

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	<b>Attachment C</b>						
2	<b>Procurement Options</b>						
3							
4	<b>Year One Purchasing Options</b>						
5			<b>Option 1: Purchase Directly from Current Micro EPL</b>		<b>Option 2: Letter of Configuration from Micro EPL</b>		<b>Option 3: Request for Proposals (RFP)</b>
6	<b>Description</b>		MDE could select one or more vendors from the EPL at a manufacturer and reseller level to provide all PCs for Year 1.		ITS could issue a Letter of Configuration(LOC) to manufacturers on the new micro EPL, asking the manufacturers to name value-added resellers.		A complete RFP could be issued by ITS on behalf of MDE, or MDE could request an exemption to issue an RFP without ITS participation. An RFP requires two advertisements in the Clarion Ledger, a week apart, with a minimum of 14 days before proposals are due.
7			If MDE is aggregating the purchases, the amount is greater than both the EPL project limit and the ITS Director approval amount. The mechanism for exceeding the EPL limit would be to request a Planned Purchase based on an updated MDE Technology Plan that included this project. Because the Planned Purchase is above \$250,000, ITS Board approval would be required.		Because the amount of the procurement is greater than \$250,000, ITS Board approval would be required.		Because the amount of the procurement is greater than \$250,000, ITS Board approval would be required for an exemption or for the award if the RFP is issued by ITS.
8	<b>Advantages</b>		(1) Timing: fastest one. No additional formal solicitation of information from vendors is required. MDE could potentially update their technology plan and receive ITS Board approval at its May 19 meeting.		(1) LOC would provide volume information, exact configuration, and specific services required, so proposals would be specific to this project.		(1) Most open and competitive mechanism.
9			(2) Least additional work for vendors, who have just responded to the micro EPL.		(2) A formal evaluation of proposals against specifications is conducted.		(2) Could be the best way to narrow the potential vendors and obtain a smaller, more easily administered list.
10					(3) Time frame is shorter than for a full RFP. Vendors have already agreed to general terms and conditions via the EPL response. Because an LOC is less complex than an RFP, the LOC and LOC responses can be prepared more quickly than an RFP and RFP responses. Because the underlying RFP has been advertised, there is no readvertising required for an LOC.		(3) Does not "piggy-back" from an existing specification, proposal, or RFP, so could be simpler to evaluate and award.
11					(4) Capitalizes on work vendors have done for EPL proposals submitted April 6, 2000.		
12					(5) Could provide some volume leverage in pricing, with pricing tiers for aggregated purchases.		
13					(6) Optionally, manufacturers could propose machines or services not included in their EPL proposals.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
14		<b>Disadvantages</b>	(1) Least competitive: largest potential for complaints and/or legal action from the vendor community.		(1) Vendor pool restricted to EPL responders.		(1) Most time consuming. Statute requires two advertisements, a week apart, with a minimum of 14 days prior to proposal opening.
15			(2) Potentially not best pricing: the micro EPL is really designed for smaller purchases. MDE might be able to obtain some volume discounts through negotiations with EPL vendors.		NOTE: Current proposals represent all Gartner Enterprise manufacturers as well as major in-state manufacturers. It is anticipated that manufacturers would provide a diverse and inclusive list of local resellers for good state-wide coverage.		(2) Vendors have just responded to the micro EPL and may not be able to devote the resources to another full RFP response.
16			(3) EPL is not well suited to purchase of bundled machine and installation service.				
17			(4) Most difficult to administer during the implementation: Because there is no additional process beyond the EPL, specific requirements of this roll-out will be harder to manage. Could be problems with districts not purchasing the exact configuration specified.				
18		<b>Timeline</b>	May 11, 2000: Work group decides on approach.		May 1, 2000: Work Group decides on approach.		May 1, 2000: Work group decides on approach and finalizes specifications and MDE/ITS begin work on RFP.
19			May 11, 2000: MDE submits updated technology plan to ITS.		May 11, 2000: Work Group finalizes specifications.		May 11, 2000: Ad submitted to the Clarion Ledger for publication on May 16 and May 23.
20			May 19, 2000: Approval of Planned Purchase by ITS Board.		May 15, 2000: MDE/ITS finalize and issue LOC.		May 16, 2000, and May 23, 2000: RFP ad dates
21			June 15, 2000: MDE/ITS complete review of EPL offerings and negotiations with vendors and publish group of manufacturers and resellers for the approved list.		May 26, 2000: LOC responses due.		May 23, 2000: MDE/ITS finalizes RFP and post to the Internet for vendor download.
22			June 30, 2000: Deadline for schools to notify MDE about choice of machine and vendor. MDE aggregates and places orders.		June 12, 2000: MDE/ITS complete evaluation of LOC responses, make recommendation to Work Group, and begin contract negotiations.		June 20, 2000: RFP proposals due.
23					June 16, 2000: Present recommendations to ITS Board for approval. Contracts can be executed as soon as ITS Board approves. MDE publishes list of manufacturers and resellers for the schools.		July 7, 2000: MDE/ITS complete evaluation of RFP proposals, make recommendation to Work Group, and begin contract negotiations.
24					June 30, 2000: Deadline for schools to notify MDE about choice of machine and vendor. MDE aggregates and places orders.		July 21, 2000: Present recommendation to ITS Board for approval. Contracts can be executed as soon as ITS Board approves. MDE publishes list of manufacturers and resellers for the schools.
25							July 28, 2000: Deadline for schools to notify MDE about choice of machine and vendor. MDE aggregates and places orders.
26							
27	<b>Year One Purchasing Options</b>						
28			(1) Repeat process from Year One.				
29			(2) Select another process from the above.				
30			(3) Continue with Year One approach (and selected vendors) and only refresh specifications and pricing.				