T-TOC

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Date: 7 December 2016

Version: Issue 1.0

Document Control

Document Title	T-TOC - Evaluation Method and Criteria
Author	Colin Hitchin
Owner	Janet Foreman
Distribution	
Document Status	Issue 1.0

Revision History

Version	Date	Description	Author
0.A	4th July 2016	First draft	Colin Hitchin
0.B	7th July 2016	Initial Draft provided to Janet Foreman	Colin Hitchin
0.C	2th November 2016	After Neil Widdop and Dave Bradbrook review	Colin Hitchin
0.D	30th November 2016	Added fixed cost for 2 years support and changed terminology for NEC contract	Colin Hitchin
1.0	7th December 2016	Formarket engagement	Colin Hitchin

Reviewer List

Name	Role

Approvals

Name	Signature	Title	Date of Issue	Version

Table of Contents

1. Overview

This document includes a proposed set of questions, evaluation criteria and scoring that will be used to determine how well the Contractor's submission meets the Employer's needs.

It includes additional information required by Contractors to prepare their responses including the current landscape within the Employer for technology infrastructure, applications in-use (and recommended for re-use) and the potential impact of other key projects, such as CHARM.

1.1. Principles

The proposed approach is intended to enable the Contractor to provide all the pertinent information about their solution without having to produce an excessive submission size. The limited number of questions should also enable the Contractor to expound on their solution to provide the fullest picture of their proposal without unnecessary repetition.

The Agile implementation strategy proposed by the Employer means that it is not possible to define the final deliverable in great detail. The Employer is looking for a Contractor able to work with them in delivering the vision expounded in the Operational Technology Strategy; adapting to changes in that vision and developing interfaces with other systems while choosing the route that provides the greatest benefit to the Employer.

The Employer has a clear policy on the use of COTS products in preference to bespoke development. There is also a preference to re-use products already successfully in use by The Employer

The proposed solution must be able to deliver the whole of the vision, and each proposal will be judged by that standard. Although the timescales for that vision necessarily rely on the implementation timetables and scope of many other projects it is important that the Employer can be confident that the proposed solution will be capable of delivering that vision.

The use of a defined Minimum Viable Product (MVP) enables the Contractor's financial submissions to be compared against a common understanding of a delivery. This is combined with a price for a defined amount of additional effort to provide confidence to the Employer of the cost of delivering further tranches and to the Contractor of the rate that will be paid.

The balance between the quality and financial elements of the scoring has to reflect the importance of the Employer's confidence in the Contractor for Agile developments.

1.2. Scoring

The scoring of the quality submission reflects the priorities of the Employer in delivering the T-TOC, with the emphasis on transitioning the administration, support and development activities to in-house teams. The number of evaluation criteria has been kept to a minimum in order to ensure that the key characteristics are adequately reflected in the score.

The Contractor will provide a response to a small number of questions, each of which will be scored against a set of evaluation criteria. A weighting will be applied to the score which will then be summed to give a mark out of 80.

A quality threshold has been stated, applying to each set of evaluation criteria, which reflects the minimum acceptable score.

The balance between the quality and financial elements of the scoring has to reflect the importance of the Employer's confidence in the Contractor to Agile developments. The scoring for the quality submission will comprise 80% of the total score, with the financial element comprising the remaining 20%.

The financial score will be derived from the pricing for a sub-set of the requirements together with a defined provision of effort. This subset is defined as the Minimum Viable Product and represents the first objective for the development, a proof of concept for the Operational Technology Strategy and the platform for further development.

2. Qualification Criteria

Tenders will only be accepted from Contractors who have already successfully applied for inclusion with Lot 14 of the TMTF 2 framework awarded in 2016.

3. Quality Evaluation

3.1. Responses

Contractors will provide a response to each of three questions in section 1. The response should not exceed the stated maximum word count, including diagrams', for each question. The Employer may not read, and therefore score, any information provided beyond the maximum word count.

Each question response will be evaluated against one or more sets of evaluation criteria.

Contractors will also provide a set of case studies to illustrate their experience of the product and similar projects. The set of case studies will also be scored as a whole against two sets of evaluation criteria. The intention is that Contractors will be able to use a range of case studies, each illustrating different facets of their experience, to demonstrate their ability to deliver the project.

3.2. Scoring Basis for Quality Submission Responses

The relevant response will be evaluated against each set of criteria and will be assigned a score from 0 to 10, where a score of 5 meets the criteria to an acceptable level and a score of 10 represents an exceptional response that would provide significant additional benefits across The Customer. Each set of evaluation criteria has been allocated a weighting as part of the total score for the tender response.

The Scoring Matrix provided separately combines the weighted scoring from each set of evaluation criteria to arrive at a total score for the Contractor's proposal.

3.3. Quality Threshold

T-TOC will provide an important business service for the Customer and so it is important that any selected Contractor is able to provide at least a minimally compliant system. Therefore no proposal will be accepted where any of set of evaluation criteria within the quality submission receives a mark of less than 5.

4. Quality Submission Questions

The Contractor must respond to each of the questions below within the word count specified, excluding diagrams and other graphics. The Employer may choose to disregard any words in the response in excess of that word count.

The Employer will mark the response against each evaluation criteria, using the scoring guidelines to determine the mark.

4.1. Contractor Approach

Q1 – With respect to the supplied specification of requirements, the context described by the T-TOC Architecture document and arrangements described by the system information document; describe how you would deliver and deploy a solution that meets all of the functional requirements and supports T-TOC as a whole in meeting the non-functional requirements		**Maximum word count** **7000**
Contractor response		
No.	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring
1.1	Does the response describe how the Contractor would deliver and deploy a solution that met all of the functional requirements	0 - for no response 1 – for a solution either meets less than half of the “Must” functional requirements or is not seen as credible, either technically or in its timescale 2 – for a credible solution that meets most but not all of the “Must” functional requirements 3 – for a credible solution that meets all of the “Must” functional requirements 4 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition meets all of the “Should” requirements 5 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition meets more than half of the “Could” requirements 6 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition fully meets all of the functional requirements 7 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition demonstrates how the extent of bespoke development will be minimised 8 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides more than 90% of the requirements using the existing capabilities of the selected products.

		9 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides significant added value to the Employer 10 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides innovative capabilities that enable benefits to be realised across the Employer's business
1.2	Does the response describe how the architecture would ensure that the non-functional requirements are met for: Availability Performance Resilience Disaster recovery	0 - for no response 1 – for a solution either does not enable all of the non-functional requirements to be met and is not seen as credible, either technically or in its timescale 2 – for a solution not seen as technically credible 3 – for a credible solution that cannot meet all of non-functional requirements 4 – Not used 5 – for a credible solution that would enable all of the non-functional requirements for continuous processes to be met, but requires significant change by the Employer 6 – for a credible solution that would enable all of the non-functional requirements for continuous processes to be met without significant change by the Employer 7 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score without changing the Employer's existing infrastructure and application landscape 8 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition would support the Employer's other systems to meet their non-functional requirements 9 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides significant added value to the Employer 10 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides innovative capabilities that enable benefits to be realised across the Employer's organisation

Q2 – Describe how the selected product set will address the Employer's needs for key features, licencing arrangements and integration with a mature platform without excessive vendor lock in		**Maximum word count** **3000**
Contractor response		
No.	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring
2.1	For each key product does the response: describe the key features of the product and how they address the Employer's needs describe the licencing/support model of the product and how HE costs can be minimised explain how the product choice aligns with the Enterprise Architecture principles of re-use before COTS and COTS before bespoke explain how the Employer can be confident that the product will continue to meet HE's needs over the next 5 years, based on track record, financial stability and roadmap	0 - for no response 1 – for a set of products that do not seem to deliver the proposed solution or the needs of the Employer 2 – Where all of the key products have been clearly described with reference to the Employer's requirements 3 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition meet most of the functional requirements with pre-existing features or capabilities 4 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition provide a clear model of the product costs, with additional modules or options fully described 5 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and either use open source products or provide an acceptable justification for the use of an alternative product 6 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and either re-use products within the approved Employer application landscape or provide an acceptable justification for the use of an alternative product. 7 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and provide a licencing or support cost model that is aligned with use of the product rather than maximum capacity 8 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and demonstrate that the product is mature, with an established user base and support for UK users. 9 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and have the financial record that provides confidence that the product will be fully supported

		for at least 5 years 10 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and include evidence of its use within highway operation or field equipment operation domains.
2.2	Does the response identify how each of the key products can be integrated with each of the key interfacing systems with respect to data access, functional re-use and user experience	0 - for no response 1 – for a set of products that do not provide facilities for integration with other systems via an open API 2 – Where all of the key products provide the capability for other systems to read all of the business data held by the products as part of online processes 3 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition enable other systems to update all of the business data held by the products, subject to business rules, using industry standard approaches, such as RESTful web services 4 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition enable the data model held within the products to be configured to align with the Employer's data model 5 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and provide: one or more APIs that would support integration with the ESB implementation described in the Architecture Description 6 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and demonstrate the capability to invoke functions, including workflows, provided by other applications through open APIs 7 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and provide: APIs that can be invoked by workflows to perform all of the key functions of the product 8 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and provide the ability to configure user interfaces to match the look and feel of other systems 9 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and enable user elements from the products to be embedded within the user forms of other applications to create an integrated user interface 10 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and provide

		an API that enables all of the functions of the product to be accessed and used by other applications
2.3	Does the response explain how each key product could be retired or replaced without incurring excessive cost?	0 - for no response 1 – Not used 2 – the response does not address any transition to new products or the retirement of existing products 3 – Not used 4 – there is a clear and credible explanation of how the business data held by each key product could be accessed and transitioned to a replacement product 5 – there is a clear and credible explanation of how each key product could be replaced 6 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition provide evidence that the replacement would not require re-development of the service or incur disproportionate cost 7 - Not used 8 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition provide evidence that the response includes a credible plan to handle transitions to new products and the retirement of the selected products 9 – Not used 10 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and where the proposal addresses specifically the replacement of all of the selected products

Q3 - Describe how support and development of the functionality and outputs of the logical function could be transferred to HE		**Maximum word count** **1000**
Contractor response		
No.	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring
3.1	Does the response describe how support and	0 - for no response 1 – There is no credible plan for transferring support and development of the

	development of the functionality and outputs of the logical function could be transferred to the Employer	logical function to the Employer 2 – The plan for transferring support and development of the logical function to the Employer is unclear 3 – There is an incomplete plan for transferring the support and development of the logical function to the Employer 4 – There is an plan for transferring the support and development of the logical function to the Employer but there are significant omissions 5 - There is a clear plan and strategy for transferring the management and administration of the applications to the Employer within a 5 year timeframe 6 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition there is a clear plan and strategy for transferring the support of the applications to the Employer within a 5 year timeframe 7 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition include proposals to build one or more Employer teams for development of the solution 8 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition include a clear plan for building a Employer capability to take over the development of the solution within 5 years 9 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria but also deliver benefits to other areas of the Employer's business 10 –. for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition provide a credible plan for transformative change in the Employer's business
Contractor response		

Q4 – In the context of the arrangements described in the Service Information document describe how you would organise the project to support the required agile development approach, the transition to Employer led teams and support of the delivered solution	**Maximum word count**	**1000**
Contractor response		

T-TOC

Evaluation Method and Criteria

No.	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring
4.1	Does the response describe how the Contractor proposes to organise the project to deliver the objectives of the project	0 - for no response 1 – for a solution that does not describe how agile development would be supported 2 – For a response that describes how agile development would be supported but omits both transition and support of the delivered solution 3 – For a response that describes how agile development would be supported but omits either transition and support of the delivered solution 4 - for a solution that describes how agile development, transition and support will be delivered but with a significant omission 5 - for a credible solution that describes how agile development, transition and support will be delivered. 6 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but is strong on how collaborative working, especially with the Product Owners, will be supported 7 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition explains how the changing outputs of agile developments will be handled within a partially fixed price project 8 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but provides additional detail on how the capability of Employer staff could be built to enable early handover from the Contractor 9 – for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides significant added value to the Employer 10 - for a solution that meets the criteria for a lower score but in addition provides innovative capabilities that enable benefits to be realised across the Employer's business

4.2. Contractor Experience

The Contractor should provide a number of case studies to illustrate their experience of similar applications, both in scale and functionality, and of the using the product. Ideally the Contractor should be able to demonstrate experience of Agile projects. The Employer's expectation is that each case study will illustrate some aspects of the Contractor's experience with the questions being marked against the aggregated experience evidenced by the set of case studies as a whole..

4 - Case Studies – a set of between 2 and 10[1] case studies, at the Contractor's discretion		**Maximum word count** **5000**
Contractor response		
No.	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring
5.1	How well do the case studies demonstrate the Contractor's knowledge of and use of the tools including integration with other applications	0 - for no response 1 – The case studies do not demonstrate any use of the key products 2 – The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor some experience of similar products 3 – The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor has used similar products on other projects 4 – The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor has successfully deployed similar products on other projects 5 - The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor had deployed some of the key products on other projects and has experience of similar products 6 – The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor has successfully deployed all of the key products on other projects 7 - The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor has successfully deployed the key products on a number of other similar projects. That is similar in scale, criticality and functionality 8 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate integration of both data and functions with other applications 9 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate integration of both data and functions with applications already in use by the Employer 10 –. for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate the Contractor has successfully transferred support and development activities to previous Employers

[1] The relatively high limit for case studies, 10, is to enable Contractors to demonstrate their expertise across a very wide field. Contractors are advised that information in the case studies should be pertinent to the tender.

5.2	How well do the case studies demonstrate the Contractor's experience in deploying similar projects, preferably with experience of an Agile methodology	0 - for no response 1 – Not used 2 – The case studies do not demonstrate any experience of similar projects 3 – Not used 4 – The case studies provide evidence that the Contractor has been involved in similar projects 5 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate some experience of similar applications 6 – The case studies demonstrate that the Contractor has previously successfully deployed at least one project that is similar, or larger, in scale and include experience of similar applications 7 - for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition include experience of multiple similar projects 8 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate experience of working within an Agile framework 9 – for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate successful handover of support to the Employer 10 –. for proposals that meet the immediately previous scoring criteria and in addition demonstrate building a development capability within a previous Employer

4.3. Scoring Framework

The score for the Quality Submission will be calculated using the following weightings for each evaluation criteria within each area of assessment and in response to each question.

The maximum quality score is 80.

Table 1 - Quality Scoring Framework

Area	Question	Criteria	Weighting
Approach	1 - Solution	1.1	20%
		1.2	5%
	2 - Products	2.1	5%
		2.2	5%
		2.3	5%
	3 – Transfer to HE	3.1	5%
	4 – Project Organisation	4.1	5%
Experience	4 – Case Studies	5.1	15%
		5.2	15%

5. Financial Evaluation

5.1. Price Basis

The Contractor will supply a single price broken down into the following categories:

- A fixed price for the effort required to deliver the defined Minimum Viable Product (MVP)
- A fixed price for a defined number of days effort at the same average rate as that for the MVP
- Costs for the procurement and use of any software up to the point of deployment of the solution
- Costs for ongoing use of the software by the Employer for a 5 year period
- Costs for the procurement and use of any hosting up to the point of deployment of the solution
- Costs for ongoing use of any hosting by the Employer for a 5 year period
- Cost for supporting the MVP as delivered for a period of 2 years

The single price will be used for the financial scoring. The breakdown of costs will be used during the period of the contract to determine whether the Employer procures those elements from the Contractor or using an alternative procurement route.

The following sections describe the coverage of each of the above categories.

5.2. Development and Deployment Cost

The T-TOC project will be organised to use an Agile methodology, with the scope of the development reacting to circumstances and change to maximise the benefit to the Employer. However the Contractor will be required to deliver the defined Minimum Viable Product to a fixed price. This provides a standard basis against which Contractors can be measured.

The Employer expects to use the Contractor's services to continue the development of T-TOC on a time and materials basis. Therefore a budget for a defined number of days of effort, termed as the Additional Defined Effort, is required from the Contractor.

Delivering the MVP

The Minimum Viable Product (MVP) is defined in section 6 of this document. The Contractor must provide a fixed price for the effort required to deliver all of the requirements identified as being part of the MVP

If, at any later stage, the Employer requires any modification to the MVP it will be handled as a contractual change.

Additional Defined Effort

In addition to the provision of the MVP the Contractor must also commit to providing Additional Defined Effort at the same average rate as that incurred to deliver the MVP. Thus if the MVP could be delivered for £500,000 using 1000 days of effort then the Contractor is committed to providing the Additional Defined Effort at a rate of £500 per day.

The price for any effort beyond the Additional Defined Effort will be as per the day rates specified within the procurement framework arrangements.

The Customer has specified that the Additional Defined Effort will be 2000 days.

5.3. Product Cost

The price provided by the Contractor must include all of the costs associated with the procurement and ongoing use of all the selected products for the development of the function and operation over a 5 year period. The costs should be based on all aspects being procured by the Employer via the Contractor, unless the Contractor can demonstrate that there would benefits in utilising other capabilities which the Employer already owns.

For products provided as Software as a Service (SaaS), where the product supplier is providing hosting, this cost will include the hosting.

The costs should be divided into Capital Costs and Recurring Costs.

Capital Costs

The Contractor should include all of the initial costs of procuring the products and their use in developing the solution. These could include: the initial purchase price, licence costs for developers and support costs during development.

In order to provide a common basis for comparison the Capital Costs should cover the period from award of contract until the successful deployment of the MVP.

Recurring Costs

The Contractor should include all of the recurring costs of using the products for a five calendar year period starting at the successful deployment of the MVP. These could include: the annual licence fees, appropriate support costs and any other recurring costs.

5.4. Hosting and Infrastructure

The price provided by the Contractor must include all of the costs associated with the procurement of and ongoing hosting for the development of the function and operation over a 5 year period. The costs should be based on the hosting services being procured by the Employer via the Contractor, unless the Contractor can demonstrate that there would benefits in utilising other hosting capabilities which the Employer already owns.

The hosting arrangements should include sufficient storage for at least three years of operation, based on the storage requirements described in the T-TOC Architecture Definition,

For products provided as Software as a Service (SaaS), where the product supplier is providing hosting, the cost for hosting may be entirely included within the Product Costs.

Contractors may assume that the costs of hosting SNMP Managers whether hardware or software, and which will be hosted within the CHARM infrastructure, can be excluded from their costs.

Capital Costs

The Contractor should include all of the initial costs of procuring the hosting and its use in developing the solution. These could include: any initial purchase cost and/or provisioning costs incurred during development.

In order to provide a common basis for comparison the Capital Costs should cover the period from award of contract until the successful deployment of the MVP.

Recurring Costs

The Contractor should include all of the recurring costs for hosting covering a five calendar year period starting at the successful deployment of the MVP. These could include: the annual support fees, estimated resource & provisioning charges and any other recurring costs.

5.5. Support

The Contractor should provide a fixed cost for supporting the solution as delivered for the MVP. This cost should include the Contractor's staff but not hosting and product costs already described above. It should also include a provision for the administration of key products, including any ESB.

6. Overall Tender Scoring

The Contractor with the highest total quality mark is given a score of 100. The score of the other potential Contractors will be calculated by deducting from 100, one point for each full percentage point by which their mark is below the highest mark.

The Contractor with the lowest price submitted is given a score of 100. The scores of other potential Contractors are calculated by deducting from 100 one point for each full percentage point by which their price is above the lowest price. Any negative financial scores will be normalised to zero

The quality score and the financial score will be combined in the ratio of 80:20 applied to the quality and finance scores respectively. The total will be expressed to one decimal place. If more than one potential Contractor has the same highest score, the Contractor with the highest quality score will be considered further.

7. Minimum Viable Product

7.1. Definition of Minimum Viable Product

The Minimum Viable Product (MVP) represents the core set of functionality required and is divided for convenience into a number of work areas, or capabilities . The requirements listed in the following sections define the baseline functionality which must be delivered , and for which Contractors will need to provide a fixed price for the delivery of those requirements.

7.2. Monitoring and Automatic Analysis

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Define and agree the format for publishing service-related health and status reports.
2.	Define and agree the format for publishing device-related status and alert reports.
3.	Provide a web service which enables NRTS to report service health and status using the published format.
4.	Provide a web service which enables SWIS to report device status using the published format.
5.	Provide a web service which enables SWIS to report alerts affecting a device using the published format.
6.	Provide an SNMP element manager function capable of managing and interrogating SNMP v3 devices and producing service health and status reports using the published format.
7.	Provide the necessary support (including software development) to enable CHARM to report the status of NMCS2, MIDAS and 2nd generation CCTV devices using the published format.
8.	Provide the necessary support (including software development) to enable SWIS to report the status of ESS devices using the published

	format.
9.	Provide an application that is able to interpret device-related status and alerts from SWIS as service-related health and status by applying configurable rules .
10.	Provide a configurable rules engine, or 'alarm manager' style application, capable of identifying Operational Assets, Equipment Items and Fixed Assets affected by the following service-related notifications: • health and status reports • incident reports Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
11.	Provide a configurable rules engine, or 'alarm manager' style application, capable of associating Operational Assets, Equipment Items and Fixed Assets identified as being affected with current Incidents, generating new Incidents if necessary. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
12.	Provide a configurable rules engine capable of assigning a criticality and impact level to each Incident by interpreting related information. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.
13.	Publish Incident reports to the separately procured Service Management function using an agreed format and method.
14.	Ensure that all data collected and generated is made available to the Operational Data Store using agreed formats. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS

7.3. Service Management

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Provide the capability to use an inventory provided by another application.
2.	Provide the capability to host an inventory that is fully accessible and addressable by other functions and that is able to model the following entities: • Equipment Item • Operational Asset • Fixed Asset • Communications • Power Supply
3.	Provide the capability to build and use Equipment Templates and Equipment Types to define Operational Assets where the Equipment

	Items are not completely described. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.
4.	Provide the capability to interact with the Workflows function in order to associate Tasks with Incidents.
5.	Migrate information relating to SWIS data into the inventory it will use.
6.	Support the management of incidents using ITIL aligned business processes, including: • creation by Monitoring and Analysis • update by Monitoring and Analysis • update by Workflow • closure by Monitoring and Analysis Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
7.	Provide the capability to generate incident reports in a standard format, to be agreed with HE. *(This is required in order to satisfy requirements currently fulfilled by the NFDB system.)*
8.	Support the provision of incident reporting from mobile devices. *(This is required in order to satisfy requirements currently fulfilled by existing handl held devices.)*

7.4. Analysis and Reporting

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Install and configure a set of reporting tools able to interrogate and report on data held across normalised relational databases and dimensionally modelled (star schemas) data. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.
2.	Train an HE team in order to enable them to build new management reports using the reporting tools.
3.	Provide a set of reports defined by HE as being required to satisfy immediate reporting needs. These will include all existing KPI reports currently used to monitor performance, such as device availability. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
4.	Install and configure a set of analysis, modelling and visualisation tools able to interrogate and report on data held across normalised relational databases, dimensionally modelled (star schemas) data and unstructured data.
5.	Train a number of five HE staff working in the Technology Intelligence

	Unit in order to enable them to create ad hoc analysis, modelling and visualisations using the analysis tools.
6.	Support the provision of dashboards and reporting to mobile devices. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.

7.5. Workflow

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Install and configure an application that provides The Customer with the capability to develop and execute workflows, orchestrating systems and people.
2.	Train a team of five Customer staff to enable them to develop and execute workflows, orchestrating systems and people.
3.	Provide a set of workflows that enable users to perform the following: • create Tasks • assigned Tasks to organisations • track changes to the status of Tasks • close Tasks Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
4.	Provide a set of workflows that enable users to collect a set of information and authorisations for a Task, at least as comprehensively as the current PEW application. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
5.	Provide the capability to perform the following: • associate Incidents with a Task • display information about a Task, and associated Incidents • create dependencies between Tasks • enable manual scheduling of Tasks • enable systems to create and schedule Tasks
	Provide a set of workflows that interact with Service Management in order to manage Incidents, and that as a minimum: • access and update the Inventory of operational assets and equipment • access and update Incident status Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
	Support remote access to workflow functions via mobile devices. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.

7.6. Document and Record Management

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Install and configure an application that provides a searchable repository for documents and records in common formats (e.g. pdf, Word, XML, jpg, mpeg etc.).
2.	Provide an initial set of tagged documents and records that meet an agreed minimum set of records for each Equipment Item and Operational Asset (subject to availability of such information within HE). Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
3.	Define a set of business processes and governance structures to oversee the management of documents and records for operational technology.
4.	Provide the capability to associate documents and records with Equipment Items, Operational Assets and Fixed Assets. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.
5.	Provide a tool for collecting experience into a knowledge base. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.
6.	Provide access to all documents and records within the system via an API .

7.7. Asset Management

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Provide the capability to use an inventory provided by another function.
2.	Provide the capability to host an inventory that is fully accessible and addressable by other functions and that is able to model the following entities: • Equipment Item • Operational Asset • Fixed Asset • Communications • Power Supply
3.	Provide the capability to use a document and record management facility provided by another function.
4.	Provide the capability to host a document and record management capability that fully accessible and addressable by other functions and is able to support records for the following types of Activity: • Procurement • Update

	• Action • Status • Disposal Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to deploying the selected software product.
5.	Provide the capability to build Asset management Plans that include scheduled and timetabled activities.
6.	Provide the capability to invoke Task creation in the selected Workflow product.
7.	Provide the capability to interact with the Document and Record Management function in order to associate documents and records with Equipment Items, Operational Assets and Fixed Assets. Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS
8.	Provide the capability to present information from an Asset Management Plan in relation to an Operational Asset.
9.	Provide the capability to present information from an Equipment Management Plan in relation to an Equipment Item.
10	Migrate the following data into the inventory or documents and record management store as appropriate: • All asset management data held within TPMS, building an Asset Management Plan for each equipment Item and Operational Asset • All specification documents relevant to installed equipment provided by The Customer Demonstration of this capability within the fixed price element will be limited to SWIS

7.8. Non-Functional Requirements

Ref.	Requirement
1.	Provide sufficient performance, communication bandwidth and storage to receive and process 30000 status messages from SWIS during each period without any need to re-request messages due to lack of T-TOC capacity.
2.	Support at least 5 service administrators
3.	Support at least 50 users able to receive incident reports and be included in workflows for resolving those incidents
4.	Support at least 5 users able to design reports
5.	Support at least 20 users able to request and receive reports generated by the system
6.	Provide storage for at least 5 years of all the data collected and

	produced by the system. It is acceptable for the oldest three years of data to be regarded as infrequently accessed for the purposes of costing.

8. References

No.	Reference	Title
1.	EA-Principles-v2.1 FINAL January 2016	Enterprise Architecture (EA) Principles

- End of Document -