AMENDMENT 1
FOR
RFP NUMBER 0A1158

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: September 10, 2015

The State of Ohio, through the Department of Administrative Services, for the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Department of Administrative Services is requesting proposals for:

OAKSenterprise

INQUIRY PERIOD BEGINS:	**August 14, 2015**
****INQUIRY PERIOD ENDS:**	**~~October 2, 2015~~ October 12, 2015****
****OPENING DATE:**	**~~October 9, 2015~~ October 19, 2015****
OPENING TIME:	**1:00 p.m.**
OPENING LOCATION:	**Department of Administrative Services General Services Division Bid Desk 4200 Surface Road Columbus, Ohio 43228-1313**

The attached page(s) represent the Request for Proposals (RFP) amendment for the RFP listed above. Please use replacement pages contained in this document to replace the page(s) previously issued by the State.

Specifications and requirements that have been revised are surrounded by double asterisks, bold type and when applicable, strikethrough.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

RFP NUMBER: 0A1158
DATE ISSUED: August 14, 2015

The State of Ohio, through the Department of Administrative Services, for the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Department of Administrative Services is requesting proposals for:

OAKSenterprise

INQUIRY PERIOD BEGINS:	August 14, 2015
**INQUIRY PERIOD ENDS:	~~October 2, 2015~~ October 12, 2015
**OPENING DATE:	~~October 9, 2015~~ October 19, 2015
OPENING TIME:	1:00 P.M.
OPENING LOCATION:	Department of Administrative Services General Services Division Bid Desk 4200 Surface Road Columbus, Ohio 43228-1313
PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE DATE:	September 15, 2015

This RFP consists of five parts and twelve attachments, totaling 86 consecutively numbered pages. Supplements also are attached to this RFP with a beginning header page and an ending trailer page. Please verify that you have a complete copy.

In lieu of taking exceptions to RFP requirements, including but not limited to terms and conditions, scope of work statements, service levels requirements, etc., or providing assumptions that may be unacceptable to the State, offerors are strongly encouraged to use the inquiry process in Part Three of the RFP.

Dates:

Firm Dates	
RFP Issued:	August 14, 2015
Inquiry Period Begins:	August 14, 2015
Pre-Proposal Conference Date:	September 15, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.
Inquiry Period Ends:	****October ~~2~~ 12, 2015, at 8:00 a.m.**
Proposal Due Date:	****October ~~9~~ 19, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.**
Estimated Dates	
Award Date:	December, 2015
Estimated Work Dates	
Work Begins:	****January, ~~2015~~ 2016**

There are references in this RFP to the Proposal due date. Unless it is clearly provided to the contrary in this RFP, any such reference means the date and time (Columbus, Ohio local time) that the Proposals are due and not just the date.

ATTACHMENT ONE: EVALUATION CRITERIA

Mandatory Requirements. The first table lists this RFP's mandatory requirements for each Supplement of this RFP. If the offeror's Proposal meets all the mandatory requirements of a Supplement, the offeror's Proposal may be included in the next part of the technical evaluation phase for those Supplement(s) as described in the next table.

Mandatory Requirements – Supplement 1 (OAKSenterprise – ODOT)	**Reject**	**Accept**
The offeror, as the prime Contractor, must have performed and completed a PeopleSoft major systems implementation or upgrade project using a PeopleSoft 9.0 or higher version HCM Suite for at least one **Public, State, Local or Federal Agency, or Global Fortune 500 company with at least 5,000 employees. **		
The offeror, as the prime Contractor, must have performed and completed a PeopleSoft major systems implementation or upgrade project using a PeopleSoft 9.0 or higher version FIN Suite for at least one **Public, State, Local or Federal Agency, or Global Fortune 500 company with at least ~~$1B~~ **$750M** in **annual** revenue.**		
The offeror, or proposed Sub-Contractor(s), must have performed and completed **a an enterprise level systems implementation or upgrade project using any offeror proposed **third party** software packages **(i.e., Non-PeopleSoft)** for at least one **Public,**-State, Local or Federal ~~Department of Transportation~~ Agency for anything other than the PeopleSoft FIN and HCM modules. **		
Mandatory Requirements – Supplement 2 (OAKSenterprise – Enterprise Procurement)	**Reject**	**Accept**
The offeror, as the prime Contractor, must have performed and completed a PeopleSoft major systems implementation or upgrade project using a PeopleSoft 9.0 or higher version FIN Suite for at least one State, Local, Higher Education, Federal Procurement Agency or Global Fortune 500 Company with at least 1,000 employees (in the company) in a procurement function.		
The offeror, or proposed Sub-Contractor(s), must have performed and completed a Systems Implementation or upgrade project using the offeror proposed software packages for at least one State, Local, Higher Education, Federal Procurement Agency or Global Fortune 500 Company within the procurement function.		
Mandatory Requirements – Supplement 3 (OAKSenterprise – Enterprise Grants Management)	**Reject**	**Accept**
The offeror must meet **one** of the following mandatory requirements: 1. If the offeror is proposing a **PeopleSoft** Enterprise Grants module based solution, then the offeror, as the Prime Contractor, must have performed and completed a PeopleSoft systems implementation or upgrade project using a PeopleSoft 9.0 or higher version Enterprise Grants Module Suite for at least one State, Local, Higher Education or Federal Agency with at least 500 Grant Recipients. 2. If the offeror is proposing a **non-PeopleSoft** Enterprise Grants solution, then the offeror, or proposed Sub-Contractor(s), must have performed and completed a systems implementation or upgrade project using the offeror proposed software grants management packages for at least one State, Local, Higher Education or Federal Agency with at least 500 Grant Recipients.		

Scored Criteria. In the technical evaluation phase, the State will rate the technical merits of the Proposals based on the following requirements and the weight assigned to each requirement:

Supplement 1 Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) Migration to OAKS with Enhanced Functionality					
Scored Criteria	**Weight**	**Does Not Meet**	**Partially Meets**	**Meets**	**Exceeds**
****Offeror Proposed Key Personnel and Team:** The quality of the offeror's proposed Project team to deliver the Projects as defined and required in Supplement 1 including the **demonstrated experience of the offeror's proposed project manager to lead projects in complex, multi-stakeholder environments, the overall** quality **and experience** of the offeror's proposed Project team **(offeror and any proposed sub-contractors)** and ongoing Project delivery capacity will impact the success of the Project**s**. Therefore, each team member's experience, education, and skills will be considered in assigning a score in this area. (Section 12).**	**90**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
Project Implementation Statement of Work Solution - The quality and content of the offeror's Project Work Plan, Microsoft Project schedule and Staffing Plan & Time Commitment information for defined elements of Supplement 1 will be critical aspects of the State's review. The narrative project work plan, project schedule and staffing plan are to be consistent and complementary and must be presented in an appropriate level of detail. This area of the offeror's proposal must clearly demonstrate that the offeror will be prepared to quickly undertake and successfully complete the required tasks across all phases of the Project. (Section 13)	**25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Financial Management - Budget and Financial Management:** The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section 3.1 in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices and ****its approach for the** integration or extension of OAKS ****and/or the implementation of any additional third party solutions to address requirements.****	****~~60~~ 75**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Financial Management - Project Accounting:** The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section 3.2 in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices and **its approach for the** integration or extension of OAKS **and/or the implementation of any additional third-party solutions to address requirements.****	****~~70~~ 40**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Financial Management - Cost Accounting: The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section 3.3 in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices and its approach for integration or extension of OAKS and/or the implementation of any additional third-party solutions to address requirements.**	****30**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Human Capital Management – Human Resource Management:** The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section **4.2 ~~04~~** in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices and integration or extension of OAKS.**	****~~35~~ 25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**

Human Capital Management - Training, Labor Relations and Safety: The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section 4.3 in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices, its approach for analyzing and confirming potential solutions, and its approach for integration or extension of OAKS and/or the implementation of any additional third-party solutions to address requirements.	**30	0	2	5	7
Procure to Pay: The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section **5.3** ~~5.0~~ in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices and integration or extension of OAKS.**	**~~35~~ 45	0	2	5	7
Capital Program Delivery - Program Management: The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section **6.1 ~~6.0~~ in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices, ** **its approach for analyzing and confirming potential solutions, and its approach for meeting the business requirements through extension of OAKS and/or the implementation of enterprise-level, third-party solutions with a proven track record in transportation or other infrastructure- intensive organizations** and **the integration of any third-party solutions to ~~or extension of~~ OAKS.**	**~~80~~ 15	0	2	5	7
Capital Program Delivery – Project Management: The Offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section 6.2 in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices, its approach for analyzing and confirming potential solutions, and its approach for meeting the business requirements through extension of OAKS and/or the implementation of enterprise-level, third-party solutions with a proven track record in transportation or other infrastructure- intensive organizations and the integration of any proposed third- party solutions to OAKS.	**20	0	2	5	7
Capital Program Delivery – Consultant Services: The Offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section 6.3 in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices, its approach for analyzing and confirming potential solutions, and its approach for meeting the business requirements through extension of OAKS and/or the implementation of enterprise-level, third-party solutions with a proven track record in transportation or other infrastructure- intensive organizations and the integration of any proposed third- party solutions to OAKS.	**40	0	2	5	7
Facilities Management: The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 1, Section **7.2** ~~7.0~~ in its entirety, inclusive of requirements matrices, **its approach for analyzing and confirming potential solutions** and integration or extension of OAKS.**	**~~35~~ 30	0	2	5	7

Supplement 2 Enterprise Procurement Requirements					
Scored Criteria	**Weight**	**Does Not Meet**	**Partially Meets**	**Meets**	**Exceeds**
****Adherence to State Delivery Service Level Standards** to the extent that the offeror demonstrates a complete and coherent solution to achieving Development Lifecycle Service Level Agreements including the content, clarity and quality of the offeror's proposal response to Section **12 6** of Supplement 2 in its entirety will be considered in assigning a score in this area.**	**25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Adherence to State Security, Privacy and Data Handling Requirements -** The quality and completeness of the offeror applied to adherence to State Security and Privacy, IT Computing and Data Handling requirements as defined in Supplement **4 6** of this RFP.**	**25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
Total Available Points	**400**				

Supplement 2 Evaluation Scoring Formula. The evaluation team will rate the Proposals that meet the Mandatory Requirements based on the following criteria and respective weights.

Criteria	***Percentage***
Technical Proposal	70%
Cost Summary	20%
MBE Set-aside	10%

The State is committed to making more State contracts, services, benefits and opportunities available to minority business enterprises (MBE). To foster this commitment, the State included an MBE Set-aside component in the Evaluation Scoring Formula (shown above) of this RFP.

To ensure the scoring ratio is maintained, the State will use the following formulas to adjust the points awarded to each offeror.

The offeror with the highest point total for the Supplement 2 Technical Proposal will receive 700 points. The remaining offerors will receive a percentage of the maximum points available based upon the following formulas:

> **Technical Proposal Points** = (Offeror's Technical Proposal Points/Highest Number of Technical Proposal Points Obtained) x 700

The offeror with the lowest proposed Not-To-Exceed Fixed Price will receive 200 points. The remaining offerors will receive a percentage of the maximum cost points available based upon the following formula:

> **Cost Summary Points** = (Lowest Not-To-Exceed Fixed Price/Offeror's Not-To-Exceed Fixed Price) x 200

The offeror with the highest proposed MBE Set-aside Cost percentage will receive 100 points respectively. The remaining offerors will receive a percentage of the maximum MBE Set-aside points available based upon the following formula:

> **MBE Set-aside Points** = (Highest MBE Set-aside Cost Percentage/Offeror's MBE Set-aside Cost Percentage) x 100

Total Points Score: The total points score is calculated using the following formula:

> **Total Points** = Technical Proposal Points + Cost Summary Points + MBE Set-aside Points

Supplement 3 Enterprise Grants Management (EGM) Project					
Scored Criteria	**Weight**	**Does Not Meet**	**Partially Meets**	**Meets**	**Exceeds**
****Offeror Proposed Key Personnel and Team** - The quality of the offeror's proposed Project team to deliver the Projects as defined and required in Supplement 1 including the quality of the offeror's proposed Project team and ongoing Project delivery capacity will impact the success of the Projects. Therefore, each team member's experience, education, and skills will be considered in assigning a score in this area. Supplement 3, Section **8.2** ~~**7.2.****~~	**55**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Project Management and Coordination Services, and Project Delivery, Role and Responsibility Requirements** - The quality and content of the offeror's Project Work Plan, Microsoft Project schedule and Staffing Plan & Time Commitment information for defined elements of Supplement 3, Section **8.3 and 9** ~~**9 and 10**~~ will be critical aspects of the State's review. The narrative project work plan, project schedule and staffing plan are to be consistent and complementary and must be presented in an appropriate level of detail. This area of the offeror's proposal must clearly demonstrate that the offeror will be prepared to quickly undertake and successfully complete the required tasks across all phases of the project.**	**40**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Grants "to Be" Process and Requirements Matrix** - The offeror's proposed approach and solution to deliver the requirements contained in Supplement 3, Sections **5 and 6** ~~**4 and 5**~~ in their entirety, inclusive of the requirements matrix.**	**40**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Data Conversion Solution** – The quality, approach, methods and coverage of the conversion of State data from existing systems and data stores to the Proposed operating environment, systems and reporting elements of the solution in accordance with Section **7** ~~**6**~~ of Supplement 3.**	**20**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Organizational Change Management -** Offeror tools, techniques, and methodologies to implement the required Organizational Change Management Work contained in Sections **11.7, 11.11, 11.15, 11.19 and 11.23** ~~**x**~~ of Supplement 3 in **their** ~~**its**~~ entirety with consideration for offeror Tools/Techniques as proposed and demonstrated, offeror Methodologies as proposed and demonstrated, offeror Demonstrated Experience with Federal, State or Higher Education Grants Applications and Management Processes.**	**35**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
****Project Management Methodology and Standards -** Adherence and ability to deliver the overall project to State Project Management standards and requirements as contained in Supplement 3, Sections **9 thru** 11 in **** their** ~~**its**~~ entirety.**	**25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
Project Completion Activities, Final Documentation and Post Implementation - Support The offerors proposed scope, role and support of the successful transition of the system(s) to production/live use and ability to support resolution of defects in the period following this introduction and handoff to the State for ongoing operation and maintenance in accordance with Supplement 3, Section 12.	**35**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**

Supplement 3 Enterprise Grants Management (EGM) Project					
Scored Criteria	Weight	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
****Adherence to State Delivery Service Level Standards** to the extent that the offeror demonstrates a complete and coherent solution to achieving Development Lifecycle Service Level Agreements including the content, clarity and quality of the offeror's proposal response to Section **18 44** of Supplement 3 in its entirety will be considered in assigning a score in this area.**	**25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
Adherence to State Security, Privacy and Data Handling Requirements - The quality and completeness of the offeror applied to adherence to State Security and Privacy, IT Computing and Data Handling requirements as defined in Supplement 4 of this RFP.	**25**	**0**	**2**	**5**	**7**
Total Available Points	**300**				

Supplement 3 Evaluation Scoring Formula. The evaluation team will rate the Proposals that meet the Mandatory Requirements based on the following criteria and respective weights.

Criteria	*Percentage*
Technical Proposal	70%
Cost Summary	20%
MBE Set-aside	10%

The State is committed to making more State contracts, services, benefits and opportunities available to minority business enterprises (MBE). To foster this commitment, the State included an MBE Set-aside component in the Evaluation Scoring Formula (shown above) of this RFP.

To ensure the scoring ratio is maintained, the State will use the following formulas to adjust the points awarded to each offeror.

The offeror with the highest point total for the Supplement 3 Technical Proposal will receive 700 points. The remaining offerors will receive a percentage of the maximum points available based upon the following formulas:

> **Technical Proposal Points** = (Offeror's Technical Proposal Points/Highest Number of Technical Proposal Points Obtained) x 700

The offeror with the lowest proposed Not-To-Exceed Fixed Price will receive 200 points. The remaining offerors will receive a percentage of the maximum cost points available based upon the following formula:

> **Cost Summary Points** = (Lowest Not-To-Exceed Fixed Price/Offeror's Not-To-Exceed Fixed Price) x 200

The offeror with the highest proposed MBE Set-aside Cost percentage will receive 100 points respectively. The remaining offerors will receive a percentage of the maximum MBE Set-aside points available based upon the following formula:

> **MBE Set-aside Points** = (Highest MBE Set-aside Cost Percentage/Offeror's MBE Set-aside Cost Percentage) x 100

Total Points Score: The total points score is calculated using the following formula:

> **Total Points** = Technical Proposal Points + Cost Summary Points + MBE Set-aside Points

3 **Establish an Standard Operating Platform for more than 15 Agencies who Originate and Administer Grants**

- Foster well-coordinated, controlled, and predictable outcomes with respect to Grant applicants, awards and management
- Drive standard processes, systems and interactions between grantee, grantor and grant administration that make doing business with the State easier and better coordinated
- Surrender/retire dozens of manual adhoc and inconsistent processes associated with Grants across the State enterprise

4 **Extend Business Intelligence Coverage Model to Address Spend, Grants and Department of Transportation Needs**

- Significantly enhance spend management (planning, execution, management and controls) for approximately $10B of State spending
- Eliminate parallel/duplicative and inconsistent reporting mechanisms with respect to Federal, State and Agency analytics and systems – establish "single points of truth" for all data domains (e.g., OAKS, ODOT-specific functions, Grants, Procurement etc.)

1.1 OAKS^{enterprise} Opportunity Conceptual Overview

In keeping with the aforementioned strategy, and in consultation and partnership with a multi-Agency set of constituents, the State has identified a program called OAKSenterprise that is designed to extend the use and usefulness of the OAKS asset to the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), a combined State Procurement and IT Planning and Governance model for the Office of Information Technology (OIT) and the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) General Services Division (GSD) and a collective of Agencies that have Enterprise Grants requirements. This Supplement is provided as an overview and specifics to each of these projects that comprise the OAKSenterprise program are detailed in Supplements 1 through-**~~6~~ 4** of this RFP.

OAKSenterprise Objectives:

- Increase the use and usefulness of the OAKS Enterprise Application Solution while allowing Agencies to reduce or eliminate legacy, non-complimentary and overlapping applications and business processes
- Include high value functionality that drives efficiency for cumbersome, complex and high value business functions that support high value, high volume or financially significant business transactions
- Address Common Enterprise functions not covered via a centralized solution to drive Agency standards and consistency

General Overview of OAKSenterprise Sponsors and Content

value that are proposed for the Software/SaaS package required as well as ongoing maintenance and support (for License based items) or ongoing subscription/usage costs (for SaaS offerings). Where volume discounts or tiers are available to the State for broader use or software items that have limitations (e.g., a single user type, agency or use) the Offeror in conjunction with the Software publisher must clearly indicate the limitations and exclusions of the proposed license. Absent Offeror and Software OEM indication of limitations to the contrary, the State will be allowed to utilize the Software at the licensed levels without limitation on an Enterprise basis Statewide.

Hardware and System Capacity and Sizing hardware and storage (memory, speeds, cpu and other configuration details should be proposed to adhere to established State standards (generally VMware based system images for x86 environments) and or virtualized Oracle Exadata/Exalogic frames and components. Offerors should indicate the estimating factor(s) and sizing rationale in the assembly of bills of materials as part of the Cost Collection Workbook for this RFP. While the State maintains ample system capacity (e.g., compute, memory, storage, redundancy, diversity, network and other technical factors) to operate, maintain and support current State use and projects on the OAKS platform, Offerors are to assume that no (zero) capacity exists in the formulation of their responses to this RFP inclusive of the Proposed Solution as it relates to the Support of work contained in Supplements 1, 2, 3 and ****5 4. ~~The Work contained in Supplements 4 (OCM) and 6 (Security/Privacy) are not anticipated to have any appreciable hardware impact to the State. Therefore,~~** Offerors will include hardware requirements in their Cost Response(s) to this RFP within the Cost Collection Workbook on the respective Bill of Materials Tab. Any PeopleSoft or BI related element(s) of Offeror responses should wherever possible utilize Oracle ExaData/ExaLogic (ExaX) technical elements and for non-ExaX platforms (e.g., x86/Linux/Unix) include technical specifics, sizing values and limitations in responses to this RFP.

3.3 Basis of Updates as a Result of Discovery or Requirements Confirmation (Gate 1)

Upon completion of any Discovery of Requirements Confirmation phase or workstream, the Contractor will in consultation with the State assemble a definitive IDA for the design phase of the work.

This IDA must clearly illustrate and include the proposed basis of estimate inclusive of proposed cost and estimating factors and impact categories and any additional information discovered during the process or any unintentional inconsistencies or omissions by the State contained in this RFP that were utilized by the Contractor in the assembly of the response to this RFP.

Based on the aforementioned information and in the context of incremental new scope or work, higher complexity or effort and other factors, as well as the State's direction to omit or reduce work based on State preferences, the Contractor will assemble a final estimate of the work to be Designed (and under later phases of the implementation lifecycle: developed, tested and deployed), but in all cases shall utilized the proposed values as an objective basis for these calculations. The Contractor will also update (if required) the Proposed Cost for Development, Testing (Contractor and State), Change Management and production Deployment Costs in light of the revised and confirmed definitive scope and requirements arising from the Discovery or Requirements Confirmation phases of the project under any Supplement that are agreed to by the State during this Phase and provide a written rationale based on the original proposed costs and the revised and final work content.

The State may request additional details from the Contractor to support any IDA, Change Order or Amendment to this agreement. Notwithstanding this process, the Contractor shall not be authorized to perform any Design or subsequent phase work in part or in full until it obtains the State's written authorization to proceed and therefore should assemble these materials over the course of the Discovery/Requirements Confirmation phase in anticipation and advance of meeting the State's need and as to not impede the progress of the project.

PeopleSoft Application Grouping	Licensed PeopleSoft Product Name	State of Ohio Implementation Status
	Payroll for North America	Production Use
	Position Management	Production Use
	Profile Management	Not Used
	Salary Planning	Not Used
	Succession Planning	Not Used
	Time and Labor	Production Use
	Training Administration	Not Used
HCM-Recruiting	Candidate Gateway	Not Used
	Talent Acquisition Manager	Not Used
HCM-Self Service	Directory Interface	Not Used
	eBenefits	Production Use
	eDevelopment	Not Used
	ePerformance	Production Use
	eProfile	Limited Use
	eProfile Manager Desktop	Not Used
	HCM Portal Pack	Not Used
Other	PeopleTools Enterprise Development	Production Use
Portal	Interaction Hub	Production Use
	PeopleSoft Applications Portal	Production Use

**** Offeror Notice: The State has utilized PeopleSoft ELM since the initial implementation of OAKS. Upon the State's review of its ongoing needs with respect to Learning Management platforms across the Enterprise user groups, the State has determined that PeopleSoft ELM is not ideally suited to these needs. Offerors are encouraged to propose alternate ELM solutions in their responses as appropriate to address the State's requirements in this RFP. ****