

## ATTACHMENT G

### SOURCING ALLIANCE RFP 2019.1 - ONE CARD PROGRAM

#### Bid Tabulations

#### Phase I Review - Initial Qualifying Criteria

Each proposal must meet all of the following Phase I proposal acceptance criteria in order to be considered for further evaluation. Any proposal receiving a "no" response to any of the following criteria may be deemed nonresponsive to the

#	Initial Qualifying Criteria	Transact/Blackb		TouchNet		CBORD		NuVision		Atrium	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	Was the Respondent's proposal received by the deadline as specified in the RFP?	X		X		X		X			Waived
2.	Did the Respondent submit a proposal comprised of a Technical Proposal and a Cost Proposal, both submitted in separate, appropriately labeled, sealed envelopes as required?	X		X		X		X		X	
3.	Does the Respondent's proposal include all required affirmative statements and certifications, signed by the Respondent's representative, as described in <b>Attachments C, D, and E</b> ?	X		X		X		X		X	
4.	Included in those certifications, does the Respondent state that it is <b>NOT</b> excluded from entering into a contract with Sourcing Alliance due to restrictions related to the federal debarment list, unfair labor findings, or O.R.C. § 9.24?	X		X		X		X		X	
5.	<a href="#">Did Sourcing Alliance's review of the Auditor of State website verify that the Respondent is NOT excluded from contracting with Sourcing Alliance by O.R.C. § 9.24 as the result of an unresolved finding for recovery?</a>	X		X		X		X		X	
<b>Does Respondent meet the Initial Qualifying Criteria? Yes or No.</b>		YES		YES		YES		YES		YES	

#### Phase 2 Review - Scoring of Technical Proposal

The Proposal Review Team will only score the Technical Proposals of Respondents who meet the Initial Qualifying Criteria. For each of the evaluation criteria listed below, reviewers will determine whether the Technical Proposal exceeds, meets, partially meets, or does not meet the requirements defined in **Attachment A - Technical Proposal Requirements & Specifications** and assign the appropriate score as follows:

- 0% Does Not Meet Requirement
- 20% Partially Meets Requirement
- 50% Meets Requirement
- 100% Exceeds Requirement

A Technical Proposal's total Phase II points will be calculated as the sum of the score for each evaluation criteria times the weighting for that criteria. Sourcing Alliance has established a total of 200 available points. Technical Proposals which do not meet or exceed a total point value of at least 100 points (a point total that represents that a Respondent can successfully perform the resulting contractual duties by receiving an average score of 50% - Meets Requirements) out of a maximum of 200 points will be disqualified from further consideration, and that Respondent's Cost Proposal will not be considered by Sourcing Alliance. Only those Respondents whose Technical Proposals

	Sections in Attachment A	Weight	Transact/Blackb		TouchNet		CBORD		NuVision		Atrium		
			Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	Score	Points	
<b>Supplier Overview &amp; Qualifications (Section 3)</b>													
	<b>General Information</b> - Respondent provided basic company information as required; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	3.1.1. - 3.1.3. 3.2.1. - 3.2.4.	1	50%	0.5	50%	0.5	50%	0.5	20%	0.2	100%	1
	<b>Financial Strength</b> - Respondent provided company financial information that demonstrates the company is financially sound; reviewers did not identify any material concerns regarding bankruptcy, insolvency, litigation, contract performance, or governmental investigation.	3.1.4. - 3.1.6. 3.3. - 3.4.	2	20%	0.4	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1
	<b>Geographic Reach</b> - Respondent's geographic footprint is large enough to provide a meaningful opportunity for Sourcing Alliance to grow the Program and provide economies of scale to YSU and Sourcing Alliance Members.	3.2.2.	3	50%	1.5	50%	1.5	50%	1.5	50%	1.5	50%	1.5
	<b>Public Sector Focus</b> - Respondent has a clear commitment and strategy to grow in the local government and educational institution markets; Respondent does not have existing contract vehicles that would materially dilute the value of a contract award from Sourcing Alliance.	3.2.5. - 3.2.6.	4	20%	0.8	50%	2	20%	0.8	50%	2	50%	2
	<b>References</b> - Respondent provided references and the references verified Respondent's ability to successfully meet or exceed the requirements of the RFP.	3.5.	4	100%	4	100%	4	50%	2	0%	0	100%	4
	<b>Insurance</b> - Respondent has or has committed to acquire insurance coverages meeting or exceeding the requirements of the RFP.	3.6.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	100%	2	50%	1
	<b>Customer Agreements</b> - Respondent described its contracting process and provided its standard customer agreements; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	3.7.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1
<b>Product/System Features &amp; Functionality (Section 4)</b>													
	<b>System User Interface (Administrators)</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its Administrator interface functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	4.1.1.; 4.1.3	6	100%	6	100%	6	50%	3	20%	1.2	100%	6
	<b>Return of Client Data</b> - Respondent will provide Client's data in the desired format and for no additional charge upon Client contract terminatio or expiration.	4.1.2.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	100%	2
	<b>Online Account Management</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its online account management functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	4.2.	5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	20%	1	100%	5
	<b>System User Interface (Patrons)</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its Patron interface functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	4.3.	6	50%	3	50%	3	50%	3	20%	1.2	100%	6
	<b>Reporting</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its reporting functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	4.4.	5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	100%	5	20%	1	100%	5
<b>Cards &amp; Card Production Specifications (Section 5)</b>													
	<b>Cards &amp; Card Production</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its cards and card production functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	5.1.1. - 5.1.2.	8	50%	4	20%	1.6	50%	4	20%	1.6	100%	8
	<b>Card Production Hardware &amp; Software</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its card and card production hardware and software capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	5.1.3.	8	100%	8	50%	4	50%	4	20%	1.6	100%	8

<b>Card Production Technology &amp; Security Features</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its card production technology and security features; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	5.1.4.	5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	0%	0	100%	5
<b>Access Control Systems (Section 6)</b>												
<b>System User Interface (Administrators)</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its Administrator interface functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	6.1.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	20%	0.4	50%	1
<b>Access Control Card Readers</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its access control card readers and they provide the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	6.2.	2	20%	0.4	50%	1	50%	1	20%	0.4	100%	2
<b>Access Control Software</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its access control software functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	6.3.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	20%	0.4	100%	2
<b>Wireless Access Control</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its wireless access control system functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	6.4.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	20%	0.4	50%	1
<b>Access Control Software</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its biometric access control functionality; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	6.5.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1
<b>Offline Access Control System</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its offline access control functionality; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	6.6.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1
<b>Point-of-Sale Hardware &amp; Terminals (Section 7)</b>												
<b>Point-of-Sale Hardware</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its POS hardware and the hardware provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	7.1.	7	100%	7	50%	3.5	20%	1.4	0%	0	100%	7
<b>Point-of-Sale Terminals</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its POS terminals and they provide the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	7.2.	7	100%	7	50%	3.5	20%	1.4	0%	0	100%	7
<b>Small Retail &amp; Activity Terminals</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its small retail and activity terminals and they provide the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	7.3.	6	100%	6	100%	6	20%	1.2	0%	0	100%	6
<b>Integration &amp; Functionality (Section 8)</b>												
<b>Integration &amp; Functionality</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of the System's integration and functionality and the System provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.1.	5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	20%	1	50%	2.5	100%	5
<b>Attendance Tracking for Events</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its event attendance tracking functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.2.	3	50%	1.5	100%	3	20%	0.6	20%	0.6	100%	3
<b>Attendance Tracking for Classrooms</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its classroom attendance tracking functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.3.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	20%	0.4	100%	2
<b>Dining &amp; Meal Plans</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its dining and meal plan functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.4.	5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	50%	2.5	20%	1	100%	5
<b>Equipment Checkout</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its equipment checkout functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.5.	1	50%	0.5	100%	1	50%	0.5	20%	0.2	50%	0.5
<b>Laundry Reservation</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its laundry reservation functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.6.	1	20%	0.2	100%	1	50%	0.5	20%	0.2	100%	1
<b>Off-Campus Vending</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its off-campus vending functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.7.	2	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	20%	0.4	100%	2
<b>Managed Off-Campus Vending</b> - Respondent provides a managed service for Clients to outsource the design, implementation, marketing, and ongoing management of an off-campus vending program; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.7.	4	50%	2	50%	2	50%	2	0%	0	50%	2
<b>Online Web-Based Ordering System</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its online web-based ordering system functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.8.	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	20%	0.4	100%	2
<b>Parking &amp; Transit</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its parking and transit functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.9.	2	100%	2	100%	2	50%	1	20%	0.4	50%	1
<b>Vending &amp; Copier Controllers</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its vending and copier controller functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.10.	1	50%	0.5	50%	0.5	50%	0.5	20%	0.2	50%	0.5
<b>Visitor Registration</b> - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its visitor registration functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.	8.11.	2		0		0		0		0		0

**Environment & Availability (Section 9)**

**Hosting** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of the System's hosting options, communication processes to address outages, SaaS offering, and provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Visitor Registration** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its visitor registration functionality and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Host System Architecture** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its host system architecture, hardware configuration, and privacy policy, and provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Security** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its System security and it provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

9.1.	6	20%	1.2	50%	3	0%	0	0%	0	100%	6
9.2.	2	0%	0	20%	0.4	20%	0.4	0%	0	50%	1
9.3.	3	50%	1.5	50%	1.5	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1.5
9.4.	4	100%	4	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	100%	4

**Implementation and Ongoing Support (Section 10)**

**Methodology & Personnel** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its project management process, key team members, handling of scope creep, client resources, ability to import and export legacy data, ability to meet YSU's implementation timeline, and provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Customer Support** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its technical and functional training, Service Level Agreements, post-implementation support, logging and resolving errors, issue resolution process, custom development services, and provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Local Hardware Support** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its local hardware support and provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**User Group** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its user group and forum options, annual conferences, online documentation, community list serve, and community forum and provides the desired capabilities; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

10.1.	4	50%	2	100%	4	20%	0.8	0%	0	100%	4
10.2.	5	100%	5	50%	2.5	20%	1	20%	1	100%	5
10.3.	4	50%	2	50%	2	20%	0.8	0%	0	100%	4
10.4.	3	100%	3	100%	3	50%	1.5	0%	0	50%	1.5

**Additional System Features & Other Offerings (Section 11)**

**Additional System Features & Interfaces** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of additional System features, functionality, and interfaces and provides additional capabilities that are compelling; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Other Offerings** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of additional product and service offerings outside the scope of the RFP that are compelling; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

11.1.	2	0%	0	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	50%	1
11.2.	2	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0

**Partnering with Sourcing Alliance (Section 12)**

**Organizational Structure & Staffing of SA Relationship** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its primary point of contact, key staff, organization chart, and sales organization; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Drive Program Participation & Revenue** - Respondent provided a sufficiently thorough overview of its vision to leverage a piggybackable contract with Sourcing Alliance, geographic and vertical market focus that aligns with Sourcing Alliance, plan to deploy the master agreement with its sales team, sales team incentives, revenue projections, and renewal and new business strategies; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Administrative Fee** - Respondent agreed to the terms of Sourcing Alliance's Administrative Fee and Shared Marketing Costs; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

**Reporting** - Respondent will meet or exceed Sourcing Alliance's sales, Administrative Fee, and sales pipeline reporting requirements; reviewers did not identify any material concerns.

12.1.1. - 12.1.4.	6	50%	3	100%	6	50%	3	0%	0	50%	3
12.1.5. - 12.1.11.	14	20%	2.8	100%	14	20%	2.8	0%	0	50%	7
12.2.1. - 12.2.2.	14	20%	2.8	50%	7	20%	2.8	0%	0	50%	7
12.2.3. - 12.2.4.	6	50%	3	20%	1.2	20%	1.2	0%	0	50%	3

**TOTALS:**

<b>200</b>	<b>110.1</b>	<b>121.2</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>156.5</b>
------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	--------------

**Is Respondent's point total at least the 100-point minimum? Yes or No.**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------

**Phase III Review - Cost Proposal**

The Issuers will only consider Cost Proposals of Respondents whose Technical Proposal score is at least 100 points - all other proposals will be disqualified. When considering Cost Proposals, the Issuers reserves the right to exclude any outlying proposals that indicate the Respondent cannot provide the required capabilities.

**Pricing**

**System & Functionality Pricing** - how does Respondent's pricing compare to other Respondents' pricing models?

**Cards & Card Production Pricing** - how does Respondent's pricing compare to other Respondents' pricing models?

**Access Control Pricing** - how does Respondent's pricing compare to other Respondents' pricing models?

**Point-of-Sale Pricing** - how does Respondent's pricing compare to other Respondents' pricing models?

**Additional Features & Offerings Pricing** - how does Respondent's pricing compare to other Respondents' pricing models?

Tab in Attachment B	Weight	Transact/Blackb Score	Blackb Points	TouchNet Score	TouchNet Points	CBORD Score	CBORD Points	NuVision Score	NuVision Points	Atrium Score	Atrium Points
1	30	20%	6	20%	6		0		0	50%	15
2	30	50%	15	20%	6		0		0	50%	15
3	12	20%	2.4	50%	6		0		0	100%	12
4	20	50%	10	50%	10		0		0	50%	10
5	8	0%	0	0%	0		0		0	0%	0
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>33.4</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>52</b>

**Total Score - Technical Proposal + Cost Proposal Scores**

Under applicable procurement guidelines of the Ohio Revised Code, the Issuers will select the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. The Winning Supplier will be determined by combining the supplier's Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal points awarded by the Proposal Review Team.

	<b>Transact/Blackb</b>	<b>TouchNet</b>	<b>CBORD</b>	<b>NuVision</b>	<b>Atrium</b>
<b>Technical Proposal Points Awarded</b>	110.1	121.2	72.7	23.2	156.5
<b>Cost Proposal Points Awarded</b>	33.4	28	0	0	52
<b>Total Points Awarded</b>	143.5	149.2	72.7	23.2	208.5
<b>Contract Awarded</b>	No	No	No	No	<u>Yes</u>