" or use cases for the potential integration | 9d | 07/06/18 | 07/18/18 |
| | Complete | | Set up IT integration meeting - data QA/QC, Security (at rest / in transit), Active Directory | 6d | 07/06/18 | 07/13/18 |
| | In Progress | | Schedule change management call with Sadie Bronk and SCL | | | |
| | Complete | | Build out several program workflows and associate with portfolio inventory | | | |
| | Not Started | | Review and provide feedback on revised implementation plan plus proposed SCL deliverables | 3d | 08/27/18 | 08/29/18 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |



PRE-AWARD CLARIFICATION IMPRESSIONS

- DSM:
 - Helped us identify numerous shortcomings and open questions in our RFP that the vendor had
 - Enabled us to adjust scope and budget appropriately prior to signing contract, resulting in far fewer surprises midway through implementation
- Building Analytics:
 - We actually cancelled the Building Analytics project after several weeks of conversation with vendor
 - Helped SCL avoid committing too many resources to a project that was not panning out as initially conceived



PROJECT ASSURANCE

- City Light & the City of Seattle recognizes the importance of unbiased, accurate, and real-time metrics for project control.
- CES worked with Seattle IT's Project Quality Manager to develop a Project Assurance requirement for the BA and DSM projects.



LESSONS LEARNED

- Took some adjustment for members of evaluation and vendor teams to understand the intent of the process
- Overall, a very positive experience that results in lower risk and less time commitment from evaluation team
- Ensure contracting starts at the same time as pre-award to avoid delays