



Request for Proposals (RFP)

**Management Consulting Services
and
Financial and Performance Audits**

No. 06-80101500-J

ADDENDUM NO. 5

**Questions and Answers
RFP Amendments**

FAILURE TO FILE A PROTEST WITHIN THE TIME PRESCRIBED IN §120.57(3), FLORIDA STATUTES, OR FAILURE TO FILE A BOND OR OTHER SECURITY WITHIN THE TIME ALLOWED FOR FILING A BOND SHALL CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 120, FLORIDA STATUTES.

Any protest concerning this agency decision or intended decision must be timely filed with the Agency Clerk. Protests may be filed by courier, hand delivery, or regular mail at: Department of Management Services, Office of the General Counsel, Attention: Agency Clerk, 4050 Esplanade Way, Suite 160, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0950. Protests may also be filed by fax at 850-922- 6312, or by email at agencyclerk@dms.myflorida.com. It is the filing party's responsibility to meet all filing deadlines.

Respondents should note that, as specified by Section 5.8 of the RFP, any Proposals or portions of Proposals previously submitted to the Department in response to this solicitation may be modified and replaced by the Respondent until the deadline for the submission of Proposals indicated in the Timeline of Events (as revised).

Please Note: This Addendum No. 5 does not need to be returned with the Proposal.

Section 1:

The Department hereby amends Request for Proposals No. 06-80101500-J as noted within this Addendum. In the event of a conflict between previously released information and the information contained herein, the information herein shall control. The information included in this addendum is now made part of this solicitation.

#	Question	Answer
1.	Is there a page limit for the Resumes section?	No. Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, below.
2.	Would there be a requirement to respond to all the Service Orders issued by the State and/or the Customers?	There is no requirement to respond to all RFQs issued by a Customer.
3.	Is there going to be any negative impacts of not responding to any Service Orders?	A requesting Customer may choose not to send future RFQs to a vendor that does not respond.
4.	Can any of the T&Cs be negotiated for each Service Order issued as they are very broad under the General Contract conditions, specifically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 19. Indemnification o 20. Limitation of Liability Liquidated Damages	No. However, see Attachments C and D Section IV(f)(1), Request for Quote(s) Requirements.
5.	Is the State willing to negotiate or reconsider any of the T&Cs under the General Contract conditions, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 19. Indemnification o 20. Limitation of Liability 	No.

	Liquidated Damages	
6.	Can any of the T&Cs be negotiated or reconsidered for either the MCS Contract or the FPA contract individually?	No.
7.	Would you please clarify the difference between the scope/definition of “Program research, planning and evaluations” and “Provision of studies, analyses, scenarios, and reports relating to a Customer’s mission-oriented business programs or initiatives”?	The Department does not have any additional information to provide.
8.	With the recent clarification that service providers may respond to selective Services categories, please confirm how the Evaluation of Technical Proposals will now be handled – will there be 12 separate category specific evaluations of experience and services (versus a single evaluation of respondents across all categories) or will the evaluation be handled another way? If another way, please confirm and explain.	A single evaluation will be conducted for each Proposal.
9.	Most, if not all, of the service providers responding to this RFP hire extensively from Florida colleges and universities, and have utilized those newly hired professionals on engagements procured under these STC vehicles. The addition of the requirement of a minimum of 3 years of experience for consultants effectively excludes this important level of staffing and could negatively impact the hiring of Florida based University and College graduates (i.e. requiring more experienced hires versus graduate hires). The Florida Gubernatorial Fellows program is an excellent example of how even prospective college graduates can provide real benefits and value to the State. So would the Department consider either lowering or removing the minimum experience requirement for Junior Consultants, OR adding a fifth consulting professional category (i.e. “Entry level Consultant”) to the list of job titles?	No. This requirement is in response to requests from Customers.
10.	In regard to Offshoring, in today’s world there is a growing need to access skills that do not reside within the US – such as with cybersecurity, where the threat to the State is highest from offshore actors, and where some of the world’s most highly skilled experts and cutting edge tools reside (e.g. Israel) – so would the Department consider differentiating between wholesale offshoring of work and the selective utilization of skilled resources that reside outside the US? Or differentiating between State data being moved or accessed offshore and the ability for non-US based personnel to apply their expertise and skills to the benefit of the State?	No.
11.	If the bidder is a state government agency that is prohibited by its state constitution from agreeing to indemnification, will DMS agree to modify the contract’s indemnification language?	No.
12.	Once the State awards the contracts, will vendors be able to modify their contracts to include service areas they did not include in their proposals?	No. See Appendix B (Revised) below.
13.	The RFP indicates "...The Department reserves the right to make multiple awards per Service Category to Respondents whose total final score is within 20% of the highest total final score for that Service Category." In this context, Service Category means either Management Consulting Services (MCS) or Financial	Please see, Attachment E (Revised), and Attachment F (Revised), below.

	Performance Audits (FPA). This suggests the evaluation of proposals is no longer which ones score the highest, but rather the evaluation is on a per service area basis. Can you please describe how the State will evaluate, score, and down select vendors proposals (either in MCS or FPA) in an equitable manner if vendors are not all responding to the same service areas.	
14.	For MCS service area 12, does the State only want proposals from vendors with grants management experience with the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act grants, or would the State be open to proposals from vendors with comparable management experience in other state and federal grants?	Respondent should provide, in its Technical Proposal, information that the Respondent determines is the best representation of Respondent's experience and solution.
15.	The "Executive/management coaching" service area can be interpreted multiple ways. So that vendors can prepare solutions that can be compared equitably, can the State please provide examples of the types of work a vendor would perform within this Scope of Work per its definition of "executive/management coaching?"	The Department does not have any additional information to provide.
16.	Will the State allow vendor bids against IDIQ task orders to include subcontractors that were not part of the original IDIQ award?	Yes. Subcontractors may be added at any time using Attachment J.
17.	Are vendors required to submit Attachment C with the response? If yes, what activities are required to be performed for Attachment C?	No. Attachment C will be submitted by awarded Contractors.
18.	Please clarify why Attachment C is included in the order of precedence below, which has been extracted from the RFP document. Order of Precedence as it related to Management Consulting Services) Addenda to solicitation, if issued (in reverse order of issuance) b) Attachment A - Cost Proposal c) Attachment B - Special Contract Conditions d) Attachment C - Draft Contract - MCS e) Attachment E - Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria - MCS f) RFP and all other RFP attachments	Attachment C contains the Statement of Work, which details the services being solicited in the RFP.
19.	Vendor is not required to submit proof of LIABILITY AND INSURANCE with the response. Please confirm.	Confirmed. Proof of Liability and Insurance will be required after Contract award.
20.	Seeking confirmation, the response for the entire technical proposal should be no more than 20 pages for the Management Consulting Services RFP.	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.
21.	Seeking confirmation, the 20 pages maximum includes the technical proposal for all services areas within the Management Consulting Contract Attachment C, Section e.	See the answer to question #20.
22.	How will scoring be calibrated among firms that respond to different numbers of categories (e.g., a firm that responds to just a few categories of services versus another that responds to most or all of the categories) given the fixed page count of the proposal? Because the page count is fixed at 20 pages for all respondents, this means that firms that respond to more categories can devote fewer pages per category than firms that respond to only a few categories. The concern is this could lead to a conclusion that the firm which provided more pages of information in a given category could be perceived as having more/better services and experience to offer, when the reality may be the opposite or equal. Please confirm	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.

	how DMS will evaluate the likely scenario of some firms having greater (or less) ability to respond fully to each category due to the overall page limit restriction. Would DMS consider assigning a page limit per category (e.g., 2 pages each, with a maximum of 24 pages) to govern the relative length of proposals based upon the number of categories each vendor is proposing?	
23.	How will the technical proposal scoring of up to 55 available points for “Services” and 75 available points for “Experience” be conducted when some firms respond to only a few categories and other firms respond to many/all categories? Will firms receive average scores based upon all of the categories they respond to, or will each category be scored separately?	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award, Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.
24.	In Addendum 2, DMS revised the Evaluation Criteria for Services in Attachments E and F, but DMS did not make a corresponding change to the Evaluation Criteria for Experience. Will the Experience category be evaluated and scored based on a vendor’s experience in the particular services the vendor is offering to perform like the Evaluation Criteria for Services? If not, then what experience will be scored?	The Department will not modify the Experience portion of Attachment E (Revised) and Attachment F (Revised). The Department believes the criteria and instructions are clear.
25.	How will the evaluators score the Technical Proposal of a vendor who responds to all 12 MCS services versus a vendor who only responds to fewer than 12 MCS services?	See the answer to Question #23.
26.	Currently a vendor responding to all services must comply to the 20-page limit to speak to all services. While another vendor could utilize 20-pages to speak to fewer than all 12 services. Is DMS making any changes to the 20-page limit for vendor’s responding to all service areas?	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.
27.	Since the “Other MCS-related services as agreed upon by the Contractor and Customer.” was removed, will agencies only be able to utilize the resulting State Term Contract for the specific services in Appendix B? Other Management Consulting Services like Procurement Support, Organizational Design, etc., provided in the past, would need to be procured via RFP.	Any needed services would need to fit into one of the services listed in Appendix B.
28.	Since vendors can qualify for single service, does a vendor need to be within the top 20% of a single service or top 20% of all vendors to be eligible for award?	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award, Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.
29.	How will DMS authorize which services a vendor qualifies for, if you are not scoring by service area?	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award, Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, Appendix B (Revised), and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.
30.	How will resumes be factored into the scoring?	Evaluators will consider resumes as a component of the Technical Proposal. No specific points are assigned to resumes.
31.	What industries generally use the DMS RFP for selection of firms for auditing services?	This RFP will result in a State Term Contract which is intended for use by State of Florida agencies.
32.	Are the audits to be performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards?	Standards for each project will be determined by the requesting Customer.
33.	Section IV.(g) Department- Specific Financial Consequences.	The Department will not modify the RFP in this way.

	<p>Financial consequences will be assessed for failure to submit the reports required by the Contract. Financial consequences will be assessed on a daily basis for each individual failure until the submittal is accomplished to the satisfaction of the Department and will apply to each target period beginning with the first full month or quarter of the Contractor's performance, as applicable, and each and every month/quarter thereafter. The Department reserves the right to recoup such financial consequences by withholding payment or by requiring the Contractor to pay financial consequences via check or money order in US Dollars within thirty (30) calendar days after the required report submission date. The Department also reserves the right to implement other appropriate remedies, such as Contract termination or non-renewal, when the Contractor has failed to perform/comply with the provisions of the Contract.</p> <p>We request the State remove the penalties for missed deliverables. Liquidated damages based on deliverables are typically not in consultant contracts because many events can delay deliverables, often out of control of the consultant. In many cases, it is the client who is responsible for the delay. For example, the State must provide information to the consultant to prepare the deliverable, and that information is not available when required. Or, the State must review previous deliverables for the consultant to move forward on the project, and that review cycle is delayed by the State. Or, the State may change its requirements, which causes a deliverable to be later than contracted. These examples demonstrate why liquidated damages for meeting deliverable dates are not valid in consultant contracts.</p>	
<p>34.</p>	<p>Would the State consider the following contract changes to better align with professional service firm industry practices and professional guidelines?</p> <p>Exhibit B: General Contract Conditions 19. Indemnification</p> <p>The Contractor shall be fully liable for the wrongful actions of its agents, employees, partners, or subcontractors and shall fully indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the State and Customers, and their officers, agents, and employees, from suits, actions, damages, and costs of every name and description, including attorneys' fees, arising from or relating to personal injury and damage to real or personal tangible property alleged to be caused in whole or in part by Contractor, its agents, employees, partners, or subcontractors, provided, however, that the Contractor shall not indemnify for that portion of any loss or damages proximately caused or alleged to be caused by the negligent act or omission of the State or a Customer.</p> <p>Further, the Contractor shall fully indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the State and Customers from any suits, actions, damages, and costs of every name and</p>	<p>No.</p>

description, including attorneys' fees, arising from or relating to Contractor's violation or infringement of a trademark, copyright, patent, trade secret or intellectual property right, provided, however, that the foregoing obligation shall not apply to a Customer's misuse or modification of Contractor's products or a Customer's operation or use of Contractor's products in a manner not contemplated by the Contract or the purchase order. If any product is the subject of an infringement by Contractor suit, or in the Contractor's opinion is likely to become the subject of such a suit, the Contractor may at its sole expense procure for the Customer the right to continue using the product or to modify it to become non-infringing. If the Contractor is not reasonably able to modify or otherwise secure the Customer the right to continue using the product, the Contractor shall remove the product and refund the Customer the amounts paid in excess of a reasonable rental for past use. The customer shall not be liable for any royalties.

The Contractor's obligations under the preceding two paragraphs with respect to any legal action are contingent upon the State or Customer giving the Contractor (1) written notice of any action or threatened action, (2) the opportunity to take over and settle or defend any such action at Contractor's sole expense, and (3) assistance in defending the action at Contractor's sole expense. The Contractor shall not be liable for any cost, expense, or compromise incurred or made by the State or Customer in any legal action without the Contractor's prior written consent, which shall not be unreasonably withheld.

RFP No: 06-80101500-J
Attachment B
7.5 Indemnification

To the extent permitted by Florida law, the Contractor agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold the Customer and the State of Florida, its officers, employees, and agents harmless from all fines, claims, assessments, suits, judgments, or damages, including consequential, special, indirect, and punitive damages, including court costs and attorney's fees, arising from or relating to Contractor's violation or infringement of a trademark, copyright, patent, trade secret, or intellectual property right or out of any wrongful acts, actions, breaches, neglect, or omissions of the Contractor, its employees, agents, subcontractors, assignees, or delegates related to the Contract, as well as for any determination arising out of or related to the Contract that the Contractor or Contractor's employees, agents, subcontractors, assignees, or delegates are not independent contractors in relation to the Customer. The Contract does not constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity or consent by the Customer or the State of Florida or its subdivisions to suit by third parties. Without limiting this indemnification, the Customer shall [remove "may"] provide the Contractor (1) written notice of any action or threatened action, (2) the opportunity to take over and settle or defend any such action at Contractor's sole expense, and (3) assistance in defending the action at Contractor's sole expense.

<p>35.</p>	<p>Attachment B – Specialty Contract Conditions:</p> <p>6.7 Time is of the Essence</p> <p>Time is of the essence regarding every obligation of the Contractor under the Contract. Each obligation is deemed material, and a breach of any such obligation (including a breach resulting from untimely performance) is a material breach.</p> <p>We request that this clause be removed because we cannot commit to this clause on an IDIQ-type contract; it will depend on specific task orders to be issued.</p>	<p>The Department will not modify Section 6.7, Time is of the Essence, of Attachment B, Special Contract Conditions in this way.</p>
<p>36.</p>	<p>Attachment B – Specialty Contract Conditions:</p> <p>7.4 Performance Bond.</p> <p>Unless otherwise prohibited by law, the Department may require the Contractor to furnish, without additional cost to the Department, a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit or other form of security for the satisfactory performance of work hereunder. The Department shall determine the type and amount of security.</p> <p>Consultant contracts typically do not require performance bonds. If this requirement remains in the contract, it may limit proposals to those from very large firms and eliminate participation from many quality smaller firms</p> <p>Will the state consider removing this clause from the contract conditions?</p>	<p>No. The Department will not remove Section 7.4, Performance Bond, of Attachment B, Special Contract Conditions.</p>
<p>37.</p>	<p>Will contractors receive more points if they submit experience related to and proposed solutions for all 12 services?</p>	<p>Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award, Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.</p>
<p>38.</p>	<p>How will DMS be scoring proposals from contractors submitting on fewer than 12 services? (I.e., how can contractors achieve the full 130 points if they are submitting on less than 12 services?)</p>	<p>Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award, Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.</p>
<p>39.</p>	<p>Some firms who confine their scope to service areas that have a lower cost structure may set the benchmark for the price proposal (i.e., the lowest bid) very low. This may disadvantage those firms who propose to cover the entire scope, which may include higher-priced services. In the price proposal scoring, will DMS score differently for firms that bid across the entire spectrum of services?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>40.</p>	<p>After contract award, will awardees have the opportunity to bid on any service area or only the ones they submitted on in their proposals?</p>	<p>Awarded Contractors may only bid on projects for Services within Service Categories that they have been awarded.</p>
<p>41.</p>	<p>Attachment B - Specialty Contract Conditions:</p> <p>7.5 Indemnification.</p>	<p>No.</p>

	<p>To the extent permitted by Florida law, the Contractor agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold the Customer and the State of Florida, its officers, employees, and agents harmless from all fines, claims, assessments, suits, judgments, or damages, including consequential, special, indirect, and punitive damages, including court costs and attorney's fees, arising from or relating to violation or infringement of a trademark, copyright, patent, trade secret, or intellectual property right or out of any negligent acts, negligent actions, breaches, neglect, or omissions of the Contractor, its employees, agents, subcontractors, assignees, or delegates related to the Contract, as well as for any determination arising out of or related to the Contract that the Contractor or Contractor's employees, agents, subcontractors, assignees, or delegates are not independent contractors in relation to the Customer. The Contract does not constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity or consent by the Customer or the State of Florida or its subdivisions</p> <p>to suit by third parties. Without limiting this indemnification, the Customer may provide the Contractor (1) written notice of any action or threatened action, (2) the opportunity to take over and settle or defend any such action at Contractor's sole expense, and (3) assistance in defending the action at Contractor's sole expense.</p> <p>Without the two changes in red, the Consultant is liable for "acts and actions" even if the Consultant is fully compliant with the contract. Will the state make the changes shown in red?</p>	
42.	<p>Could the State explain how liquidated damages for delayed performance would be assessed? Does a Contractor have the ability to negotiate this term if awarded project work resulting from an RFQ?</p>	<p>The terms and conditions for any liquidated damages for delay would be negotiated between the Contractor and a Customer at the purchase order level.</p>
43.	<p>Has the State ever assessed financial consequences for contractors providing these or similar services?</p>	<p>The Division of State Purchasing is unaware whether Customers have assessed financial consequences.</p>
44.	<p>Would the State consider providing point ranges for the evaluators instead of single point values? The current scoring options do not seem to provide for the potential range in quality of proposals. For instance, a proposal with a "good" rating in the Experience section could receive from 40-60 points, depending on the evaluator's perception of good.</p>	<p>No. The Department will not modify the RFP in this way.</p>
45.	<p>Since Attachments G-J do not count towards the 20 page technical proposal limit, should we include them as a separate file?</p>	<p>The MFMP Sourcing Application has specific sections to submit Attachments G, H, and I. Attachment J is not required to be submitted at this time.</p>
46.	<p>7.6 Limitation of Liability.</p> <p>Unless otherwise specifically enumerated in the Contract or in the purchase order, and not withstanding anything to the contrary set forth in this Contract, neither the Department, nor the Customer nor the Contractor shall be liable for special, indirect, punitive, or consequential damages, including lost data or records (unless the Contract or purchase order requires the Contractor to back-up data or records),</p>	<p>No.</p>

	<p>even if the Department, or Customer or Contractor has been advised that such damages are possible. Neither the Department, nor the Customer, nor the Contractor shall be liable for lost profits, lost revenue, or lost institutional operating savings. The Department or Customer may, in addition to other remedies available to them at law or equity and upon five (5) business days prior written notice to the Contractor, retain such monies from amounts due Contractor as may be necessary to satisfy any good faith claim for damages, penalties, costs, and the like asserted by or against them. Any such retention shall not act as a final resolution of any issue leading to such retention and shall not be evidence of a breach by Contractor. The State may set off any liability or other obligation of the Contractor or its affiliates to the State against any payments due the Contractor under any contract with the State.</p> <p>Will the state accept the changes in red to limit liability?</p>	
<p>47.</p>	<p>8.2.3 Indemnification Related to Confidentiality of Materials.</p> <p>The Contractor will protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the Department for claims, costs, fines, and attorney's fees arising from or relating to its designation of materials as trade secret or otherwise confidential.</p> <p>This implies that if the Department does not protect the consultant's confidential information and the consultant sues, it has to pay the Department's attorney's fees.</p> <p>Will the state amend this language to indicate that the consultant is not responsible for the Department's attorney fees in the event the consultant sues due to breach of protection of the consultants confidential information?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>48.</p>	<p>11.3.2 Liquidated Damages.</p> <p>The Contractor acknowledges that delayed performance will damage the Department/Customer, but by their nature such damages are difficult to ascertain. Accordingly, the liquidated damages provisions stated in the Contract documents will apply. Liquidated damages are not intended to be a penalty and are solely intended to compensate for damages.</p> <p>Consulting contracts typically do not include liquidated damages. We cannot compensate for damages that are beyond out control. Will the state amend this language to clarify that the Contractor would not have to pay liquidated damages in the event the Department/Customer caused the delay?</p>	<p>No. See Attachment B, Special Contract Conditions, Section 11.3.1 Notification.</p>
<p>49.</p>	<p>"The Order of Precedence states Attachment B will take precedence over Attachment C , the MCS contract with a state department. Can Attachment C (MCS) with a state department take precedence over the Special Contract Conditions after the solicitation is won? Are new terms negotiable with each department contract and can it take precedence over the Special Contract Conditions?"</p>	<p>See Attachments C and D Section IV.(f)(1), Request for Quote(s) Requirements.</p>

50.	<p>12.2 Payment Audit.</p> <p>Records of costs incurred under terms of the Contract will be maintained in accordance with section 8.3 of these Special Contract Conditions. Records of costs incurred will include the Contractor's general accounting records, together with supporting documents and records of the Contractor and all subcontractors performing work, and all other records of the Contractor and subcontractors considered necessary by the Department, the State of Florida's Chief Financial Officer, or the Office of the Auditor General.</p> <p>Detailed payment records are not typically required for Firm Fixed Price contracts. Will the state amend this language to remove the requirement for this level of granularity in records required to be made available to the Department/Customer?</p>	No.
51.	Can you confirm that the "systems" in the systems alignment and consolidation service area is related to IT services?	No.
52.	Will the State consider redacting submitted pricing under the applicable public records laws?	<p>To redact the prices, the information would have to be exempt from public records disclosure requirements of Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. Trade secrets are exempt from disclosure. However, if a Contractor were to assert trade secret protection for its prices, DMS would not be able to publish the prices to Customers. This could make the Contract very difficult for Customers to use.</p> <p>Please refer to RFP Section 3.4, Redacted Submissions, for information on how to claim confidentiality when submitting a Proposal.</p>
53.	Will the State consider daily or weekly rates for this submission?	No.
54.	To increase competition will the state consider modifying the contract terms?	No.
55.	<p>Attachment C – State Term Contract:</p> <p>Section IV.(f)(1), 2 nd paragraph – Request for Quote(s) Requirements When creating a Customer SOW, Customers are permitted to negotiate terms and conditions which supplement those contained in this Contract. Such additional terms must be for services contemplated in the Contract and must not reduce the Contractor's obligations under the Contract (if any such conflicting terms are included in the Customer SOW, the conflict between the terms of the Customer SOW and this Contract will be resolved in favor of terms most favorable to the Customer). Specific terms and conditions within a Customer SOW are only applicable to the Customer's PO.</p> <p>The second sentence cancels the intent of the first sentence and implies that we cannot negotiate T&Cs at the SOW/Task Order level. Will the state amend this language to eliminate this contradiction?</p>	No. The Department does not view these as contradictory.

56.	<p>Attachment C – State Term Contract: Section IV (i) Contractor Warranty The Contractor agrees to the following representation and warranty: Should any defect or deficiency in any deliverable, or the remedy of such defect or deficiency, cause incorrect data to be introduced into any Customer’s database or cause data to be lost, the Contractor shall be required to correct and reconstruct, within the timeframe established by the Customer, all production, test, acceptance, and training files or databases affected, at no additional cost to the Customer.</p> <p>As consultants, we cannot provide this warranty. We can only warrant our own work product. Will the state amend this language to clarify that the Consultant cannot warranty work or products not provided by the Consultant?</p>	No.
57.	Are there any scoring points for Veteran owned CPA firms. If so, what is the amount of the points to be allocated.	There are no specific points allocated for Veteran owned firms.
58.	Appendix A appears to provide the award amounts of dollars per firm for one year (FY2018 - 19). Can your team provide the revenue per firm for both categories for FY 2017-18 , FY 2016-17 and FY 2015-16.	See Appendix C at the end of this addendum.
59.	<p>Attachment E.1</p> <p>The following question was denied: “Can the Agency articulate the criteria for an experience rating of good vs. extensive? Articulate the criteria for an experience rating of good vs. Exceptional?”</p> <p>Can the Agency provide qualitative definitions for ratings such as "good" vs. "extensive"?</p>	The Department will not offer any additional definitions.
60.	Will the State/Agency waive the requirement for monthly/quarterly reports when there is no open project?	Contractors will be required to submit reports indicating no sales during the reporting period.
61.	<p>Although this RFP does not specify any goals for minority (MBE/WBE) participation, can we reasonably expect that individual project Customers utilizing the Management Consulting OR the Financial and Performance Audit Service state term contract, WILL establish goals for minority participation in the individual RFQs?</p> <p>If so, will the firms in the pool created through this RFP have to identify the minority partner within the pool, or can they identify a minority partner outside of the pool.</p>	These will be determined by the Customer.
62.	The current Florida State Term Contracts (973-000-14-02 and 973-000-14-01) include a limitation of liability with a cap. Why did DMS take a different approach with this RFP regarding not including a mutual indemnification and cap on liability?	The Department considers this approach in the best interest of the State.
63.	As an incumbent to the current Florida State Term Contracts we were excited to see the release of the Request for Proposal for new statewide contracts. Our existing Florida State Term Contracts include a limitation of liability (LOL) and indemnification provisions that limits contractor liability by dollar cap and type of damages. The terms of the expected replacement contract (paragraphs 7.5 and	The Department will not modify the RFP in this way.

	<p>7.6) do not include any provision limiting contractor liability. The State's responses in the Q&A indicate the State will not revert back to the existing contracts for certain terms, including the LOL provision that limited contractor liability.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there are certain contract terms that are considered to be necessities for our firm (as well as several other leading mid-sized and large-sized professional services and consulting firms). The lack of a LOL provision applicable to contractors in these contracts poses a significant challenge for our firm, and likely many other firms submitting a bid. Presently we have several active contracts with the State on the MC and FPA contracts, all of which have all been successfully negotiated to mutually acceptable terms, and include a LOL provision.</p> <p>Over the years we have noticed that when other jurisdictions have taken a similar approach and chosen not to include LOL provision, mid-tier and large firms do not respond to competitive procurements, which in turn results in reduced competition within that jurisdiction, and a decrease in value provided to the jurisdiction. Over time as those jurisdictions realized that they were not getting "best – value," they have moved back to including a LOL provision that limits contractor liability in their contracts.</p> <p>Our firm (and based on the Q&A, it appears many other firms) requests that DMS consider including a LOL provision consistent with terms presented in the current State Term Contracts 973-000-14-02 and 973-000-14-01, even if the LOL has an adjusted cap. This change will give mid and large-sized firms an opportunity to bid on future procurements and help the State achieve "best value" from truly competitive solicitations.</p>	
64.	Why did the Department release Addendum No. 2 to modify its original answers that were released in Addendum No.1?	The Department believed it was in the best interest of the State to do so.
65.	In Addendum No.2, the Department modified the RFP requirements and such that respondents are not required to respond to all services in the authorized services chart that will be delivered under this contract. How will the Department ensure fair technical evaluation of vendors if some vendors meet all service areas and others only meets one? For example, if technical responses are otherwise equal but Vendor 1 covers one service area and Vendor 2 covers all service areas, would Vendor 2 get a higher technical score? How will this be determined such that all vendors are measured (and thus the contracts are awarded) based on clear, fair, and uniform scoring methodology / standard?	Please see modifications to RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award, Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, and Attachments E and F (Revised), below.
66.	In Addendum No.2, the Department modified the RFP requirements and changed the pricing evaluation criteria to be for services the vendor will perform, instead of requiring respondents to be evaluated on comprehensive services that will be delivered under this contract. Specifically, following the current evaluation formula, a vendor that only provides one service under the contract may have significantly lower rates as its business only supports one service covered by the contract. Larger firms instead provide varying resources with experience in all of the areas	The Department believes the evaluation methodology is fair.

requested, which comes at a higher operating cost. As a result, the pricing criteria as written may skew the cost score of a vendor that can meet all services disproportionately (see the table below) and could result in vendors that provide comprehensive services being at an unfair disadvantage in the procurement process, thus limiting competition and the services available to the State. How will the Department ensure fair evaluation of vendors' cost proposals between a vendor providing one service and a vendor providing comprehensive services?

Vendor Services Offered	Example Sum of Rates	Cost Score	Missed Points	Technical Score (Assumption*)	Total Score
Vendor 1 – Niche Services	\$448.00	70.0	0.0	125	195.0
Vendor 2 – Niche Services	\$710.00	44.2	-25.8	125	169.2
Vendor 3 – Some Services	\$670.00	46.8	-23.2	125	171.8
Vendor 4 – Some Services	\$725.00	43.3	-26.7	125	168.3
Vendor 5 – Most Services	\$830.00	37.8	-32.2	125	162.8
Vendor 6 – Most Services	\$1,065.00	29.4	-40.6	125	154.4
Vendor 7 – All Services	\$1,259.00	24.9	-45.1	125	149.9

*Technical Score assumption is that all vendors represented above score 125/130 on the Technical Response under the current scoring guidance provided in the RFP and Q&A.

Section 2:

The following modifies requirements found in the RFP. The variations between the new and the old requirements are highlighted in yellow.

1. RFP Section 5.5, Basis of Award Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, is hereby modified as follows:

5.5 Basis of Award

Contract(s) will be awarded to the responsible and responsive Respondent(s) for each Service in each Service Category whose Proposal(s) is determined in writing to be the most advantageous to the State, taking into consideration the Cost Proposal and Technical Proposal as follows:

The Department intends to issue an award(s) for Management Consulting Services and an award(s) for Financial and Performance Audits under separate STCs to the Respondent(s) with the highest total final score for each Service in each Service Category, which will be calculated by the Procurement Officer by combining the average of the Evaluator technical scores and the Cost Proposal score. If a Respondent submits a Technical Proposal and a Cost Proposal for both categories, the Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal for each Service Category will be evaluated and scored separately. The Department reserves the right to make multiple awards per Service within a Service Category as listed in Attachment C, Section e) Services, for Management Consulting Services, and Attachment D, Section e) Services, for Financial and Performance Audits, to Respondents whose total final score is within 2025% of the highest total final score for that Services within the Service Category. The methodology for scoring each Service Category is outlined below:

Proposal	Available Points
A. Technical Proposal (Attachment E for MCS and Attachment F for FPA)	
1. Experience	75
2. Proposed Solution – Per Service	55
B. Cost Proposal (Attachment A)	70
Total Available Points for a Per Service within Service Category 1 or 2 (A + B)	200

A Respondent may receive awards for either or both of the Service Categories in accordance with the terms of the RFP. However, the Department reserves the right to make no award in either or both Service Categories, as determined to be in the best interest of the State.

2. RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal – 130 Available Points for a Service Category, is hereby modified as follows:

5.5.1 Technical Proposal - 130 Available Points for a Service within a Service Category

The Respondent will be awarded up to 130 points for a Service within a Service Category based on its submitted Technical Proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined in the Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria (Attachment E for MCS and Attachment F for FPA). Only the Technical Proposal document submitted by the Respondent will be provided to the Evaluators for evaluation (i.e., the Evaluators will not consider other documents provided in the Proposal when completing their evaluations). Resumes should be limited to relevant information and experience but are not limited in total pages. If a Respondent submits a Technical Proposal for both categories, each Technical Proposal will be independently evaluated.

Technical Proposals for each Service Category should be no more than 20 pages the page limits outlined in the following chart (not including resumes or Appendix B):

Number of Services Being Offered	Total Technical Proposal Page Limit
1 - 5	20
6	21
7	22

8	23
9	24
10	25
11	26
12	27

There are no restrictions to how Respondents may use the total pages for the Technical Proposal. However, if the Technical Proposal exceeds the 20 pages limit, only the first 20 pages that do not exceed the limit, plus resumes and Appendix B, will be provided to the Evaluators (Note: cover pages and tables of contents are included in the 20-page limit).

3. Appendix B, Authorized Services Chart, is hereby replaced in its entirety as follows:

APPENDIX B

Authorized Services Chart (REVISED)

Respondents must place a check next to the services the Contractor, through its personnel, will offer to provide upon if awarded. Note: The services designated through this chart and awarded to the Contractor will be the only services the Contractor will be authorized to perform for the life of the Contract.

Category 1: Management Consulting Services.

CHECK	SERVICE
	Consulting on management strategy.
	Project management.
	Program research, planning, and evaluations.
	Provision of studies, analyses, scenarios, and reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives.
	Executive/management coaching services.
	Customized training as needed to achieve a management consulting objective.
	Assistance with policy and regulation development.
	Assistance with process and productivity improvement.
	Expert witness services in support of litigation, claims, or other formal cases relating to management consulting.
	Advisory and assistance services relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives.
	Systems alignment and consolidation.
	Comprehensive grants management services related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal grant programs.

Category 2: Financial and Performance Audits.

CHECK	SERVICE
	Financial Statements Audits - Audit of financial statements prepared in conformity with standards of accounting issued by SFFAS and by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA).
	Audits of Segments of Financial Statements - Audit of financial information (i.e., statement of revenue and expenses, statement of cash receipts and

	disbursements, statement of fixed assets, budget requests, and variances between estimated and actual financial performance).
	Internal Controls Audits
	Economy and Efficiency Audits
	Program Results and Program Fraud Audits

Section 3:

The following modifies requirements found in the RFP. The variations between the new and the old requirements are extensive and therefore **not** highlighted in **yellow**. Respondents should review these documents thoroughly.

4. **Attachment E, Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria, Service Category 1: Management Consulting Services, is hereby replaced in its entirety:**

**Attachment E (Revised)
Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria
Service Category 1: Management Consulting Services**

The Respondent should prepare and submit its Technical Proposal according to the criteria and instructions provided in this attachment. Responses to this Attachment E should be labeled “Technical Proposal – Service Category 1: Management Consulting Services”. Do not submit **more than the page limit outlined in RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal, (not including resumes and Appendix B) in aggregate for Experience and Proposed Solution, including cover page and table of contents**. If the Respondent would also like to be considered for Service Category 2 – Financial and Performance Audits, the Respondent should submit a separate Technical Proposal for Service Category 2 using Attachment F – Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria (Service Category 2: Financial and Performance Audits). Documents should be submitted in PDF format with fully searchable text and image features throughout the document.

Proposal	Available Points
A. Technical Proposal (Attachment E for MCS and Attachment F for FPA)	
1. Experience	75
2. Proposed Solution – Per Service	55
B. Cost Proposal (Attachment A)	70
Total Available Points Per Service within Service Category 1 (A + B)	200

1. Experience – 75 Available Points

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should provide a narrative on the Respondent’s relevant experience, including diverse knowledge and skillsets (preferably with demonstrated experience in providing services relevant to governmental entities), applicable to Service Category 1. A Respondent may, but is not limited to, demonstrate relevant experience by identifying clients and describing past projects. Evaluators will use the following when scoring the experience section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the quality, depth, and relevance of the experience (preferably with demonstrated experience in providing services relevant to governmental entities) in providing Management Consulting Services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent’s Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent does not demonstrate that it has quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Management Consulting Services.	0
Respondent demonstrates a minimal level of quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Management Consulting Services.	25
Respondent demonstrates a good level of quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Management Consulting Services.	50
Respondent demonstrates an extensive level of quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Management Consulting Services.	75

2. Proposed Solution – 55 Available Points Per Service Offered

a) Consulting on Management Strategy

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Consulting on Management Strategy services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Consulting on Management strategy will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Consulting on Management Strategy services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Consulting on Management Strategy services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Consulting on Management Strategy services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Consulting on Management Strategy services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Consulting on Management Strategy services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

b) Project Management

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Project Management services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Project Management services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent’s proposal for carrying out Project Management services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent’s Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent’s proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Project Management services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Project Management services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Project Management services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Project Management services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

c) Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent’s proposal for carrying out Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent’s Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent’s proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36

Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Program Research, Planning, and Evaluations services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55
---	----

d) Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Provision of Studies, Analyses, Scenarios, and Reports relating to a Customer's mission-oriented business programs or initiatives services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

e) Executive/Management Coaching Services

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Executive/Management Coaching Services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Executive/Management Coaching Services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the

following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Executive/Management Coaching Services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Executive/Management Coaching Services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Executive/Management Coaching Services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Executive/Management Coaching Services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Executive/Management Coaching Services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

f) Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36

Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Customized Training as needed to achieve a Management Consulting Objective services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55
--	----

g) Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Assistance with Policy and Regulation Development services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

h) Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

i) Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Assistance with Process and Productivity Improvement services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36

Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Expert Witness Services in Support of Litigation, Claims, or Other Formal Cases Relating to Management Consulting statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55
--	----

j) Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Advisory and Assistance Services Relating to a Customer's Mission-Oriented Business Programs or Initiatives statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

k) Systems Alignment and Consolidation

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Systems Alignment and Consolidation services, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Systems Alignment and Consolidation services will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Systems Alignment and Consolidation services in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on

the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Systems Alignment and Consolidation services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Systems Alignment and Consolidation services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Systems Alignment and Consolidation services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Systems Alignment and Consolidation services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

I) Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 1 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Financial and Performance Audits, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Management Consulting Services).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18

Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Comprehensive Grants Management Services Related to the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other related State and Federal Grant Programs statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

5. Attachment F, Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria, Service Category 2: Financial and Performance Audits, is hereby replaced in its entirety as follows:

**Attachment F (Revised)
Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria
Service Category 2: Financial and Performance Audits**

The Respondent should prepare and submit its Technical Proposal according to the criteria and instructions provided in this attachment. Responses to this Attachment F should be labeled “Technical Proposal – Service Category 2: Financial and Performance Audits”. Do not submit **more than the page limit outlined in RFP Section 5.5.1, Technical Proposal, (not including resumes and Appendix B) in aggregate for Experience and Proposed Solution, including cover page and table of contents**. If the Respondent would also like to be considered for Service Category 1 – Management Consulting Services, the Respondent should submit a separate Technical Proposal for Service Category 1 using Attachment E – Technical Proposal Instructions and Evaluation Criteria (Service Category 1: Management Consulting Services). Documents should be submitted in PDF format with fully searchable text and image features throughout the document.

Proposal	Available Points
A. Technical Proposal (Attachment E for MCS and Attachment F for FPA)	
1. Experience	75
2. Proposed Solution – Per Service	55
B. Cost Proposal (Attachment A)	70
Total Available Points Per Service within Service Category 2 (A + B)	200

1. Experience – 75 Available Points

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should provide a narrative on the Respondent’s relevant experience, including diverse knowledge and skillsets (preferably with demonstrated experience in providing services relevant to governmental entities), applicable to Service Category 2. A Respondent may, but is not limited to, demonstrate relevant experience by identifying clients and describing past projects. Evaluators will use the following when scoring the experience section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the quality, depth, and relevance of the experience (preferably with demonstrated experience in providing services relevant to governmental entities) in providing Financial and Performance Audits in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Management Consulting Services, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent’s Technical Proposal for Financial and Performance Audits).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent does not demonstrate that it has quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Financial and Performance Audits.	0
Respondent demonstrates a minimal level of quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Financial and Performance Audits.	25
Respondent demonstrates a good level of quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Financial and Performance Audits.	50
Respondent demonstrates an extensive level of quality, depth, or relevance in experience in providing Financial and Performance Audits.	75

2. Proposed Solution – 55 Available Points Per Service Offered

a) Financial Statements Audits

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 2 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Financial Statements Audits, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Financial Statements Audits will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Financial Statements Audits in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Management Consulting Services, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Financial and Performance Audits).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Financial Statements Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Financial Statements Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Financial Statements Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Financial Statements Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

b) Audits of Segments of Financial Statements

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 2 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Audits of Segments of Financial Statements, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Audits of Segments of Financial Statements will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Audits of Segments of Financial Statements in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Management Consulting Services, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Financial and Performance Audits).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Audits of Segments of Financial Statements statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Audits of Segments of Financial Statements statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Audits of Segments of Financial Statements statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Audits of Segments of Financial Statements statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

c) Internal Controls Audits

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 2 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Internal Controls Audits, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Internal Controls Audits will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent's proposal for carrying out Internal Controls Audits in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Management Consulting Services, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent's Technical Proposal for Financial and Performance Audits).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent's proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent's ability to provide Internal Controls Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Internal Controls Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Internal Controls Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Internal Controls Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

d) Economy and Efficiency Audits

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 2 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Economy and Efficiency Audits, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Economy and Efficiency Audits will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent’s proposal for carrying out Economy and Efficiency Audits in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Management Consulting Services, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent’s Technical Proposal for Financial and Performance Audits).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent’s proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Economy and Efficiency Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has minimal ability to provide Economy and Efficiency Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a good ability to provide Economy and Efficiency Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent’s proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has exceptional ability to provide Economy and Efficiency Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

e) Program Results and Program Fraud Audits

In its Technical Proposal, the Respondent should fully describe its proposal for carrying out Service Category 2 services, which should demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Program Results and Program Fraud Audits, including the ability to provide the services statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets. The Respondent may demonstrate its ability for providing services by providing relevant information for consideration including, but not limited to, describing a general approach to how Program Results and Program Fraud Audits will be provided, describing staffing, and/or providing resumes. Evaluators will consider the following information when scoring the services section:

The Evaluator will evaluate the Respondent’s proposal for carrying out Program Results and Program Fraud Audits in accordance with the following guidelines and must base his or her score on the information provided in the Technical Proposal (note: if an Evaluator reviews a Technical Proposal from a Respondent for Management Consulting Services, the Evaluator must not consider any of the information provided in that Technical Proposal when evaluating the Respondent’s Technical Proposal for Financial and Performance Audits).

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Respondent’s proposal does not demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide Program Results and Program Fraud Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	0

Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has <u>minimal</u> ability to provide Program Results and Program Fraud Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	18
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has a <u>good</u> ability to provide Program Results and Program Fraud Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	36
Respondent's proposal demonstrates that the Respondent has <u>exceptional</u> ability to provide Program Results and Program Fraud Audits statewide and to offer diverse knowledge and skillsets.	55

APPENDIX C

MANAGEMENT CONSULTING SERVICES

Supplier - Company Name	FY2015-2016	FY2016-2017	FY2017-2018
Carr, Riggs & Ingram, LLC	\$ 100,212.70	\$ 55,115.00	\$ 11,800.00
Ernst & Young, LLP	\$ 4,431,255.01	\$ 2,546,283.57	\$ 1,295,459.83
Gartner, Inc.		\$ 1,050,542.00	
Grant Thornton LLP	\$ 1,076,855.00	\$ 1,442,859.18	\$ 860,747.75
ISF, Inc.	\$ 1,697,291.25	\$ 1,910,613.50	\$ 1,898,423.00
KPMG LLP	\$ 1,147,051.75	\$ 976,182.00	\$ 474,795.75
MAXIMUS Consulting Services	\$ 33,500.00	\$ 65,450.00	\$ 99,387.50
MAXIMUS, INC.	\$ 60,990.00	\$ 60,750.00	\$ 59,280.00
RSM US LLP			\$ 120,517.87
The North Highland Company	\$ 6,278,998.24	\$ 7,535,780.45	\$ 9,097,909.06
Thomas Howell Ferguson P.A.	\$ 523,404.48	\$ 878,320.06	\$ 338,668.75
Grand Total	\$ 15,349,558.43	\$ 16,521,895.76	\$ 14,256,989.51

FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE AUDITS

Supplier - Company Name	FY2015-2016	FY2016-2017	FY2017-2018
Carr, Riggs & Ingram, LLC	\$ 119,754.50	\$ 785,650.09	\$ 712,048.21
Ernst & Young, LLP			
KPMG LLP	\$ 1,008,173.00	\$ 659,995.00	\$ 749,764.00
RSM US LLP	\$ 14,000.00		
Thomas Howell Ferguson P.A.	\$ 654,064.10	\$ 1,061,923.00	\$ 1,199,329.26
Grand Total	\$ 1,795,991.60	\$ 2,507,568.09	\$ 2,661,141.47

Note: The spend information in the chart above includes State Agencies spend only and does not include local governments, schools and universities.

Source: MyFloridaMarketPlace Analysis