

Office of the Attorney General of the State of Utah

Request For Proposal For A Case Management System Solicitation Number: FT16002CP

Notice of Award and Scores

The Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”) hereby announces that it has awarded solicitation number FT16002CP for a case management software system (“System”) to Legal Files Software, Inc. (“Legal Files”).

The RFP generated five detailed written Proposals. One Offeror withdrew its Proposal voluntarily. The remaining four Offerors went through an evaluation process that included reference checks and live presentations of their Systems to the OAG Evaluation Committee. Following the live presentations, the OAG Evaluation Committee determined that one Proposal did not meet the minimum requirements and was not responsive to the RFP. Upon the recommendation of the OAG Cost Committee, and with the approval of the Procurement Officer for this solicitation, the remaining three Offerors were invited to make best and final offers.

The OAG Evaluation Committee conducted a Technical Evaluation of the three finalists, applying the following grading scale to each subcategory of the evaluation criteria:

Grading Scale

- 1 = Poor, fails to address the requirements in the RFP
- 2 = Fair, addresses the requirements in the RFP unsatisfactorily
- 3 = Good, addresses all requirements in the RFP satisfactorily
- 4 = Very Good, addresses all requirements in the RFP and may exceed some
- 5 = Superior, addresses all requirements in the RFP and exceeds them

Evaluation Criteria

Functionality (Total Scoring Weight = 10): The ability of a System to perform a particular task or to work in a particular way. Functionality is focused on what a System can do. The RFP defined specific tasks or aspects of functionality that are desirable in a case management system. Subcategories of Functionality include:

Primary Functionality (Scoring Weight = 7): Specific important aspects of Functionality that a System should have, which were detailed in the RFP. These core abilities were weighted the most heavily in evaluation.

Secondary Functionality (Scoring Weight = 3): Specific aspects of functionality which were detailed in the RFP that, while not weighed as heavily as Primary Functionality, are

deemed to be desirable. Some of these aspects of functionality were specified to meet the special needs of specific OAG Units.

Usability (Total Scoring Weight = 8): The ease with which a System can be used by the end user, including how well the System integrates with other software. Usability focused on how well a System does what it can do. Subcategories of Usability include:

Daily Usability (Scoring Weight = 5): Evaluates how easy it is for end users who have become familiar with the System to use it on a day to day basis for their primary uses. This criterion evaluates the quality of the interface and how easy it is to perform basic functions.

Feature Usability (Scoring Weight = 3): Evaluates how robust the System's features are for special uses and high-end users. For example, the ease with which an experienced user can customize the System to better meet that user's needs is evaluated as Feature Usability.

Deployability (Total Scoring Weight = 2): The ease with which a System can be deployed initially and taught to new employees. Subcategories of Deployability include:

Physical Deployability (Scoring Weight = .6): The ability of the System to be deployed in a timely manner and with minimal interference with work flow. This includes the physical installation of the System, setting up hosting for the System's data, and customization to meet the needs of different OAG Units.

Legacy Deployability (Scoring Weight = .4): The ability of the System to capture legacy data as it exists in both electronic and paper formats, to the extent deemed desirable by the OAG.

Training Deployability (Scoring Weight = 1): The ease with which IT staff and employees who are not familiar with the System can (A) begin working with the System, and (B) become proficient in using the System. This is evaluated both with regard to existing employees who may be trained in group settings as well as future hires, who may need to learn the System with less formal training. Proposals that are more intuitive and require less training, and proposals that include higher levels of initial training and ongoing support scored higher in this category.

Each of the OAG Evaluation Committee members independently scored each Proposal by multiplying a grade of between 1 and 5, times the scoring weight of each subcategory of the Evaluation Criteria. The total scoring weight of all criteria is 20, and a perfect Technical Evaluation score was 100 points (20 times 5). The total Technical Evaluation scores of all OAG Evaluation Committee members were averaged to obtain a Technical Evaluation score for each Proposal.

The OAG Cost Committee reviewed each of the three best and final offer Amended Cost Proposals. The Amended Cost Proposals covered the anticipated costs for deploying and maintaining the Systems for a five year period of time. The lowest Amended Cost Proposal

scored 100 points, and the others were scored as a ratio: Cost Proposal Score = (Lowest Amended Cost Proposal / Amended Cost Proposal) x 100.

Finally, for each Proposal the average Technical Evaluation score was multiplied by .75, the Cost Proposal Score was multiplied by .25, and the two were added together. A perfect total combined score would have been 100 points.

The Legal Files Proposal received a total combined score of 84.63 points. The other two finalists received total combined scores of 84.29 and 79.64 points respectively. The OAG believes that the Legal Files Proposal provides the best value to the OAG. The Legal Files Proposal was both the highest scoring and lowest cost. Although one finalist had a combined score nearly as high as Legal Files, it was significantly more expensive.

The OAG is justified in selecting the Legal Files Proposal because it appears to more than adequately meet the overall needs of the OAG at the lowest cost. In addition to receiving a 100 point score for its Cost Proposal, it also scored 79.5 points for its Technical Evaluation. While the other two finalist Proposals received somewhat higher Technical Evaluation scores, the 79.5 Technical Evaluation points awarded to Legal Files reflects an average score of 3.87, which equates to "Very Good, addresses all requirements in the RFP and may exceed some."

The Evaluation Committee noted one sub-function of the Secondary Functionality criterion where the Legal Files Proposal was markedly inferior to the second highest scoring Proposal. That sub-function, which was desirable but not a requirement of the RFP, concerns tracking criminal restitution payments. As a result of that relative weakness, the Legal Files Proposal received its lowest average score (a grade of 3.39) in the Secondary Functionality category. However, the OAG believes that it will be able to provide satisfactory restitution payment tracking functionality, possibly by purchasing separate specialized software, for a small fraction of the difference in price between the two proposals.

The OAG thanks all of the Offerors for the time and effort that they put into their Proposals and presentations.