

State of Colorado



John W. Hickenlooper
Governor

Kathy Nesbitt
Executive Director

Jennifer Okes
Deputy Executive Director

Adrienne Benavidez
Division Director

DPA

Department of Personnel
& Administration

Division of Finance and Procurement
State Purchasing Office

633 17th Street, Suite 1520
Denver, Colorado 80202-3609

(303) 866-6100

Fax (303) 866-6016

www.colorado.gov/dpa

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEMORANDUM COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS eProcurement Solutions and Services RFP-TS-00003-11

A. Purpose

The State of Colorado Department of Personnel and Administration, State Purchasing Office issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the purpose of soliciting proposals from providers of eProcurement solutions, with the objective of establishing a multi-state cooperative contract for the provision of eProcurement and related services to the participating states. This RFP was a multi-state cooperative solicitation issued by the Colorado State Purchasing Office (CSPO) on behalf of those member states of the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA) and National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO).

B. Overview

The State of Colorado issued the RFP for eProcurement Solutions and Services on Friday October 15, 2010 (RFP #: RFP-TS-00003-11). The solicitation was posted as a public procurement on the State of Colorado BIDS (Bid Information and Distribution System) website. There were 4 modifications made to the RFP over the course of the solicitation. The original bid submission deadline was Tuesday November 23, 2010 at 1:30 pm (MST). As a result of the modifications, the final bid submission deadline was subsequently extended to Wednesday December 22, 2010 at 1:30 pm (MST).

On Wednesday December 22, 2010 at 1:30 pm (MST) the CSPO conducted a public bid opening. The CSPO received 15 responses to this RFP from the following vendors:

1. Basware Inc	9. Periscope Holdings Inc
2. BidSync	10. Proactis Inc
3. Business Purchasing Solution	11. Quest Construction Data Network
4. BusinessGenetics	12. Sciquest Inc
5. K12Buy.com	13. Symplicity
6. Ketera Technologies	14. Sysoft eRFP – Integratise Inc
7. Main Street Exchange Incorporated	15. Verian Technologies
8. Mercury Commerce Solutions	

The CSPO also had the following communications with vendors regarding the RFP Opening:

- **BidSync** - BidSync sent in two proposals to the RFP. Shortly before the bid submission deadline, the CSPO confirmed BidSync's request to rescind their initial response.
- **Coupa Software** - Coupa Software's response delivery was rejected by the CSPO as their proposal was attempted to be delivered at 10:05 am on December 23, 2010 (Fed Ex tracking number 8741 5716 5495). This was after the bid submission deadline.
- **PFITech** - PFITech's response was sent to a contact in the Denver metro area. This contact then attempted to deliver the response to the CSPO shortly after the bid submission deadline and was subsequently rejected.
- **Sicomm.net** - Sicomm.net's response was not received by the bid submission deadline. Tom Spiker spoke to Tim Goodwin with SiComm.net at 2:33 pm on 12.22.2010 and informed him that the delivery was rejected due to the fact that the delivery was attempted after the bid submission deadline and no exceptions would be made for bad weather.
- **Enporion Inc** - Enporion Inc sent an e-mail indicating their decision not to respond.

Multiple clarification rounds were concluded with a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round that was issued to the two leading proposers. Consideration of all submitted materials, presentation impressions and Core Evaluation Team deliberations resulted in the determination of a unanimous award recommendation by the Core Evaluation Team.

C. Evaluation Approach

The Core Evaluation Team or "committee" for this RFP consisted of 8 purchasing professionals. This committee included a member from each of the 4 core states identified in the RFP (Colorado, Nevada, Oregon and Washington) along with a single member from the states of Idaho, New Jersey, Oklahoma and Utah.

The Core Evaluation Team agreed on the necessity of a phased approach to the evaluation. The RFP evaluation process consisted of the following 4 phases:

1. Phase One - Administrative and Mandatory Requirements Review
2. Phase Two – Core Evaluation Team Review
3. Phase Three – Extended Stakeholders Review
4. Phase Four – Best and Final Offer (BAFO)

1. Phase One – Administrative and Mandatory Requirements Review

The CSPO verified that the 15 vendors were registered with BIDS as required in the RFP. In accordance with RFP Section 1.13 Confidential/Proprietary Information, the proposals submitted by Basware Inc, BidSync, Business Genetics, SciQuest Inc and Symplicity all had readily identified, marked and/or separated/packaged (both hard copy and electronically) confidential/proprietary information from the rest of their proposal. After consideration of the identified information, the CSPO made the following determinations:

- **Basware Inc** – The CSPO rejected the request. Basware Inc accepted 12.30.2010.
- **BidSync** – The CSPO rejected the request. BidSync accepted 01.03.2011.
- **BusinessGenetics** – The CSPO made a determination on 01.10.2011 that the written request for confidential/proprietary information for Annexure T1, Secure Bid Process, and T2, Key Manager, was valid and would be honored by the State of Colorado.

- **SciQuest Inc** – The CSPO made a determination on 01.13.2011 that the written request for confidential/proprietary information for IBM Confidential Material - IBM Confidentiality Cover Letter and IBM Confidential Material - IBM eProcurement Transformation Framework was valid and would be honored by the State of Colorado. The CSPO rejected the request for confidential/proprietary information for IBM Confidential Material - IBM Better Change Framework and IBM Confidential Material - IBM WWPMM Framework. SciQuest Inc accepted 01.13.2011.
- **Symplicity** - The CSPO rejected the request. Symplicity accepted 01.04.2011.

The core state members of the evaluation team then conducted a review of the administrative and mandatory requirements to further determine responsiveness. This review was to ensure the following: 1) that all materials requested were provided by the respondents; and 2) the materials submitted met the mandatory requirements.

During this phase it was determined that the responses from the following vendors were non-responsive:

- **BidSync** – Failed to meet the mandatory functional requirements described in Section 4.2.1 and listed in the Mandatory Required (MR) and Mandatory Scored (MS) categories in Figure 3.
- **K12Buy.com** – Failed to provide a cost proposal for each of the following: 1) Fixed Price Proposal; 2) Per Transaction Fee based Price Proposal (In accordance with modification 2 dated 11.24.2011, opening introduction)
- **Quest Construction Data Network** - Failed to meet the mandatory functional requirements described in Section 4.2.1 and listed in the Mandatory Required (MR) and Mandatory Scored (MS) categories in Figure 3.
- **Sysoft eRFP – Integratise Inc** - Failed to meet the mandatory functional requirements described in Section 4.2.1 and listed in the Mandatory Required (MR) and Mandatory Scored (MS) categories in Figure 3.
- **Verian Technologies** - Failed to meet the mandatory functional requirements described in Section 4.2.1 and listed in the Mandatory Required (MR) and Mandatory Scored (MS) categories in Figure 3.

In the event a proposal was determined to be non-responsive by one of the core state evaluation committee members, the reason for the determination was reviewed by a second core state evaluation committee member. The final determination of a non-responsive proposal was agreed upon and documented by a minimum of two core state evaluation committee members and the offeror was notified of the determination. Proposals meeting the administrative and mandatory requirements review were considered responsive and moved on to Phase Two of the evaluation process.

2. Phase Two – Core Evaluation Team Review

Overview

Phase One of the evaluation process determined which proposals met the administrative and mandatory requirements of the RFP. Of the fifteen proposals that were submitted, ten were considered responsive and responsible and moved on to Phase Two of the evaluation process.

Those ten vendors were the following:

1. Basware Inc	6. Mercury Commerce Solutions
2. Business Purchasing Solution	7. Periscope Holdings Inc
3. BusinessGenetics	8. Proactis Inc
4. Ketera Technologies	9. Sciquest Inc
5. Main Street Exchange Incorporated	10. Symplicity

Phase Two of the evaluation process consisted of detailed evaluation & scoring of the responsive technical written proposals to ultimately determine a competitive range of offerors. This process was carried out by the Core Evaluation Team of 8 purchasing professionals.

The Core Evaluation Team held a conference call on January 4, 2011 to discuss the evaluation process. The team was provided with an agenda for the call along with documents outlining the guidelines, instructions, the code of ethics and affidavit, a contact list and the scoring template/tool.

Scoring and Weights

The Core Evaluation Team individually evaluated and scored each technical proposal based on the RFP requirements. All weights, scoring guides and scoring criteria were established prior to the RFP submission deadline. Team members were given a scoring template to record their individual scores for each responsive technical proposal. Proposals were not compared but were evaluated on their independent approach and ability to accomplish the RFP requirements. While the Core Evaluation Team Members represented individual States, evaluations were not based on any individual States objectives.

The scoring for the Functional Requirements (RFP Section 4.2.1) was completed based on an automated approach to the vendor responses received in Exhibit F. All weights, scoring guides and scoring criteria were established prior to the review of any submittals.

Cost was evaluated by the Lead State with the assistance of a consultant in accordance with the weights, scoring guides and scoring criteria established prior to the RFP submission deadline. Cost scores were presented to the Core Evaluation Team after technical proposal discussions were completed.

RFP Section	Evaluation Category	Possible Points
4.1	Business Objectives	400 Points
4.2.1	Functional Requirements	1200 Points
4.2.2	Implementation Services	800 Points
4.2.2	Training Services	400 Points
4.2.2	Customer Support Services	400 Points
4.2.3	Architecture	400 Points
4.2.3	Security	400 Points
4.2.3	Maintenance and Upgrades	400 Points
4.2.3	Integration	400 Points
4.2.4	Implementation Requirements	800 Points
4.2.5	Use Cases	1200 Points
5.2.5	Project Plan	1200 Points
5.2.6	Cost and Pricing Model	2000 Points

Once each member independently evaluated and scored each technical responsive proposal, the Core Evaluation Team met in Denver during the week of January 31st for a deliberation meeting to discuss the scores from the technical proposals. All individual scores were shared with all team members at this meeting. The team discussed the ten proposals and any areas where substantial individual variation in scoring existed. Based on the discussions, each team member was given the option to retain or revise their independent findings. Scores were then compiled and presented to the team in a summary spreadsheet and graphical illustration.

Phase Two Determination

The final combined scores were as follows:

Number	Vendor	Combined Score (out of a possible 10,000)
1.	SciQuest Inc	7,912
2.	Periscope Holdings Inc	7,391
3.	Ketera Technologies	7,225
4.	Mercury Commerce Solutions	7,124
5.	Symplicity	6,693
6.	BusinessGenetics	5,565
7.	Proactis Inc	5,476
8.	Main Street Exchange	4,006
9.	Business Purchasing Solution	3,817
10.	Basware	3,799

As a result of the combined scores, the team agreed on the decision to advance five of the ten vendors. The five vendors considered to be within the competitive range were the following:

1. Ketera Technologies
2. Mercury Commerce Solutions
3. Periscope Holdings Inc
4. SciQuest Inc
5. Symplicity

The Core Evaluation Team agreed that the five vendors determined to be in the competitive range demonstrated a strong understanding of the RFP and were expected to have the ability to meet the requirements as outlined in the RFP. All five of the competitive range vendors had a score over 6,600 while the other five were in a distinctly lower cluster where all scored under 5,600.

The team believed that vendors that were in the “lower cluster” lacked an understanding of state and local government needs and didn’t necessarily understand what was being asked in the RFP.

- **BusinessGenetics** - The team agreed that BusinessGenetics responses to the RFP weren’t focused enough and failed to address the specific needs identified in the RFP. The team felt that their proposal lacked consistency and that the vendor didn’t integrate their answers very well. They also felt there was a lack of evidence of ever having worked with their partners.
- **Proactis Inc** - The team agreed that Proactis responses to the RFP weren’t focused enough and failed to address the specific needs identified in the RFP. While Proactis met most of the overall requirements, the team felt that their overall response was lacking detail in too many areas.

- **Main Street Exchange** - The team felt that Main Street Exchange failed to provide sufficiently comprehensive answers to the questions posed in the RFP and missed opportunities to provide additional detail to support some of their responses.
- **Business Purchasing Solution** - The team felt that Business Purchasing Solution failed to provide sufficiently comprehensive answers to the questions posed in the RFP and missed opportunities to provide additional detail to support some of their responses. The team further believed that while Business Purchasing Solution may have had some of the required functionality to support the implementation requirements outlined in the RFP, they were lacking in their ability both to articulate it and apply it to our specific needs.
- **Basware** - The team felt that Basware failed to provide sufficiently comprehensive answers to the questions posed in the RFP and missed opportunities to provide additional detail to support some of their responses.

The team used the preceding discussions to draft clarification questions for the five vendors they determined to be in a competitive range. Proposals determined by the Core Evaluation Team to be within the competitive range moved on to Phase Three of the evaluation.

3. Phase Three – Extended Stakeholders Review

Overview

The five vendors determined to be in the competitive range were requested to present their solution in a one-day session that was scripted by the Core Evaluation Team. The order for the vendor presentations was drawn at random and witnessed by the Core Evaluation Team at the conclusion of the Deliberation Meeting on February 4, 2011. The Core Evaluation Team used the discussions from the second phase to draft clarification questions for the five vendors that were brought into consideration at the conclusion of Phase Three. Those clarifications were issued to the vendors on Friday February 11, 2011.

The Extended Stakeholder Review Team was comprised of 6 members of the Core Evaluation Team, from Phase Two, along with extended stakeholders representing and identified by those States who signed an Intent to Participate. Two members of the Core Evaluation Team, representing the States of Idaho and New Jersey, requested to be removed due to workload requirements of their respective positions within their states. The Extended Stakeholders consisted of 21 members and included representatives from the Information Technology, Finance and Procurement Divisions and other Subject Matter Experts (SME's) identified by the Sourcing Team as well as representatives of the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA) and National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO) organizations.

The Extended Stakeholder Review Team was required to read the Final RFP solicitation documents as well as the five proposals and clarification responses from those vendors determined to be in the competitive range.

The Extended Stakeholder Review Team objective was to discuss and document the strengths and weaknesses of each offeror based on proposal review and vendor presentations and ultimately provide a recommendation to the Core Evaluation Team on which vendor(s) would receive an award or to determine whether it was in the best interest of the States to offer a best and final opportunity to the strongest offerors.

Presentations

The vendor presentations were held the week of March 6, 2011 at the Denver Grand Hyatt. There were a total of 21 Extended Stakeholders to which the vendors were presenting. While the team invited the five competitive range vendors identified in Phase Two to present, Ketera Technologies declined the invitation as they were unsuccessful in resolving issues with one of their proposed partners.

The presentation day was broken down into the following components:

- Presentation Session 1 – Firm Overview (1 hour 45 minutes)
- Presentation Session 2 – Demonstrations (2 hours)
- Presentation Sessions 3a and 3b – Interviews (2 hours)
- Presentation Session 4 – Ad Hoc Problem Solving Solution (30 minutes)
- Presentation Session 5 – Questions (1 hour)

Each extended team member was given an evaluation packet for each vendor to capture the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, risks and issues for each presenting vendor for each of the above sessions. The extended team held a discussion at the conclusion of each presentation day to discuss the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, risks and other questions or issues for each vendor with respect to the requirements as outlined in the RFP. The extended team held a final discussion once all presentations were complete to capture the overall thoughts from each of the extended team members. The Core Evaluation Team then held a separate meeting to discuss the presentations, discussion results and the next steps.

Phase Three Evaluation Summary

➤ **Mercury Commerce**

While the extended team appreciated some of the features proposed by Mercury Commerce Solutions they felt that the solution was very limiting to the states. The major concern was with regards to the vendor database. It was apparent that the database would reside with EMS (Mercury Commerce Solutions) and not the states. The proposal would charge vendors a fee for registration and would be limited in their ability to identify/sort locations they will supply goods or services to. The extended team also felt the proposed solution was limited in the ability for configuration and the demonstration lacked analytics. The extended team also recognized limitations on workflow approvals and the ability to support complex procurements like a Request for Proposals. Other concerns surrounded the history of the experience of the proposed team in working together and the governance among partners.

➤ **Periscope Holdings Inc**

The extended team saw a number of area of opportunity with Periscope Holdings. The solution appeared highly configurable and the offeror demonstrated experience with vendor data integration. The presentation team recognized the WSCA goals and also provided an opportunity for NIGP adoption among states. The extended team felt that Periscope Holdings Inc could leverage the experience of CGI in providing a solution. The extended team also expressed some areas of concern with the vendors limited State experience. The extended team also felt there was insufficient first level phone support and noted some areas of concern from the demonstration.

➤ **SciQuest Inc**

SciQuest Inc demonstrated a comprehensive and robust solution. The extended team was impressed by the functionality of the solution and was educated on the various features offered

by the offeror. The extended team liked the idea of the offerors use of a consortium group for feedback and also looked favorably at the vendors ERP agility and ability to support multiple commodity codes. There were some concerns from the extended team with features that would be included in future releases. The extended team also had concerns with the proposed Project Manager and the limited experience with the proposed partners.

➤ **Symplicity**

Symplicity demonstrated a very robust and easy to use solution however the extended team felt that the vendor failed to have a realistic grasp of the magnitude of this procurement. There was a lack of confidence in the offerors ability to support WSCA catalog punch-outs. The extended team also felt that the offeror failed to sufficiently demonstrate Implementation Requirements 2 and 3 during the course of their presentation. The extended team also felt that the vendor lacked an understanding of commodity code importance when considering integration. The extended team was disappointed that the project manager and other key individuals that would work on the implementation of their solution did not attend the presentation. Overall, the extended team felt that the proposed solution would have to be configured in too many areas and that the vendor lacked the depth and experience to contribute to a successful implementation.

Phase Three Determination

Deliberations with the Core and Extended Team resulted in a unanimous determination that two vendors, Periscope and SciQuest, were the clear leaders. Through leverage of the Core and Extended Team's written submissions from the presentations, consolidated clarifications were requested from the two leading vendors. The clarifications were evaluated by the Core Evaluation Team at the beginning of Phase Four.

4. Phase Four – Best and Final Offer (BAFO)

Overview

The Core Evaluation Team used the discussions from the third phase to draft clarification questions for the two lead vendors. Clarifications were based on the demonstrations and cost proposals and were evaluated by the Core Evaluation Team for strengths and opportunities, as well as weaknesses, risks and issues. Those clarifications were issued to the vendors on Thursday March 24, 2011 and due by 5:00 pm MT on Thursday March 30, 2011.

Following the clarification evaluation, a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) was requested from the two leading vendors. The offerors were afforded the opportunity to address remaining questions and perceived deficiencies in their proposals as determined through Core Evaluation Team discussions as well as an opportunity to assemble and put forth their most competitive proposals.

The BAFO request included sections requesting clarity around key definitions and proposed service levels, cost granularity for all components and related services in order to allow for adoption of cooperative pricing by any participating state, and answers to remaining questions along with a request for acceptance of two key State of Colorado contract terms. The request for Best and Final Offers was issued to the vendors on Friday April 22, 2011 and due by 6:00 am MT on Friday April 29, 2011.

Deliberation Summary (May 3-4, 2011)

The Core Team felt that both leading proposers had assembled strong proposals and were each capable of meeting the requirements of the RFP. Deliberations focused on key strengths and weaknesses of the two leading proposals in order to differentiate the leading proposals from one another. One member of the Core Evaluation Team, representing the State Oklahoma, requested to be removed from the Best and Final Offer evaluation.

➤ **Periscope Holdings Inc**

The Core Evaluation Team identified and communicated many strengths of the Periscope Holdings Inc proposal. For example, many members were impressed with the short proposed implementation timeframe. Further, the core team volunteered the value of limited dependence on partnership, along with hosting strength and expertise with NIGP crosswalks and predicted a good probability of success.

However, perceived weaknesses were also voiced with respect to poor demonstration performance (busy screens, inferior user interface) that many felt may lead to limited user adoption. Customization potential was also viewed as limited. The perception was also present that the offeror may not have fully understood what WSCA and the member States were truly looking for in the desired solution. Also volunteered were concerns about the offerors experience with higher education along with concerns for costs.

While the core team recognized the strength of a short implementation schedule, the team felt the vendor failed to provide an adequate amount of comfort in the ability to meet such an aggressive time frame. Another area the core team recognized as a strength was the vendor experience with the NIGP commodity codes and experience building crosswalks. This, however, was also viewed by many as a weakness since Periscope may be too focused on the NIGP code versus other codes that participating states may be using.

At the conclusion of the Periscope Holdings Inc demonstration, the Core Evaluation Team had numerous concerns. The core team felt that the demonstration was poor and left concerns over user adoption in that the screens were very busy, there was a limited WSCA demonstration and many also had concerns with the usability of the ad hoc reporting.

The Core Evaluation Team believed that Periscope Holdings Inc's BAFO response was limited and didn't go into detail or demonstrate a clear understanding of what WSCA and the States were truly looking for in a cooperative based solution. In the BAFO, the core team requested that the offerors submit a confidential and proprietary strategic partnership proposal. Offerors were requested to submit their "most competitive pricing possible" based on further clarification around the WSCA/NASPO eProcurement Cooperative's Success and Vision. While Periscope Holdings Inc did offer more aggressive pricing, it was still significantly more than what the Lead State of Colorado budgeted for year one of Implementation Requirement 2.

➤ **SciQuest Inc**

The Core Evaluation Team identified and communicated numerous strengths of the SciQuest proposal. For example, the core team volunteered that SciQuest had provided a "demonstration of a superior" solution that had a very good "look and feel," seemed far more intuitive, and appeared to be a "more robust, evolved" product. These strengths were expected to increase user acceptance.

In addition, the core team communicated that the SciQuest offering had good partnerships and good partner solutions, possessed an “exceptional” probability of success and demonstrated a strong understanding of what WSCA and States were looking for in a solution.

Weaknesses in the proposed offering discussed included the proposed marketing approach, potential limitations in executive engagement, limited experience with NIGP crosswalk tables, and potential concerns for costs of catalog uploads.

As is listed below, the strengths identified by the Core Evaluation Team far outweigh the weaknesses. The core team further believes that the identified weaknesses can be addressed during contract negotiations. The Core Evaluation Team believes that the strengths outlined below coupled with the proposed pricing and strategic partnership proposal offered by SciQuest provides an advantageous opportunity.

Strengths

- Like look and feel of product
- More robust, evolved
- User acceptance
- Appears to be less expensive
- SLA – good metrics
- Good ROI
- Exceptional probability of success
- Demonstration of superior system
- Far more intuitive – easier user adoption
- Answers to questions of BAFO superior
- More exceptional approach
- Understands what States/WSCA looking for improvement
- Firm discounts – extended to poly-sub
- Good partnerships – good partner solutions
- Follow directions – responded well
- Paying attention – understand WSCA
- Good background interfacing with other systems
- Understands government and WSCA business
- Customer input/user group for continued improvement
- TIN matching/verification
- User friendly reporting
- Managed fields, true match
- User adoption, demo clear and concise
- User feedback to make system improvements
- Understood strategic partnership
- Less expensive on BAFO Cost response

Weaknesses

- Marketing approach good but is it realistic
- Executive engagement concerns
- NIGP Crosswalk tables
- Concerns on catalog cost for upload

D. Conclusion

Over the course of the final evaluation process and final deliberations, the Core Evaluation Team considered the relative strengths of both leading proposers and considered both single and multiple award scenarios. The team concluded that the benefits of a single award clearly outweighed any potential benefits of a multiple award based on the strategic partnership proposed by SciQuest Inc. In addition, while all 5 Core Team evaluators felt confident that both leading vendors were capable of meeting the requirements as outlined in the RFP, the clear and distinct leader was SciQuest.

E. Recommendation

The Core Evaluation Team conducted an evaluation of all qualified proposals. Upon review of proposals, demonstrations, all clarification materials and BAFO responses, coupled with thorough deliberation and in accordance with the evaluation factors set forth in RFP Section 6, Evaluation and Award Selection Process, the review team has unanimously recommended that upon successful negotiation of contractual terms and conditions, a single award shall be offered to SciQuest Inc., as the eProcurement solution provider with the highest ranking proposal due to the strategic aspect of the cooperative.

**FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEMORANDUM
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS
eProcurement Solutions and Services
RFP-TS-00003-11**

I, the undersigned, a designated voting member of the State Request For Proposal (RFP) Core Evaluation Team for RFP-TS-00003-11 for eProcurement Solutions and Services, hereby certify I do not have a conflict of interest in regard to this RFP, I conducted my evaluation in an objective, unbiased manner in accordance with the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP and upon successful negotiation of contractual terms and conditions, I support the recommendation for the award to be offered to SciQuest Inc, as the eProcurement solution provider with the strongest proposal and the most advantageous offer to the State of Colorado, the core States of Oregon, Nevada and Washington and those member states of the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA) and National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO) for the multi-state cooperative contract for eProcurement and related services.

Printed Name: _____

Title and Organization: _____

Signature *Date*