FINANCE COMMITTEE
December 1994

The Finance Committee met on December 8, 1994 with the following in attendance:

Rick Lauber, Chairman	Steve Pennoyer
Rich Marasco	Marcus Hartley
Clarence Pautzke	Chris Oliver
Judy Willoughby	

The Council put an RFP to contractors to develop conceptual models for complex database. Six proposals were received and evaluated by staff. These evaluations were explained to the Committee by Marcus, Clarence and Chris. After discussion it was decided to award the contract to Advanced Technologies Consulting Group of Anchorage.

Attachment

North Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Richard B. Lauber, Chairman
Clarence G. Pautzke, Executive Director

605 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 103136
Anchorage, AK 99510

Telephone: (907) 271-2809
Fax: (907) 271-2817

TO: Chairman Lauber, and Members of the Finance Committee

FROM: Marcus L. Hartley

DATE: December 1, 1994

SUBJECT: Contract Award

The Council received six proposals in response to our recent RFP (94-2). After careful review the Council Staff have concluded that the contract should be awarded to Advanced Technologies Consulting Group of Anchorage, Alaska (AdTech). This proposal most closely met expectations in terms of project scope and Council staff involvement. Among the proposals submitted, AdTech's investigators appeared to have the greatest amount of experience and expertise in the area of the development of conceptual models for complex databases.

The following summarizes the decision process used in evaluating the proposals.

1) Did the proposal clearly recognize the difference between relational and flat databases?
   - One proposal (ISER) did not show a clear recognition of this concept and therefore was rejected.

2) Was the proposal's planned interaction with Council staff sufficient to develop a useful model
   - One proposal (Chow) was rejected and two proposals were scored lower (LGL, R.Data).

3) Did the conceptual model and deliverables proposed meet expectations of the staff.
   - One proposal was scored lower (R.Data).

4) Was the proposal within budget constraints?
   - One proposal was scored lower (AdTech).

5) Was the proposal realistic in terms of what could be accomplished within the budget.
   - One proposal was scored lower (W-B).

6) Was the relevant experience of the principle investigators consistent with the complexity of the conceptual model proposed.
   - Two proposals were scored lower (LGL, W-B).