

Award Justification Statement

Solicitation #CJ21-3

Contract Name: Wireless Voice, Data, and Accessories Award Category 3 Resolicitation

A. RESULT

Overall, the Evaluation Committee determined that the proposals submitted by the following firms provides the best value to the State for Award Categories 3A-3Q:

Category 3: Turnkey Wireless Solutions	See Below for subcategories
Category 3: Subcategory A: Fleet Management	Geotab, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory B: Field Service Management	T-Mobile, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory C: Mobile Device Management/Enterprise Mobility (MDM/EMM)	None
Category 3: Subcategory D: Workforce Management	T-Mobile
Category 3: Subcategory E: Mobile Data Collection	T-Mobile, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory F: Traffic Management and Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS)	T-Mobile, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory G: Snow and Ice Removal Route Management	US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory H: Public Safety Systems	US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory I: IoT Management	US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory J: Energy Conservation/Management	AT&T, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory K: Building and Facilities Automation	AT&T
Category 3: Subcategory L: Mobile Integration/Mobile Substitution Solutions	T-Mobile
Category 3: Subcategory M: Enterprise Messaging	AT&T, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory N: Secure LAN Access	AT&T, Federated Wireless, US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory O: Utility Operations, Monitoring and Support	US Cellular
Category 3: Subcategory P: Health and Human Services	Verizon Wireless
Category 3: Subcategory Q: Education	Verizon Wireless

B. EVALUATION PROCESS

A request for proposals (RFP) was issued by the State to select vendors to provide Wireless Voice, Data and Accessories services under Award Category 3 from the original solicitation (CJ18012). Pursuant to Utah Code § 63G-6a-702(2), the RFP process was used because criteria other than cost were considered important in determining which vendor's proposal provides the best value to the State. This RFP divided into 17 Award Categories within Award Category 3 (3A-3Q). Vendors were welcome to submit proposals for all Award Categories.

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Part 7 of the Utah Procurement Code by an Evaluation Committee composed of central procurement officers from the states of Washington, Nevada, Michigan, Utah, and the city of Park City, Utah. An additional representative from the Division of State Purchasing was consulted throughout the process to ensure compliance with the Procurement Code but was not a voting member of the Evaluation Committee.

Following an evaluation of mandatory minimum requirements for each Award Category, six vendors advanced to the initial technical scoring stage. Six vendors advanced to the technical scoring stage for the applicable Award Categories.

A threshold of 70% of the total available technical points was set for the minimum necessary score for contract consideration in all Award Categories. Vendors falling below this threshold would be ineligible to enter into a contract with the State. As such, vendors below this 70% threshold did not move onto the cost evaluation stage of the process.

Award Category 3A

General Technical Scorable Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	Geotab	Vendor A	US Cellular		
Describe your Reporting	50	34	36	38		
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.						
Employee number and expertise	60	40.8	38.4	45.6		
All offerors who submitted had varying levels of employee numbers and expertise.						
Years of experience	75	54	57	63		
The offerors in this category demonstrated Good experience in the industry.						
Customer Service	50	38	38	36		
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals with none describing more than the standard CS language						
Category 3A Criteria						

Criteria	Points Possible	Geotab	Vendor A	US Cellular		
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	136	136		
All offerors represent acceptable turnkey options.						
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	57	51	57		
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criterion.						
Service Factors	50	40	34	34		
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria,						
References	50	38	38	38		
All references received were nominally Acceptable.						
Training	50	30	30	32		
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criterion.						
Security	150	102	102	102		
All offerors provided information regarding security that is effective to varying degrees.						
Cost						
Vendor A scored 560.4 and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). Cost evaluation is completed by dividing the cost proposed by the total points earned in Stage 2. Proposals with a cost per point ratio of 300% or below represent an acceptable Best Value to the State and will be awarded a contract. In this case the best cost per point was \$2,177.17 by US Cellular. All scores of \$6,531.52 or lower will be awarded a contract.						
Summary						
Offerors were allowed to submit as many products in each subcategory as they wished to provide. Because of this if any of their products are awarded, the offeror is awarded all products within this award category. Geotab scored \$2,749.33, and US Cellular scored \$2,177.17 and represent a best value to the state.						

Award Category 3B

General Technical Scorable Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	T-Mobile	US Cellular			
Describe your Reporting	50	36	38			
T-Mobile and US Cellular provided acceptable reporting commitments.						
Employee number and expertise	60	52.8	45.6			
T-Mobile and US Cellular provided Good employee numbers and expertise. T-Mobile showed more here.						
Years of experience	75	66	63			
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated good experience in the industry.						
Customer Service	50	38	36			
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.						
Category 3B Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	T-Mobile	US Cellular			
Turnkey Offerings	200	144	144			

All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	60	54			
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Service Factors	50	34	30			
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
References	50	36	34			
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Training	50	32	30			
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Security	150	102	102			
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Cost						
Cost evaluation is completed by dividing the cost proposed by the total points earned in Stage 2. Proposals with a cost per point ratio of 300% or below represent an acceptable Best Value to the State and will be awarded a contract. In this case, the best cost per point was \$92.99 by US Cellular. All scores of \$278.98 or lower will be awarded a contract.						
Summary						
Offerors were allowed to submit as many products in each subcategory as they wished to provide. Because of this if any of their products are awarded, the offeror is awarded all products within this award category. US Cellular scored \$92.99 and T-Mobile Scored \$117.14. They both represent a best value to the state.						

Award Category 3C

General Technical Scorable Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B			
Describe your Reporting	50	36	38			
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.						
Employee number and expertise	60	38.4	45.6			
All offerors who submitted had Good employee numbers and expertise with Vendor B showing more in their proposal.						
Years of experience	75	57	63			
Offerors showed acceptable experience with Vendor B scoring higher.						
Customer Service	50	38	36			
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.						
Category 3C Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B			
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	128			
All offerors had good descriptions for this category but not excellent.						
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	54	57			
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Service Factors	50	36	28			

All offerors had fair or poor proposals for this criteria.					
References	50	40	34		
All references received were fair.					
Training	50	26	28		
All offerors had substandard descriptions for this criteria.					
Security	150	102	102		
None of the proposals had excellent security information included. They were nominally acceptable.					
Cost					
Vendor A scored 563.4 and Vendor B scored 559.6 and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). Cost evaluation is completed by dividing the cost proposed by the total points earned in Stage 2. Proposals with a cost per point ratio of 300% or below represent an acceptable Best Value to the State and will be awarded a contract. In this case, no vendor made the score threshold and were considered for cost.					
Summary					
Offerors were allowed to submit as many products in each subcategory as they wished to provide. Because of this if any of their products are awarded, the offeror is awarded all products within this award category. No vendor scored above the stage I threshold of 567 points and do not represent a best value to the state. No award in this category.					

Award Category 3D

General Technical Scorable Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	T-Mobile	Vendor B
Describe your Reporting	50	36	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	48	48	45.6
All offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise.				
Years of experience	75	66	66	63
Offerors in this category demonstrated Good experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	32	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3D Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	T-Mobile	Vendor B
Turnkey Offerings	200	128	136	120
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criterion.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	57	60	54
T-Mobile was superior to Vendor A in its description of the planning and process.				
Service Factors	50	34	38	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criterion.				
References	50	34	34	34
All references received were nominally Acceptable.				
Training	50	32	32	30
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				

Security	150	96	102	102
None of the proposals had excellent security information included. They were nominally acceptable but did not include detail				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 563 points and Vendor B scored 556.6 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). T-Mobile offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points.				
Summary				
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total available points or more (630 points). T-Mobile with a score of 680 represents a best value to the State.				

Award Category 3E

General Technical Scorable Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	T-Mobile	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	48	50.4	45.6
All offerors who submitted had good employee numbers and expertise with T-Mobile showing the most in this category.				
Years of experience	75	66	63	63
The offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	32	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3E Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	T-Mobile	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	144	128
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria. T-Mobile showed more value in their proposal.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	54	60	54
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Service Factors	50	36	34	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
References	50	14	34	36
Most references received were nominally Acceptable. Vendor A did not provide reasonable references.				
Training	50	30	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Security	150	102	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 554 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the				

given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available.

US Cellular offered a 20% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. T-Mobile offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 45 cost points.

Summary

Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 658.6 total points. T-Mobile scored 640.4 total points. US Cellular and T-Mobile represent a best value to the State.

Award Category 3F

General Technical Scorable Criteria					
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	T-Mobile	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	36	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.					
Employee number and expertise	60	48	38.4	52.8	45.6
Vendor B showed poorly here in comparison to the other vendors.					
Years of experience	75	66	54	63	63
The offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.					
Customer Service	50	34	38	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.					
Category 3F Criteria					
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	T-Mobile	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	128	112	144	136
T-Mobile and US Cellular had the best description and demonstration of value in their offerings for this category.					
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	54	42	60	57
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Service Factors	50	36	28	34	38
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
References	50	30	32	34	32
All references received were nominally Acceptable.					
Training	50	32	28	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Security	150	90	84	102	102
All offerors had poor to acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Cost					
Vendor A scored 554 points and Vendor B scored 492.4 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that					

service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available.

US Cellular offered a 20% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. T-Mobile offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 45 cost points.

Summary

Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 669.6 total points. T-Mobile scored 642.8 total points. US Cellular and T-Mobile represent a best value to the State.

Award Category 3G

General Technical Scorable Criteria			
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.			
Employee number and expertise	60	48	45.6
All offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise.			
Years of experience	75	66	63
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.			
Customer Service	50	34	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.			
Category 3G Criteria			
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	128
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	48	57
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Service Factors	50	36	36
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
References	50	34	34
All references received were nominally Acceptable.			
Training	50	36	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Security	150	90	102
US Cellular showed good security considerations in their proposal with Vendor A poor to acceptable.			
Cost			
Vendor A scored 564 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed			

discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular offered a 30% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points.

Summary

Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 663.6 total points. US Cellular represents a best value to the State.

Award Category 3H

General Technical Scorable Criteria			
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.			
Employee number and expertise	60	48	45.6
All offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise.			
Years of experience	75	66	63
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.			
Customer Service	50	30	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.			
Category 3H Criteria			
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	144
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	48	60
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Service Factors	50	36	40
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
References	50	14	22
All references received were substandard or not provided.			
Training	50	36	36
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Security	150	90	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria. Vendor A was not as well defined as US Cellular.			
Cost			
Vendor A scored 540 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular offered a 15% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points.			
Summary			

Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 676.6 total points. US Cellular represents a best value to the State.

Award Category 3I

General Technical Scorable Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	48	52.8	45.6
All offerors who submitted had excellent employee numbers and expertise. They are the leaders in the industry.				
Years of experience	75	66	63	63
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	36	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3I Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	144	144	144
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	51	54	51
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Service Factors	50	32	34	36
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
References	50	14	34	32
All references received were nominally Acceptable. Vendor A did not provide reasonable references.				
Training	50	32	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Security	150	102	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 561 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. Vendor B offered a 1% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 9 cost points.				
Summary				

Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). Vendor B scored 600.8 total points and does not represent a best value to the State. US Cellular scored 669.6 total points. US Cellular represents a best value to the State.

Award Category 3J

General Technical Scorable Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	AT&T	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	38.4	48	45.6
All offerors who submitted had Good employee numbers and expertise.				
Years of experience	75	54	66	63
The offerors in this category demonstrated good experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	38	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3J Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	AT&T	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	120	152	144
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria With AT&T and US Cellular having much better descriptions and representing better value.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	45	57	60
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Service Factors	50	36	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
References	50	30	28	34
All references received were nominally Acceptable.				
Training	50	32	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Security	150	96	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 525.4 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. AT&T offered a 5% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 45 cost points.				
Summary				

Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 676.6 total points. AT&T scored 640.0 total points. US Cellular and AT&T represent a best value to the State.

Award Category 3K

General Technical Scorable Criteria			
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	AT&T
Describe your Reporting	50	38	36
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.			
Employee number and expertise	60	45.6	48
All offerors who submitted had good employee numbers and expertise.			
Years of experience	75	63	66
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.			
Customer Service	50	36	38
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.			
Category 3K Criteria			
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	AT&T
Turnkey Offerings	200	128	136
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	51	54
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Service Factors	50	36	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
References	50	34	36
All references received were nominally Acceptable.			
Training	50	32	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Security	150	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.			
Cost			
Vendor A scored 565.6 points did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. AT&T offered a 5% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points.			
Summary			
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). AT&T scored 674 total points. AT&T represents a best value to the State.			

Award Category 3L

General Technical Scorable Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	T-Mobile	Vendor B
Describe your Reporting	50	36	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	48	52.8	45.6
All offerors who submitted had good employee numbers and expertise.				
Years of experience	75	66	66	63
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	38	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3L Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	T-Mobile	Vendor B
Turnkey Offerings	200	144	136	112
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	51	42	54
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Service Factors	50	34	32	36
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
References	50	14	36	32
All references received were nominally Acceptable. Vendor A did not provide reasonable references.				
Training	50	32	32	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Security	150	102	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 565 points and Vendor B scored 550.6 points did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. T-Mobile offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points.				
Summary				
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). T-Mobile scored 662.8 total points. T-Mobile presents a best value to the State.				

Award Category 3M

General Technical Scorable Criteria

Criteria	Points Possible	AT&T	US Cellular	Vendor A
Describe your Reporting	50	36	38	36
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	48	45.6	52.8
All offerors who submitted had excellent employee numbers and expertise. They are the leaders in the industry.				
Years of experience	75	66	63	63
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	36	36	38
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3M Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	AT&T	US Cellular	Vendor A
Turnkey Offerings	200	152	152	144
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	54	60	48
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Service Factors	50	36	32	28
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
References	50	34	34	16
All references received were nominally Acceptable.				
Training	50	34	32	28
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Security	150	102	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 555.8 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. AT&T offered a discount of 5% and earned 45 points.				
Summary				
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 684.6 total points and AT&T scored 643 total points. US Cellular and AT&T present a best value to the State.				

Award Category 3N

General Technical Scorable Criteria

Criteria	Points Possible	AT&T	Federated Wireless	Vendor A	US Cellular
Describe your Reporting	50	36	38	36	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.					
Employee number and expertise	60	48	36	52.8	45.6
All offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise.					
Years of experience	75	66	45	63	63
The offerors in this category demonstrated good experience in the industry.					
Customer Service	50	36	36	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.					
Category 3N Criteria					
Criteria	Points Possible	AT&T	Federated Wireless	Vendor A	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	152	152	128	144
All offerors had acceptable to good proposals for this criteria.					
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	54	57	57	54
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Service Factors	50	36	34	32	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
References	50	36	36	14	34
All references received were nominally Acceptable. Vendor A did not provide reasonable references.					
Training	50	32	36	30	30
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Security	150	108	108	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Cost					
Vendor A scored 552.8 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular and Federated Wireless offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. AT&T offered a 5% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 45 cost points.					
Summary					
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). US Cellular scored 668.6 total points. Federated Wireless scored 668 total points. AT&T scored 649 points. US Cellular, Federated Wireless and AT&T represent a best value to the State.					

Award Category 30

General Technical Scorable Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	US Cellular

Describe your Reporting	50	36	34	38
All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.				
Employee number and expertise	60	48	50.4	45.6
All offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise.				
Years of experience	75	66	66	63
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.				
Customer Service	50	38	38	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.				
Category 3M Criteria				
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	US Cellular
Turnkey Offerings	200	120	144	144
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	48	54	57
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Service Factors	50	30	34	30
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
References	50	32	38	26
All references received were nominally Acceptable.				
Training	50	30	34	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Security	150	102	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.				
Cost				
Vendor A scored 550 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. US Cellular offered a 15% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. Vendor B offered a 5% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 30 cost points.				
Summary				
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). Vendor B scored 624.4 total points and does not represent a best value to the State. US Cellular scored 665.6 total points. US Cellular represents a best value to the State.				

Award Category 3P

General Technical Scorable Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Verizon Wireless	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
Describe your Reporting	50	36	34	38	38	36

All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.						
Employee number and expertise	60	48	50.4	36	45.6	52.8
All offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise.						
Years of experience	75	66	66	45	63	66
Similarly, the offerors in this category demonstrated experience in the industry.						
Customer Service	50	36	38	36	36	38
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.						
Category 3E Criteria						
Criteria	Points Possible	Vendor A	Verizon Wireless	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	136	136	128	144
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	51	51	51	54	63
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Service Factors	50	34	34	34	34	34
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
References	50	28	40	32	34	34
All references received were nominally Acceptable.						
Training	50	30	32	32	30	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Security	150	102	102	96	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.						
Cost						
Vendor B scored 536 points and Vendor C scored 564.6 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. Verizon Wireless offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points. Vendor A offered a 5% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 45 cost points. Vendor D offered a 1% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned 9 cost points.						
Summary						
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). Vendor A and Vendor D scored 612 total points and 610.8 total points, respectively, and do not represent a best value to the State. Verizon Wireless scored 673.4 total points. Verizon represents a best value to the State.						

Award Category 3Q

General Technical Scorable Criteria					
Criteria	Points Possible	Verizon Wireless	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C
Describe your Reporting	50	34	36	38	38

All offerors provided acceptable reporting commitments.					
Employee number and expertise	60	50.4	48	36	45.6
Most offerors who submitted had acceptable employee numbers and expertise with Vendor B scoring poorly.					
Years of experience	75	66	66	48	63
The offerors in this category demonstrated good experience in the industry.					
Customer Service	50	38	36	36	36
All of the offerors demonstrated acceptable customer service commitments in their proposals.					
Category 3Q Criteria					
Criteria	Points Possible	Verizon Wireless	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C
Turnkey Offerings	200	136	128	128	136
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Description of Turnkey Planning and Process	75	48	48	48	48
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Service Factors	50	34	34	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
References	50	38	20	34	34
All references received were nominally Acceptable. Vendor A did not provide reasonable references.					
Training	50	34	32	34	32
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Security	150	108	102	102	102
All offerors had acceptable proposals for this criteria.					
Cost					
Vendor A scored 550 points and Vendor B scored 538 points and Vendor C scored 566.6 points and did not advance to the cost evaluation stage (567 threshold). The Offeror with the highest proposed minimum discount % (or Average discount off) for the given subcategory will receive 100% of the cost points possible for that service category. All other Offerors will receive a percentage of the cost points possible based on the percentage by which their proposed discount % is lower than the highest discount % in the given category. The formula to compute cost points is: (Proposed Discount % / Maximum Proposed Discount %) * Total Cost Points Available. Verizon Wireless offered a 10% discount off of its catalog/public price and earned all 90 cost points.					
Summary					
Award will be made to any offeror who scores a total of 70% of total points (630 points). Verizon Wireless scored 676.4 total points. Verizon Wireless represents a best value to the State.					

FINAL CONCLUSION

For all award categories, the above-recommended offerors presented technical experience and demonstrated expertise as reflected in the assigned points. This technical score along with the cost methodology leads the committee to this recommendation. It is the opinion of the State Evaluation Committee that an award of multiple contracts to the offerors listed in Section A is appropriate, and that they represent best value to the State.