



STATE OF WASHINGTON
 ENTERPRISE SERVICES OF INSERT PURCHASER
NAME (PURCHASER)
 ITPS WORK REQUEST

Purchaser Work Request No: WR 13-002-104

DES Work Request (Tracking) No: WR-13-132

- This is a Second-Tier Work Request issued by the Purchaser named above pursuant to the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Information Technology Professional Services (ITPS) program.
- Only if your firm has an ITPS Master Contract with DES for the one or more Technical Service Categories and Skill Levels indicated below, may your firm submit a Response to this Work Request.
- All rights and obligations of the parties are subject to and governed by the terms of the Master Contract including any subsequent modifications incorporated herein.

SCHEDULE

Date Issued: June 17, 2013

Questions Due: June 20, 2013

Answers Submitted: June 26, 2013

Response Due Date: July 2, 2013, 4:00 PM PDT

WORK PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

FROM: 08/19/2013

To: 12/31/2016

Work Request Coordinator

Name: Jilene Siegel

Title: Contracts Manager

Address: Department of Retirement Systems
 PO Box 48380
 Olympia, WA 98504-8380

Phone: (360) 664-7291

E-mail: Jilene.Siegel@drs.wa.gov

- 1. IT Funding Request, Financial Analysis
- 2. IT Business Analysis
- 3. External IT Quality Assurance
- 4. IT Project Management
- 5. Technology Architecture Development
- 6. Security Analysis
- 7. Enterprise Content Management
- 8. Contingency & Disaster Recovery Planning
- 9. Systems Analysis
- 10. Network Administration
- 11. Software Quality Assurance & Testing
- 12. Desktop Applications Development & Training
- 13. Geographic Information Systems Application Development
- 14. Workstation Installation & Support
- 15. Client Server, Web & N-Tier Application Development
- 16. General Mainframe Development
- 17. General Database Administrator/Database Developer/Data Analyst

EXPERIENCE LEVEL(S) REQUESTED

- Junior a minimum of one (1) year of recent experience and demonstrated knowledge, skills and abilities
- Journey a minimum of three (3) years of recent experience & demonstrated superior knowledge, skills, and abilities
- Senior a minimum of five (5) years of recent experience & demonstrated superior knowledge, skills, and abilities
- Expert a minimum of eight (8) years of increasing levels of responsibilities, and supervisory or management responsibility

American Recovery & Reinvestment Act funding

Yes No The selected vendor will be assigned an Purchaser workstation(s) and assessed a workstation fee of \$XXXX per month for each workstation.

I. REQUEST FOR SPECIFICATIONS

A. Quality Assurance Services

B. Background

The Washington State Department of Retirement Systems' (DRS) anticipates implementing two significant projects and is seeking a qualified vendor to provide independent quality assurance services for one or both projects.

Employer Reporting Application (ERA) Project

The DRS Employer Information System (EIS) processes retirement data for approximately 300,000 active members from over 1,300 employers that participate in the state's 15 pension plans and the Deferred Compensation Program. EIS collects and processes more than one million transactions each month containing critical core data that is ultimately used to calculate and distribute benefits.

EIS is over 20 years old. The original system design and underlying architecture create challenges for keeping pace with increasingly complex business requirements crucial to the management of the state's retirement data. Constraints posed by the current system architecture have severely limited the system's ability to adapt, which has translated into higher resource demands, higher cost and higher risk of failure when implementing new business processes.

DRS submitted a funding request to the 2013 Washington State Legislature, to replace EIS with an efficient tool that will meet the needs of its customers.

After considerable research, the Business Process Management Suite (BPMS) technology was selected as the new platform for building the new ERA, which is one of several mission critical components that make up the entire retirement systems infrastructure.

The project is structured into four distinct phases:

- 1) Employer Business Process Modeling/Planning (currently underway)
- 2) BPMS Procurement and Installation (procurement currently underway)
- 3) Initial Business Process Development (Proof-of-Concept)
- 4) Remainder of Business Process Development

Public Employees' Saving Plan (PESP) Project

If [Senate Bill 5851](#) is enacted, DRS will implement a new optional defined contribution plan for public employees. This bill would provide an additional retirement plan choice for certain employees hired into eligible positions. PESP is a defined contribution plan, where member and employer contributions are invested at the discretion of the member in investment options provided by DRS.

C. Project Scope of Work

The Quality Assurance (QA) Consultant will ensure that the appropriate quality management and risk management activities are conducted. Activities will include Quality Management Planning, Quality Control, Quality Assurance, Independent Verification and Validation, and Risk Assessment reviews.

The primary goals of this QA effort are:

- 1) Assess the project(s) state as of the delivery date of each QA report
- 2) Assess project(s) deliverables against established standards for quality

- 3) Identify project(s) risks and recommend management strategies and mitigations
- 4) Provide input that supports Project Management in detecting and responding to variations in the project that threaten project completion or quality

To this end, the QA Consultant will review project reporting and available data sources, as well as conduct periodic interviews of project personnel, including other third-party vendors, to derive findings and make recommendations. This activity will be performed monthly with quarterly reporting, unless the QA Consultant identifies a major threat to the project that needs immediate escalation to the Executive Sponsor.

DRS plans to follow the Washington Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) policies (132) and guidelines¹ for using QA consultants as outlined below:

- Engage QA Practitioners that have recent professional experience assessing information technology (IT) projects of similar or greater size, risk, and complexity when compared to the project being undertaken.
- Agencies shall not use the services of a QA Practitioner on any project where the QA Practitioner is, or has been used, on any non-QA activities for the same project.
- The QA Practitioner shall report directly to the Executive Sponsor(s) and work with all members of the project team.
 - Work with the project team includes providing informal recommendations and professional advice. The project team includes, but is not limited to, key staff such as the project director, project manager, business sponsor, and others.
- Quality Assurance reports shall contain the following:
 - A cover letter signed by the QA Practitioner responsible for the content that attests to the independent preparation of the report.
 - An executive summary that describes:
 - The QA Practitioner’s brief assessment of the project.
 - A summary of any findings, recommendations, and significant risks contained in the detailed portion of the QA report.
 - The agency’s response to any findings, recommendations, and significant risks.
 - A listing of any findings the agency has not addressed or has not resolved by the due date.
 - Sections that include detailed descriptions of the information included in the executive summary.
 - A table that summarizes all open findings as well as those closed during the reporting period, including the QA Practitioner’s assessment of the agency’s actions.

¹ See OCIO Policy no. 132 - Providing Quality Assurance for Information Technology Projects <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/ocio/policies/documents/132.pdf>

D. Deliverables

The QA Consultant shall provide the following deliverables:

- Quality Assurance Plan - This plan defines how the independent quality assurance consultant will provide the requested services.
- Monthly Quality Assurance Reviews with Quarterly Reports - The Quarterly Reports will be addressed to the project’s executive sponsors and will follow the OCIO standard (Policy 132) for quality assurance reporting.
- Additional Assessments – At the discretion of the Executive Sponsor, additional project assessments may be requested.

E. Estimated Procurement Schedule

Issue Work Request	<i>June 17, 2013</i>
Questions Due	<i>June 20, 2013</i>
Complaints Due	<i>June 25, 2013</i>
Answers Posted	<i>June 26, 2013</i>
Responses Due	<i>July 2, 2013, 4:00 PM PDT</i>
Announce Apparent Successful Vendor	<i>July 23, 2013</i>
Last Day to Request Debriefing Conference	<i>July 26, 2013</i>
Debriefing Conferences (if requested)	<i>July 29-31, 2013</i>
Last Day to File a Protest	<i>Five business days after debriefing</i>
Begin Contract Work	<i>August 19, 2013</i>

II. VENDOR’S RESPONSE

A. Work Request Coordinator and Submission of Response

Responses shall be emailed on or before the response due date. Vendors shall send their proposals to the Work Request Coordinator:

Work Request Coordinator	Jilene Siegel
Email	Jilene.siegel@drs.wa.gov
Address	6835 Capitol Blvd SE PO Box 48380, Tumwater WA 98504-8380

Submittal by email is preferred. Hard copies of the proposal will also be accepted by mail or in-person delivery. Faxed proposals will not be accepted.

Attachments to e-mail shall be in PDF formatted files or Microsoft Office formatted files (Word, Excel, Visio, or PowerPoint). Zipped files cannot be received and cannot be used

for the submission of proposals. DRS does not take responsibility for any problems with e-mail.

If hard copies are submitted, the envelope should be clearly marked to the attention of the Work Request Coordinator and sent to the address listed above. Consultants mailing proposals should allow normal mail delivery time to ensure timely receipt of their proposals by the Work Request Coordinator.

Consultants assume the risk for the method of delivery chosen. DRS assumes no responsibility for delays caused by any delivery service. Late proposals will not be accepted and will be automatically disqualified from further consideration. All proposals and any accompanying documentation become the property of DRS and will not be returned.

B. Work Request Response – Instructions to Vendors

Vendor proposal must include:

- Letter of Submittal;
- Response to Exhibit A – Checklist for Responsiveness
- Response to Exhibit B - Questionnaire and Cost Quotation

III. EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA

A. Mandatory and Highly Desirable Experience and Qualifications

- a. Mandatory Experience and Qualifications:
 - i. Experience providing independent quality assurance services on Washington information technology projects following the OCIO Policy 132.
 - ii. Experience providing independent quality assurance services for projects acquiring and installing large software applications.
 - iii. Experience in providing independent quality assurance services for application development projects involving complex interfaces with external entities.
 - iv. The Consultant must have a methodology for providing quality assurance services.
- b. Highly Desired Experience and Qualifications:
 - i. The Consultant's key staff should have significant experience providing independent quality assurance services to state organizations of similar size and projects with similar scope, risk, and complexity.
 - ii. Experience providing quality assurance services to organizations that utilize central IT services from Washington State's Consolidated Technology Services (CTS).

- iii. Experience providing quality assurance services to organizations using Business Process Management (BPM) and Business Process Management Suite (BPMS).
- iv. Experience providing quality assurance services to organizations using agile software development methodology.
- v. Project Management and/or analysis and systems development experience in the business environment of pensions, finance or investment related fields.
- vi. The Consultant should have project management credentials such as PMI Project Management Professional (PMP) Certification or equivalent.

B. References

The Vendor shall provide three professional references for the proposed QA Consultant assigned to the project. Reference checks will only be conducted for the top scoring Vendors. Reference checks will inquire regarding:

- QA Consultant completed scope of work
- QA Consultant met deadlines and expectations
- QA Consultant provided effective QA that added value
- QA Consultant was easy to work with
- QA Consultant's work products were of high quality

DRS will also utilize Vendor performance evaluations submitted to the Department of Enterprise Services based on previous master contract work.

C. Oral Presentation/Interview (if used)

DRS may invite one or more Consultants with the best scoring proposals to participate in an oral interview. Oral interviews, if conducted, will be evaluated separately from the written proposals.

D. Evaluation Procedure

Responsive proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements stated in this solicitation and any addenda issued. The evaluation of proposals shall be accomplished by an evaluation team, to be designated by DRS, which will determine the ranking of the proposals.

Items in Exhibit A, Checklist for Responsiveness, marked "mandatory" must be included as part of the proposal for the proposal to be considered responsive; however, these items are not scored. Items marked "scored" are those that are awarded points as part of the evaluation conducted by the evaluation team. DRS, at its sole discretion, may elect to select the top-scoring Consultants as finalists for an oral interview and for conducting reference checks.

E. Weight Evaluation Criteria

<u>PRELIMINARY SCORE</u> <u>REQUIREMENTS/CRITERIA</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u> <u>ASSIGNED</u>
Qualifications and Experience of QA Consultant	30
Qualifications and Experience of Vendor	20
Approach/Methodology/Availability	25
Cost Proposal	25

IV. ADMINISTRATION

A. Complaint Process

Any Vendor who is qualified to respond to this Work Request may submit a complaint up to five (5) business days prior to the response deadline. Grounds for the complaint may include:

- a. The solicitation unnecessarily restricts competition;
- b. The solicitation evaluation or scoring process is unfair or flawed; or
- c. The solicitation requirements are inadequate or insufficient to prepare a response

Interested Vendors should note that, if they choose not to file a complaint, they waive their right to file a protest based on grounds that could have been raised as a complaint.

Complaints must meet the following requirements: be in writing; sent to the Work Request Coordinator in a timely manner; should clearly articulate the basis for the complaint; and should propose a remedy. DRS will send a written response to the complainant before the deadline for response submissions. The response will explain DRS's decision and any steps it will take in response to the complaint. The complaint and the response, including any changes to the solicitation that may result, will be posted on DRS' website and on WEBS.

B. Debriefing

All Vendors who submit a response to this solicitation will be given the opportunity for a debriefing conference if requested. The request for a debriefing conference must be submitted by email to the Work Request Coordinator in accordance with the estimated procurement schedule in Section I OR within three (3) business days after notification of the ASV. A debriefing will be scheduled in accordance with the dates in the procurement schedule. If additional time is required, the requesting party will be notified of the delay. Discussion will be limited to a critique of the requesting Vendor's proposal. Comparisons between proposals or evaluations of other proposals will not be allowed. Debriefing conferences may be conducted in person or by telephone and will be scheduled for a maximum of thirty (30) minutes.

C. Protest Procedure

No protest may be submitted until after DRS has announced the Apparent Successful Vendor. After that announcement, an unsuccessful Vendor who timely requested and participated in a debriefing conference may file a protest. The protest must be filed with the Work Request Coordinator within five business days after the completion of the protester's debriefing conference.

DRS reserves the right to reject, without consideration, any protest that does not comply with any requirement in this section.

DRS will only consider a protest if it is factually and unambiguously based on one or more of the following grounds:

1. Errors in scoring the protester's response.
2. Failure to follow the procedures described in this solicitation document, applicable law or rule.
3. Bias, discrimination, or conflict of interest negatively affecting the protester's evaluation or interests.

The protest must be written and signed by a person authorized to bind the protester to a contractual relationship. If a protest is submitted electronically, a hard copy, with original signature(s), must be mailed to the Work Request Coordinator on the same day of electronic transmission.

The protest must contain:

1. The name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address of the person responsible for submitting the protest.
2. A clear and factually specific statement of the ground(s) for the protest.
3. A complete and specific statement of the relief or corrective action requested.

Protest process:

- a. A person who was not involved in the solicitation process will objectively review the information submitted by the protester, as well as other relevant facts known to DRS.
- b. If a protest directly affects another Vendor's interests, DRS will give that Vendor an opportunity to submit its views and any relevant information to the Work Request Coordinator.
- c. DRS will resolve the protest by making appropriate findings and deciding on an appropriate course of action. DRS may find, for example, that:
 1. The protest lacks merit, and the procurement process will be upheld.
 2. Only technical or harmless errors occurred, which had no significant effect on the fairness or legality of the procurement process, and the procurement process will be upheld.

3. The protest has merit, and DRS will take corrective action, such as reevaluating all responses, cancelling the procurement, or reissuing the Work Request.
- d. DRS will send its written response to the protester within ten business days after receiving the protest, unless it extends that time period and explains the reason(s) for that extension to the protester.

Option To Extend

DRS reserves the right to extend the Work Order issued under this Work Request for one (1) one year period at DRS' option.

Right to Cancel

DRS reserves the right to cancel this Work Request at any time, reject any and all responses received, and/or not to execute a Work Order from this Work Request without penalty to DRS. The release of this solicitation document does not obligate DRS to contract for the services specified in this Work Request. DRS shall not be liable for any costs incurred by a Vendor in preparation of a proposal submitted in response to this Work Request, in the conduct of an oral interview, or any other activity related to responding to this Work Request.

Note: Attached is the Sample Work Order

Exhibit A

CHECKLIST FOR RESPONSIVENESS

- _____ One (1) original Letter of Submittal was submitted with the Vendor's proposal. Letter of Submittal was signed by a person authorized to legally obligate the QA Consultant. (Mandatory)
- _____ Proposal was submitted on or before 4:00 p.m. on July 2, 2013. (Mandatory)
- _____ Vendor provided qualifications and experience for proposed QA Consultant(s). (Scored)
- _____ Vendor provided qualifications and experience of the Vendor. (Scored)
- _____ Vendor provided and described the Approach/Methodology/Availabilities of the proposed QA Consultant(s). (Scored)
- _____ The maximum contract total does not exceed \$150,000.00. (Mandatory and Scored)
- _____ Vendor provided references for proposed QA Consultant(s). (Mandatory)
- _____ Vendor references were provided. (Mandatory)
- _____ Proposal provided 90 days for acceptance of its terms from the due date of proposals. (Mandatory)

Exhibit B

QUESTIONNAIRE AND COST QUOTATION

1. **Qualifications and Experience of QA Consultant (SCORED)**

- A. Identify QA Consultant(s) who will provide the service under the potential work order, indicating the responsibilities and qualifications of such personnel. In particular, please provide the following information:
- Experience providing independent quality assurance services on Washington information technology projects following the OCIO Policy 132.
 - Experience providing independent quality assurance services for projects acquiring and installing large software applications.
 - Experience providing independent quality assurance services for application development projects involving complex interfaces with external entities.
 - Experience providing independent quality assurance services to state organizations of similar size and projects with similar scope, risk, and complexity.
 - Experience providing quality assurance services to organizations that utilize central IT services from Washington State's Consolidated Technology Services (CTS).
 - Experience providing quality assurance services to organizations using Business Process Management (BPM) and Business Process Management Suite (BPMS).
 - Experience providing quality assurance services to organizations using agile software development methodology.
 - Project Management and/or analysis and systems development experience in the business environment of pensions, finance or investment related fields.
 - Identify any credentials the Consultant possesses relevant to this scope of work such as PMI Project Management Professional (PMP) Certification or equivalent.
- B. Provide résumés for the proposed QA Consultant(s), which include information on the individual's particular skills related to this project, education, experience, significant accomplishments and any other pertinent information.

2. **Qualifications and Experience of Vendor (SCORED)**

- Overall experience providing Quality Assurance services.
- Experience providing independent quality assurance services on Washington information technology projects following the OCIO Policy 132.
- Experience providing independent quality assurance services for projects acquiring and installing large software applications.

3. **Approach/Methodology/Availability (SCORED)**

- Describe the Consultant's approach to providing QA services.
- Describe the tools that will be used and provide an example of a recent QA report.

- Describe how the Consultant will adapt their process to meet Washington QA Practices (OCIO Policy 132).
- Describe the approach the Consultant will use to track risks associated with this project.
- Describe the approach the Consultant will use to work with the project team in detecting and responding to variations in the project that threaten project completion or quality.

4. Cost Proposal (SCORED)

For both projects (ERA and PESP), the Vendor shall provide a not-to-exceed deliverable based cost proposal for the QA Plan and Monthly Assessments with Quarterly QA Reports. The Vendor shall disclose the assumptions used for determining these costs, including rates and hours per deliverable. In addition, the Vendor shall provide an hourly rate amount for any additional assessments requested by the Executive Sponsor.

Deliverable #1 – QA Plan

Project	Total Cost	Assumptions (hourly rate, total number of hours, other)
ERA		
PESP		

Deliverable #2 – Monthly Assessments with Quarterly QA Reports

Project	# Reports*	Cost Per Quarterly Report	Assumptions (hourly rate, total number of hours, other)
ERA	12		
PESP	8		

*Estimated number of reports. This number could change depending on duration of project(s).

Deliverable #3 – Additional Assessments or Services

Hourly Rate

5. References for QA Consultant(s) (Mandatory)

List names, addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses of three business references for which work has been accomplished by the proposed QA Consultant(s) and briefly describe the type of service provided. The Consultant(s) must grant permission to DRS to contact the references. Do not include current DRS staff as references.

6. References for Vendor (Mandatory)

List names, addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses of three business references for which work has been accomplished by the Vendor and briefly describe the type of service provided.

SAMPLE WORK ORDER

 STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF <u>INSERT PURCHASER NAME</u> <u>(PURCHASER)</u> ITPS WORK ORDER	PURCHASER WORK ORDER NO.	CONTRACTOR'S DES ITPS MASTER CONTRACT NO.

SECTION 1: PARTIES

This Work Order ("Contract") is entered into by the Department of Retirement Systems located at 6835 Capitol Blvd SE, Tumwater, Washington, and [Contractor], a corporation licensed to conduct business in the state of Washington, located at [Contractor's address] for the purpose of providing External IT Quality Assurance.

SECTION 2: PURPOSE

The Quality Assurance (QA) Consultant will ensure that the appropriate quality management and risk management activities are conducted. Activities will include Quality Management Planning, Quality Control, Quality Assurance, Independent Verification and Validation, and Risk Assessment reviews.

The primary goals of this QA effort are:

- 1) Assess the project(s) state as of the delivery date of each QA report
- 2) Assess project(s) deliverables against established standards for quality
- 3) Identify project(s) risks and recommend management strategies and mitigations
- 4) Provide input that supports Project Management in detecting and responding to variations in the project that threaten project completion or quality

SECTION 3: STATEMENT OF WORK

The QA Consultant will review project reporting and available data sources, as well as conduct periodic interviews of project personnel, including other third-party vendors, to derive findings and make recommendations. This activity will be performed monthly with quarterly reporting, unless the QA Consultant identifies a major threat to the project that needs immediate escalation to the Executive Sponsor.

DRS plans to follow the Washington Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) policies (132) and guidelines for using QA consultants as outlined below:

- The QA Practitioner shall report directly to the Executive Sponsor(s) and work with all members of the project team.
 - Work with the project team includes providing informal recommendations and professional advice. The project team includes, but is not limited to, key staff such as the project director, project manager, business sponsor, and others.
- Quality Assurance reports shall contain the following:
 - A cover letter signed by the QA Practitioner responsible for the content that attests to the independent preparation of the report.
 - An executive summary that describes:
 - The QA Practitioner's brief assessment of the project.
 - A summary of any findings, recommendations, and significant risks contained in the detailed portion of the QA report.
 - The agency's response to any findings, recommendations, and significant risks.
 - A listing of any findings the agency has not addressed or has not resolved by the due date.
 - Sections that include detailed descriptions of the information included in the executive summary.
 - A table that summarizes all open findings as well as those closed during the reporting period, including the QA Practitioner's assessment of the agency's actions.

WORK PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE START DATE: _____ **END DATE** _____

This Work Order may be extended by one additional one-year period or otherwise amended at the sole discretion of the PURCHASER by written agreement between the parties hereto.

SECTION 4: COMPENSATION

Check the appropriate Box and fill in the number of Workstations assigned, if applicable

Yes No The Contractor is assigned _____ workstation(s) and assessed a workstation fee of \$xxx.xx per month for each workstation.

BUDGET

TASKS/DELIVERABLES		SKILL LEVEL	ESTIMATED HOURS	HOURLY RATE <i>(IF APPLICABLE)</i>	FLAT FEE <i>(IF APPLICABLE)</i>
1	(i.e., title of deliverable, not defined , etc.)			\$	\$
2				\$	\$
3				\$	\$

(MAXIMUM COMPENSATION OF THIS WORK ORDER) TOTAL COST \$

PURCHASER COST CODES

MASTER INDEX	FUND	APPN INDEX	OBJECT	SUB-OBJECT	DOLLARS
					\$
					\$

(MAXIMUM COMPENSATION OF THIS WORK ORDER) TOTAL COST \$

SECTION 5: SPECIAL TERMS & CONDITIONS

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Work Order.

By signing below, the Purchaser and the Contractor acknowledge that this Work Order is issued under the provisions of the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services Information Technology Professional Services Master Contract Program. The services authorized are within the scope of services set forth in the *Purpose* of the Master Contract between DES and the Contractor. All rights and obligations of the parties are subject to and governed by the Master Contract including any subsequent modifications incorporated herein. The persons signing below warrant that they have the authority to execute this Work Order.

CONTRACTOR NAME		PURCHASER	
ADDRESS		ADDRESS	
EMAIL			
PHONE			
<i>(Signature)</i>		<i>(Signature)</i>	
<i>(Date)</i>		<i>(Date)</i>	
PRINT NAME		PRINT NAME	
TITLE		TITLE	
CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE PROVIDED <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO ENDORSEMENT PROVIDED <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			

Purchaser's Work Order Manager and the Contractor's Project Manager
are responsible for and shall be the contact person for all communications/billings regarding performance of this Work Order.

CONTRACTOR PROJECT MANAGER		PURCHASER WORK ORDER MANAGER	
ADDRESS		ADDRESS	
TELEPHONE NO.		TELEPHONE NO.	
E-MAIL		E-MAIL	