EVALUATION AND SELECTION REPORT

for

RFP _____

Name of Project

for

Name of Department

date

(Model Revised 12/29/06 – do not include this revision date in your report)

EVALUATION AND SELECTION TEAM

SIGN-OFF

The following team members have read the enclosed Evaluation and Selection Report and concur with the findings as written:

_____
Name
Department of

_____
Name
Department of

_____
Name
Department of

_____
Name
Department of

_____
Name
Department of

_____
Name
Department of

_____
Name
Department of

I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

A. SUMMARY

The purpose of this IFB/RFP was to elicit proposals for a *(insert the project description. Give the reader enough information to understand what the project was all about.)* The term of the contract is for (*insert the term of the contract as stated in the solicitation)*. *(If this is the preliminary version of the report created prior to cost opening, the estimated value of the contract should also be identified.)*

Services that the contractor will provide include:

For example:

- scheduled installation
- post-implementation system support and maintenance
- management reports as required

….Include all as required by the solicitation

The IFB/RFP was conducted using the two-envelope procedure, the first for the administrative and technical response and the second for cost. The administrative and technical responses to the IFB/RFP were first evaluated for responsiveness, points were scored and the scores were published at the cost envelope opening. The DVBE incentive was included as an administrative requirement with points offered for DVBE participation. The value-effective aspects of the solicitation were weighted 40% and cost was weighted 60%. *(Note: the default is 50% admin/tech and 50% cost. A % less than 50% must be justified and approved by DGS/PD.)* Final selection was determined on the basis of highest overall point score resulting from a combined score of the technical evaluation and the total cost evaluation for proposals that are responsive to the IFB/RFP requirements. Award, if made, would be to a single bidder receiving the highest score.

B. RECOMMENDATION

Final Proposals were submitted from (*list all bidders)*. The total scores are as follows *(If this is the preliminary version of the report created prior to cost opening, the total score would not yet be known so identify the total administrative and technical score)*:

	Total Score
Bidder 1	0
Bidder 2	.8872
Bidder 3	.9686
Bidder 4	.8690

(If this is the preliminary version of the report created prior to cost opening, identify bids containing material deviations and include a recommendation that their cost envelope not be opened. If this is the final report, identify rejected bidders and acknowledge that their cost envelope was not opened.) The Evaluation and Selection Team recommends that the cost envelope for Bidder 4 not be opened in accordance with Section IX, Evaluation, D.3. which states "After completion of the Administrative and Technical Evaluation, the cost sections will be opened for all the bids that have not been rejected..." and Sec.IX.E which states "Final selection will be on the basis of highest weighted score among the proposals which are responsive to the RFP requirements. Responsiveness is comprised of meeting the technical and functional requirements, performing a satisfactory demonstration and conforming to the rules of Section II.

The cost envelopes were opened and the cost calculations were verified (see Section II of this report for a summary of adjustments). The administrative and technical score and the cost score were calculated and weighted (see Section B for detail).

At the demonstration of the proposal from Bidder 5, it was determined that the (*this is the area where any deviations in scoring may be accounted for and explained.)*

The highest combined score is for Bidder 3 proposal with 0.9686. It is the recommendation of the Evaluation and Selection Team that the Intent to Award be issued to **Bidder 3** as the bidder receiving the highest score in accordance with Section IX, Evaluation of the RFP.

C. DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DVBE) PARTICIPATION

The following display depicts the results of the bidder's DVBE participation requirements.

Bidder	Adjusted Bid Total	DVBE Bid Dollar/%	Goal/GFE
Bidder 2	$21,140,179.90	-0-/ 0%	GFE Met
Bidder 3	$21,186,524.80	1,050,000/5%	Goal & GFE Met
Bidder 4	$27,046,447.64	-0-/ 0%	GFE Met

II. EVALUATION

This analysis format has two parts as the RFP used as an example had mandatory requirements that were "pass/fail" with no score and included "functional" requirements that were scored. Include statements that explain the reasons for any price adjustments.

A. COST SUMMARY

The cost sheets were recalculated for verification with adjustments and corrections made as follows:

Bidder	As Opened	Adjustments	Adjusted Bid Total
Bidder 2	$21,007,217.00	+ 132,962.90	$21,140,179.90
Bidder 3	$20,856,450.65	+ 330,074.15	$21,186,524.80
Bidder 4	$26,920,841.82	+ 125,605.82	$27,046,447.64

Section II of the RFP, Rules Governing Competition, allows the State to correct discrepancies in a bidders proposal if the intent of the bid is not clearly established by the complete bid submittal and the Master Copy has priority over the copies, the bid narrative has priority over the contract and the contract has priority over the cost sheets. Within this framework, the following corrections were made:

1. Cost Adjustments-All bidders

All calculations on Cost Sheet 1 were verified and no corrections were necessary. On Cost Sheet 2 bidders were instructed to enter their "receipt printer" supplies costs and the State would calculate and add these costs to each bidder's proposal. The resultant Cost Sheet 2 **additions** for all bidders for receipt printer supplies was Bidder 2, **$132,962.73**, Bidder 3 **$330,074.15** and Bidder 4 **$125,605.82**.

2. Bidder 2

Bidder 2 requested both the TACPA and EZA "workplace" preference. The Office of Small Business and DVBE Certification (OSDC) denied the TACPA request and the Trade and Commerce Agency approved the EZA preference. Bidder 2 was the low cost proposal, in which case the $50,000 wouldn't apply.

B. EVALUATION RESULTS

The Section VI requirements were reviewed for responsiveness and scored. The Evaluation and Selection Team met as a group. Each proposal was read by each team member. Each proposal was reviewed in total upon completion of the review, in group discussions. In accordance with Section IX of the RFP, the proposal responses were compared and scored. The scores were derived as described on the Linear Graph, (see attached). The Administrative and Technical scores were weighted and combined with the weighted cost value to attain the resulting final score as shown below. None of the bidders claimed the small business preference.

Bidder	Admin/ Tech Pts	Adjusted Cost	Admin/Tech Weighting Factor= 40%	Cost Weighting Factor= 60%	Final Score
Bidder 2	535	$21,140,179.90	535 ÷ 745 = .7181x40%=**.2872**	21,140,180 ÷ 21,140,180= 1.0000 1.0000x60% = **.6000**	.6000+.2872 =**.8872**
Bidder 3	689	$21,186,524.80	689 ÷ 745 = .9248x40%=**.3699**	21,140,180 ÷ 21,186,525 = .9978 .9978x60% = **.5987**	.5987+.3699 =**.9686**
Bidder 4	745	$27,046,447.64	745 ÷ 745 = 1.000x40%=**.4000**	21,140,180 ÷ 27,046,448 = .7816 .7816x60% = **.4690**	.4690+.4000 = **.8690**

The following is an example of Mandatory "pass/fail" scoring. Each deviation must be examined to determine if it is material or not, See the Deviation Worksheet and Section II of the Model IFB/RFP for further explanation of how materiality is determined. Each deviation must be written into the analysis of each final bidder's proposal using the examples below.

1. Bidder 1

a. Volume I - Administrative and Technical Response

The proposal from Bidder 1 contained the following defects: *Note: It is important to detail each defect found with an analysis of materiality such as the examples found below:*

Item	RFP Requirement:	Bidder's Proposal Response	State's Analysis:
1.	Section V, M.4. - Requires the bidder to submit an installation plan that encompasses the following: "As the new system is installed, the old system will be removed. The department will not allow dual operation within an office."	Vol I, Section 2.9 pages 2 through 151 - The bidder states that installation will be performed when the Field Office site is not open for business.	The bidder's proposal does not indicate that dual operation will not occur. Since the bidder does commit to installation when the Field Office site is not open and since the Field Offices do not have the capacity for dual operation, this has been determined to be a non-material deviation.

Item	RFP Requirement:	Bidder's Proposal Response	State's Analysis:
2.	Section V, para N.2 - Requires the bidder to be responsible for the following that includes - "Repair or replacement of their inoperative or stolen equipment or parts in all offices at bidder's expense."	Vol I, Section 2.10.8, pg. 2-155 - The bidder states "(the bidder) will accept the cost associated with providing repair or replacement of equipment malfunctions not caused by misuse or neglect."	The bidder has placed a qualifying condition on the requirement. Their statement excludes some of the equipment from repair or replacement and the requirement is for all. In addition, (the bidder) has excluded "stolen" equipment from their conditional statement. **These omissions are not in substantial accord with the RFP requirement. In addition, the omission of some of the VCS's from replacement and the exclusion of replacement for stolen VCS's provides this bidder with an advantage over other bidders that may effect the cost of the proposal and has a potentially significant effect on the cost to the State. For these reasons, this omission must be deemed to be a material.**
3.	Section V, para. S.3.b. - Requires the contractor to provide a detailed disaster recovery plan for the proposed system. In the event of a disaster the contractor must provide within five (5) days, a method of producing 10% of the daily card total, within 90 days, produce 25% of the card total, and within 180 days, be at 100% production of the daily card total.	Vol I, Section 2.14.4.2, pg 2-180 - The bidder states "within 5 days, (the bidder) will produce 10 percent of the daily card total...Within 180 days (the bidder) will be at 100% production of the daily card total."	The bidder's proposal response does not address the requirement to produce 25% of the daily card total within 90 days of the disaster. The (bidder's) statement can be interpreted to mean that in the event of a disaster, the (bidder) system would produce 10 % of the cards for anywhere from 1 day to 179 days. **This omission is not in substantial accord with the RFP requirement. In addition, the omission of the requirement to produce 25% of the daily card total with 90 days of a disaster provides this bidder with an advantage over other bidders that may affect the cost of the proposal and has a potentially significant effect on the cost to the State. For these reasons, this omission must be deemed to be a material**

b. Volume II - Completed Contract

The bid contained approved and acceptable contract language.

c. Volume III – Cost Data

(Include this section when deviations are identified or adjustments/revisions are necessary. Provide an explanation.)

2. Bidder 2, 3, 4 etc.

Repeat the analysis found in B. a. and b. above for each bidder. The presence of material deviations will affect the cost envelope opening and it is vital to the outcome of the evaluation that this analysis be fully developed and thoughtfully analyzed.

The following is an example of functional scoring. This table shows the requirement and its overall score as well as the breakdown of scored requirements within that overall functional requirement. The intent here is to show that bidders were evaluated on a competitive basis (side-by-side) for scoring purposes. In this case, the solicitation stated that this was the methodology that would be used and that bidders equally responsive, would receive the same score.

Functional Requirements

Item G.1 Workplan/Installation Maximum 250 Points

G.1.1 Each bidder must submit a workplan and an installation schedule that provides for full implementation of all offices and automated/ non automated travel crews in no more than 90 calendar days from acceptance of the system in the pilot region.

Bid Requirement	Bidder 2	Bidder 3	Bidder 4
G.1.1a (150 points) The bidder's experience in issuing DL and/or ID cards. Weight will be given to the bidder's experience in centralized card issuance and the number and size of DL/ID card systems currently in production.	California - central issue (Vol. I, pg. 11), 8 other central issue jurisdictions with an annual volume from 133,000(Wyoming) to 5,901,000 (CA), Vol. I, pg. 18-21 Maryland and Virginia - over the counter, 10 other on laundry list, Vol. I, pg. 18 - 21, annual volume from 53,000 (Vermont) to 3,640,000 (Florida) Presently supply 59% of the licenses for US, and 63% for the US and Canada. Presently supply 60% of the states with digital driver licenses, Vol. I, pg 5.	Texas - Central issuance (4-5 million annually). Provide database and retrieval, hardware software, large scale system integration and card production. Colorado - Over the counter (1.2 million annually) Central issuance 30,000 for rural areas. Texas DOC ID cards - Over the counter ID card issuance (100,000 annually) Mexico Voter ID Card - Estimated volume is 1 - 1.5 million annually. Beginning of project, issued 46 million cards within a 19 month period (29 million per year). Nebraska - Instant over the counter (450,000 annually) Additionally, provide service for DL/ID cards for 22 other jurisdictions. (Customer Reference call. Vol. I. Section 4 Appendix Pg. 1-4)	Centralized Issuance in the following: Province of Ontario Canada - 1.6 million annually; Mass.- 1.5 million annually; Minnesota - 1.3 million annually; CitiBank (photo ID credit card) - 4.2 million annually estimated Over the counter issuance in the following: Ohio - 3.0 million annually; South Carolina - 900,000 annually; North Dakota - 175,000 annually; New Brunswick - 175,000 annually Unisys also supports an additional 9 ID card producing entities. (Vol. I, VI-64A, 64B)
45 points	Points awarded 45	Points awarded 40	Points awarded 25

Bid Requirement	Bidder 2	Bidder 3	Bidder 4
G.1.1a (continued) The bidder's experience in database design, access and maintenance. Weight will be given to image database systems. **25 points**	Designed and maintains database for California. Vol. I, pg. 10 Is prime for Maryland's server. Vol. I, pg. 7 Manitoba - designed digitized database and imaging for storage and retrieval. Vol. I, pg. 13. Also has Virginia's database. Transfers images to the central storage facility in Richmond via on-line terminal emulation. NBSI is not managing the database via the Virginia reference called. Vol. I, page 14 Louisiana - Database is PC based, Vol. I, pg. 15. Points awarded 15	Calif. DOJ (CDI) - Statewide fingerprint switching store and forward system. County of Orange (CDI) - Over 2,000 terminals have access to inquiry and update. 16 different computers have access through the message switch. CDI has maintenance contract, they respond 24 hours a day. (Customer Reference call. Vol. I V-85) Points awarded 20	State of Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (Digitized Imaging System - DIS); Huntington National Bank, Columbus, OH (DIS); The Walt Disney Company; Beaumont Hospital (DIS); NASA/Rockwell International; Essex County, Salem, MA (DIS); Kmart Corporation; Minnesota Secretary of State - UCC and Voter Registration; Maine Department of Labor (DIS) (Vol. I, VI-64H, 64I, 64J). Points awarded 25
…and so on….	Points awarded 30	Points awarded 30	Points awarded 20
150 points total	Total Points 135	Total Points 135	Total Points 105

Perform the same analysis for how points were scored as above for each subsequent "functional" or scored requirement to lead up to the final total score as shown below.

Item G.1 Total	Total Points 215	Total Points 235	Total Points 205
Item G.2 Total	Total Points 152	Total Points 217	Total Points 275
Item G.3 Total	Total Points 125	Total Points 110	Total Points 120
Item G.4 Total	Total Points 43	Total Points 132	Total Points 145
Grand Total	Total Points 535	Total Points 694	Total Points 745

III. BACKGROUND

A. EVALUATION AND SELECTION TEAM

The Proposal evaluation was completed by the Evaluation and Selection Team. Members of the team are listed on the Evaluation and Selection Team Sign-Off.

B. RELEASE OF RFP

On June 10, 200x a Request for Interest letter was (*either published on the CSCR or the RFP was published on the CSCR).* On July 5, 200x the RFP was released to those bidders indicating an interest in receiving a copy. (*Note: This will only occur if an RFI was used, otherwise the RFP was already released.)* This RFP was a multi-step procurement consisting of Detailed Technical Proposals, Confidential Discussions, Draft and Final Proposal submittal (with cost separately sealed). Subsequent to release, Letters of Intent were received from ten suppliers.,

Eighteen (18) addenda were issued as follows:

Addendum #1	July 19, 200x	Addendum #10	November 23, 200x
Addendum #2	July 22, 200x	Addendum #11	December 14, 200x
Addendum #3	August 8, 200x	Addendum #12	December 20, 200x
Addendum #4	August 12, 200x	Addendum #13	January 4, 200x
Addendum #5	August 23, 200x	Addendum #14	January 11, 200x
Addendum #6	August 30, 200x	Addendum #15	February 10, 200x
Addendum #7	October 3, 200x	Addendum #16	February 16, 200x
Addendum #8	October 11, 200x	Addendum #17	February 23, 200x
Addendum #9	November 1, 200x	Addendum #18	February 28, 200x

C. BIDDER'S CONFERENCE

(If there was a Bidder's Conference, provide information related to the event; otherwise, state there was no Bidder's Conference scheduled.)

D. CONCEPTUAL PROPOSALS

(If this step was included, identify who submitted proposals; otherwise, state this step was not applicable for this solicitation.)

E. DETAILED TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

Detailed Technical Proposals were received from eight bidders: *(List the names of the bidders)*. Confidential Discussions were held with each if the bidders.

F. DRAFT PROPOSALS

Draft Proposals were received from seven bidders: *(List the names of the bidders)*.

G. FINAL PROPOSALS

Final Proposals were received from six bidders on March 3, 200x. The separately sealed Cost Envelopes were certified and witnessed as sealed documents, publicly opened and read at 2:00 PM, on April 3, 200x by (*name of procurement official)* of the (*name of department).* Representatives from the following were in attendance:

(List names of organizations)

Proposal amounts were read as follows:

(Bidder name)	*(Total $ Amount read)*

IV. DEMONSTRATION

The State had the option to require a demonstration. This option was exercised by the State. *(Identify the bidder providing the demonstration and results of the demonstration. If a demonstration was not held or was not applicable, include that acknowledgement.)*