



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

February 26, 2018

James Filippi
Applied Data Systems, Inc.
8401 Golden Valley Road STE 200
Golden Valley, MN 55427

Re: **RFQ # 1025669, ARCHIBUS Support and Implementation**

Dear Mr. Filippi:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 1025669 for ARCHIBUS Support and Implementation. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to Applied Data Systems, Inc., contingent upon successful contract negotiations.

Depending on the file sizes, the responses to the procurement solicitation and supporting award documentation can be made available either by email, CD for pickup, or in person for inspection. If you desire to receive or review the documentation or have any questions, please contact Genario Pittman by email at genario.pittman@nashville.gov Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

If the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements were a part of this solicitation, the awardee must forward a signed copy of the "Letter of Intent to Perform as Subcontractor/Subconsultant/Supplier/Joint Venture" for any minority/women-owned business enterprises included in the response to the Business Assistance Office within two business days from this notification. Should you have any questions concerning this requirement, please contact Jerval Watson, BAO Representative, at (615) 862-5461 or at jerval.watson@nashville.gov.

Thank you for participating in Metro's competitive procurement process.

Sincerely,

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Purchasing Agent

Cc: Solicitation File
Other Offerors

Pursuant to M.C.L. 4.36.010 Authority to resolve protested solicitations and awards.

A. Right to Protest. Any actual or prospective bidder, offeror or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the Purchasing Agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

**1025669 ARCHIBUS Support and Implementation
Evaluation Team Score Sheet**

Offeror	Applied Data Systems, Inc.	Horizant Corp	InfoNarus, LLC	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.	OnLINE FM, LLC
Qualifications (15 Points)	14	14	12	10	9
Approach (35 Points)	33	32	29	28	22
Scenarios (15 Points)	14	15	12	11	9
Cost (35 Points)	34.50	34.22	38.30	28.80	30.30
Total Evaluation Scores	95.50	95.22	91.30	77.80	70.30

Evaluation Comments

<p>Applied Data Systems, Inc.</p> <p>Strengths - Proposal detailed multiple years of experience in the scope of work. The proposed team has been on the client side of the scope of work and can relate to being a client. One of the proposed team members has experience in condition assessment which will be beneficial on this project. Proposal detailed sufficient capacity to perform requested work. Proposal discussed firms view on this being more than just a software project, also service and support. Provided references were very strong and in line with the requested scope of work. Proposal demonstrated understanding of Metro wanting “out of the box” solutions and how it will be beneficial for potential future upgrades. Proposal provided a detailed potential issue log. Proposal provided a very detailed and systematic Project management plan. Proposal discussed code review process. Proposal discussed a detailed training approach with shadow training. Proposal provided a detailed explanation to their Service Level Agreement with Metro and how Metro would be taken care of throughout the contract. Proposal demonstrated understanding and ability on approach and how to manage the contract. Proposal discussed how firm will handle quality test before anything is provided/delivered to Metro. Proposal demonstrated experience with Archibus connectors.</p> <p>Weaknesses - Proposal did not provide Support FTE percentages. Proposal discussed response time but not resolution time. Two attachments were mentioned within the proposal but they were not attached with proposal submission. Provided responses to scenarios appeared to be cut and paste.</p>
--

Horizant Corp

Strengths - Proposal provided a detailed organization chart with several business analysts. Proposal provided a detailed narrative in regards to Support FTE for Metro's needs. Proposal provided detailed explanation on scalability of firms approach. Proposed team discussed a dedicated trainer. Service Level Agreement detailed support on an annual/no limits basis with multiple levels of support and the ticketing process for each. Proposal detailed resolution time as well as response time. Proposal provided detailed Needs Assessment and GAP analysis. Proposal laid out a detailed explanation on "as is" vs "should be". Proposal provided detailed explanation on data to be provided. Proposal laid out a training program with 20 special topic videos. Proposal provided detailed understanding of Feel Flex and Mobile processes. Proposal was very straightforward on the complexities of modules.

Weaknesses - Proposal focused on working remotely vs providing in house assistance. Provided response time does not meet the department's needs. Proposal did not discuss tolls to be used on reports or report generation in general.

InfoNarus, LLC

Strengths - Proposal provided detail on workplace process and complexity. Proposal discussed how contract would be software, service and support. Proposal demonstrated commitment of time and team to Metro. Proposal discussed JIRA and how Metro can check outstanding tickets. Proposal provided detailed response on reporting and how firm handles performance metrics. Proposal provided detailed Needs Assessment and GAP analysis explanation. Proposal provided detailed explanation of workflow on each scenario. Proposal provided detailed response to assess management.

Weaknesses - Proposal only demonstrates 2 years of experience as a company. Proposal did not provide detail on if firm has the capacity in place to handle the scope of work. Project Manager and Solution Architect would be offsite. Proposal appeared to be cookie cutter and not tailored for Metro. Proposal did not demonstrate an understanding of code review. Proposal discusses 24 hour down time for critical fixes.

Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.

Strengths - Proposal detailed 1.7 dedicated FTE to Metro throughout the contract. Proposal provided detailed explanation and understanding to initial project planning and implementation. Proposal demonstrated that critical response time was 15 minutes. Proposal provided a detailed GAP analysis. Proposal discussed "client need" in all three scenario responses.

Weaknesses - Did not provide cost as requested in Exhibit A – Pricing. Proposal did not include a letter from Archibus as was requested in Minimum Requirements. Provided support contracts were not of similar scope and lacked detail. Provided Archibus partnership explanation was confusing and lacked detail. Provided explanation on down time for fixing critical problems lacked detail. Provided business model appears to be project managers and not supporters. Provided Service Level Agreement was weak and lacked detail. Provided explanation of support appears to be a queue process and not an actual support person assigned to Metro. Provided explanation on training appeared to be "do it yourself". Proposed solution to scenario one was complex and scenario two focuses on the promotion of certain products.

OnLINE FM, LLC

Strengths - Proposal detailed extensive experience in the scope of work. Proposal discussed that Metro would receive a response from a team member for all concerns throughout the contract. Proposal provided detailed explanation on Assets Management Bar Coding. Proposal discussed Mobile Devices and Asset Management.

Weaknesses - Proposal did not include a dedicated support team for Metro. Proposal did not demonstrate that firm will or can provide what is requested in the scope of work. Metro currently works with Firm and has not received the "service desk" service that is stated in the proposal. Current help desk and service portal is just an email address. Proposal did not provide a detailed Service Level Agreement. Metro has not had access to the proposed CRM system in the current contract even though it has been requested.

Solicitation Title & Number	RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
ARCHIBUS Support and Implementation RFQ# 1025669	28	7	35

Offeror's Name	Total Bid Amount	SBE/SDV Participation Amount	RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
Applied Data Systems, Inc.	\$116,938.00	\$116,938.00	28.00	6.50	34.50
OnLINE FM, LLC	\$140,505.00	\$125,917.00	23.30	7.00	30.30
InfoNarus, LLC	\$100,000.05	\$100,000.05	32.74	5.56	38.30
Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.	\$113,678.80	\$0.00	28.80	0.00	28.80
Horizant Corp	\$118,504.00	\$118,504.00	27.63	6.59	34.22

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Jerval Watson
Contract Specialist: Stephen Pitman
Date: 01/31/2018

Department Name:
RFP/ITB Number: 1025669

Project Name: Archibus Support and Implementation

Primary Contractor*	Prime Bid Amount	Total Offered SBE (\$)	SBEs approved?	Total Approved SBE (\$)	SBE (%)	Comments
Applied Data Sysytems, Inc.	\$116,938.00	\$116,938.00	YES	\$ 116,938.00	100.00%	The primary contractor is a Metro approved SBE
OnLine FM, LLC	\$140,505.00	\$125,917.00	YES	\$ 125,917.00	81.00%	The primary contractor is the only Metro approved SBE
InfoNarus, LLC	\$100,000.05	\$100,000.05	YES	\$ 100,000.05	100.00%	The primary contractor is a Metro approved SBE
Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.	\$113,678.80	\$0.00	NO	\$ -	0.00%	There are no SBE participation
Horizant Corp	\$118,504.00	\$118,504.00	YES	\$ 118,504.00	100.00%	The primary contractor is a Metro approved SBE

*For ITBs, only apparent low bidder will be listed.