

Award Justification Statement
Solicitation # KM21-47
Contract Name: Citizen Engagement Platform
Awarded: July 27, 2021

Solicitation Summary

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued by the State of Utah on behalf of NASPO ValuePoint, participating states, and their eligible end users on April 1, 2021. The RFP provided the following Categories for the solicited scope:

- Category 1- Platform Management
- Category 2 – Master Data Management
- Category 3 – Chatbots and Customer Service
- Category 4 – Customer Engagement
- Category 5 – Social Listening

The RFP closed May 17, 2021 with 39 vendors responding through the State of Utah's eProcurement system with a proposal in at least one Category.

Evaluation Process

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Part 7 of the Utah Procurement Code by an Evaluation Committee comprised of representatives from the State of Idaho, Louisiana, Missouri, and Utah. A representative from the Utah Division of Purchasing attended the evaluation committee meetings to ensure that the process outlined in the Procurement Code was followed but was not a voting member on the evaluation committee. The RFP process was used because criteria other than cost were considered important in determining which proposal provides the best value to the State. These other factors (other than cost) were highly significant in determining which vendor's proposal provided the best value to the State. The following paragraphs describe each scoring category and explain and compare the scores assigned to each proposal by the State's evaluation committee.

1. Stage 1 – Mandatory Minimum Requirements

The evaluation for Stage 1 was conducted by the State of Utah to ensure compliance with the RFP's minimum qualifications / requirements, as listed below from the RFP:

1. Completed Attachment B - Key Personnel Form
2. Completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form
3. Completed Attachment D - Project Capability (including the D.4 - Service Plan and D.5 - Real World Use Plan)
4. Addresses each of the Expectations outlined in the solicitation
5. Offeror is the original software publisher for its proposed solution. Proposals will not be accepted from software resellers
6. Proposal is submitted according to the requirements of the published RFP

7. Submission submitted in SciQuest on time (Vendor clicked submit and uploaded and answered all necessary documents and questions)

Upon preliminary review of the mandatory pass/fail RFP criteria, 3 vendors were rejected and determined non-response for failing to conform to each of the mandatory minimum requirements. 36 vendors were submitted to the evaluation committee for technical scoring (Stage 2).

2. Stage 2 – Technical Evaluation

Vendors in the Stage 2 technical evaluation were evaluated against the following 8 criteria for each Category they sought an award in:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>
Attachment D1 - Level of Expertise Plan (LE)	1,000 points
Attachment D2 - Risk Assessment Plan (RA)	250 points
Attachment D3 - Value Added Plan (VA)	250 points
Attachment D4 - Service Plan	750 points
Attachment D.5 - Ease of Use Functionality	750 points
Attachment D.5 - Real World Examples	500 points
Attachment D.5 - Data Privacy Controls	500 points
Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form	1,750 points
 Total Stage 2 technical Points available	 5,750 points

As outlined in the KM21-47 RFP, only those vendors still remaining in the evaluation and that achieve a minimum score threshold of 75% (or 4,312.5 total points) of the total points available from Stage 2 for the Category they are seeking an award in will qualify for an award determination in that Category. The evaluation committee determined that vendors who received 4,312.5 total points or higher for the Category the vendor sought an award in provided sufficient information that demonstrated their proposal adequately meet the requisite requirements for that Category. Individual criteria were scored on a scale of 1, 5, and 10, as outlined in the RFP. Overall, the evaluation committee determined that these proposals would allow Participating Entities an opportunity to make a best value determination based on the proposals provided by the vendors.

Offerors with a score of less than the minimum required 4,312.5 technical points for the given Category were deemed non-responsive and ineligible for further consideration for that Category. Proposals that did not meet this requisite threshold were those did not provide sufficient demonstration to the evaluation committee that their proposal met the outlined requirements.

Attachment H - Interactive Scorecard was provided in the RFP for an illustration for how the scoring methodology was applied against the points available for each Category.

Following this stage 2 evaluation, 18 vendors received technical scores in at least one of the Categories they submitted a proposal that met or exceeded the minimum technical point requirements outlined in the RFP and proceeded onto the award determination. Refer to Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation for the distribution of scores given.

18 vendors were rejected for not meeting the requisite threshold of 4,312.5 in any Category the vendor sought an award in. The rejected proposals did not adequately demonstrate that their offered solutions met the purposes of the RFP. The evaluation committee determined that these proposals did not substantively address the topics/criterion identified in KM21-47 RFP. Refer to Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation for the distribution of scores given.

3. Award Determination

Vendors seeking an award in a certain award Category only received an award in the respective category if total points earned for that meet the award threshold of 4,312.5. Provided below are the awarded vendors and their accompanying awarded categories:

Vendor Name	Awarded Categories and Points Earned				
	Category 1 - Platform Management	Category 2 - Master Data Management	Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service	Category 4 - Customer Engagement	Category 5 - Social Listening
Accenture	4,706.3		4,687.5	4,762.5	
Adobe	4,531.3	4,900.0		4,756.3	
Bang the Table USA LLC				4,756.3	4,543.8
Blue Prism Software Inc.			4,825.0	4,400.0	
Citibot, Inc			4,756.3		
CitizenLab				5,156.3	
CoreSphere, LLC				5,187.5	
Deloitte	5,531.3	5,356.3		5,062.5	
Granicus, LLC				4,312.5	
IBM	4,356.3	5,437.5	5,375.0	4,762.5	
Indigov Corporation	4,868.8			4,775.0	
Maximus US Services, Inc.	5,062.5				5,187.5

Medallia				4,556.3	4,775.0
Merit International	4,431.3				
PayIt, LLC				4,575.0	
Sambuq.com Inc	4,325.0				
Synchronous Technologies Inc DBA GreenRope				4,468.8	
Tyler Technologies Inc.	5,062.5	4,362.5			

Conclusion

Based on the justifications outlined above, and pursuant to the KM21-47 RFP, the 18 vendors identified above provide the best value to the State and other participating entities. Subject to successful negotiations of the terms and conditions, each has been awarded a contract.

Per the RFP, Contract negotiations for an individual master agreement will only begin with these vendors after they have provided a verified request from an entity eligible to use the Master Agreement indicating the entity's intent and need to use the resulting Master Agreement.

The State of Utah Division of Purchasing does not guarantee any purchase amount under an awarded master agreement.