

CalSAWS

Statewide Portal/Mobile Application
Request for Proposal 2019-01

Vendor Selection Report

April 20, 2020

DOCUMENT HISTORY

This document is controlled through the Document Management Process. To verify that the document is the latest version, please contact the Procurement Project Manager.

DATE	DOCUMENT VERSION	REVISION DESCRIPTION	AUTHOR
April 20, 2020			

Table of Contents

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 EVALUATION PROCESS RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATION	2
2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS	6
2.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	6
2.2 EVALUATION STEPS	6
2.3 PREPARE FOR EVALUATION	7
2.4 BUSINESS PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS	7
2.4.1 Review Proposals for Compliance with Submission Requirements	7
2.4.2 Evaluate Business Proposals.....	7
2.5 PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS	15
2.5.1 Review Price Proposals for Compliance with Submission Requirements	15
2.5.2 Evaluate Price Proposals.....	15
2.6 CALCULATE FINAL SCORES.....	16
2.7 EVALUATION TEAMS	16
3 RESULTS, RATIONALE AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION	18
3.1 BUSINESS PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION.....	18
3.1.1 Business Proposals.....	18
3.1.2 Price Proposals.....	18
3.2 BUSINESS PROPOSAL RANKING AND SCORING JUSTIFICATION	18
3.2.1 Firm Qualifications Justification Summary	21
3.2.2 Approach to Portal/Mobile Services Justification Summary.....	22
3.2.3 Portal/Mobile Solution Justification Summary	24
3.2.4 Staff Approach and Qualifications Justification Summary	25
3.2.5 Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews Justification Summary	26
3.3 PRICE PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION.....	28
3.4 FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	30
Table 1 - Evaluation Results and Recommended Vendor	3
Table 2 -DD&I Phase 1 and Phase 2 Price and Normalized Price Points	4
Table 3 -Requirements Summary	5
Table 4 - Evaluation Methodology	6
Table 5 – Business Proposal Scores Summary.....	19
Table 6 – Requirements Summary, DXC and Deloitte	20
Table 7 – Requirements Summary, Accenture and Alluma	20
Table 8 Firm Qualifications Ranks and Scoring Summaries	22

Table 9 – Approach to Portal/Mobile Services Ranks and Scores	24
Table 10 – Portal/Mobile Solution Ranks and Scores.....	25
Table 11 -Staffing Approach and Qualification Ranks and Scores	26
Table 12 - Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview Score Summaries.....	27
Table 13 – DD&I Phase 1 Price Summary	29
Table 14 – BAFO Variance to Lowest Price	29
Table 15 – BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor Price.....	29
Table 16 – Business Proposal and Price Proposal Summary.....	31

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 4, 2019 the California Statewide Automated Welfare System (CalSAWS) Consortium, acting for the benefit of the 58 California Counties, released a Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit proposals from qualified Vendors to develop a Statewide Portal/Mobile Application (Portal/Mobile App) to serve the residents of all California Counties and integrate seamlessly with the CalSAWS system.

This procurement solicited services, including project management support, to perform activities required to design, develop, and implement the Portal/Mobile infrastructure and application solution. The RFP established a base contract period of 14 months, beginning August 2020 and continuing through go-live in September 2021, followed by a one-year Maintenance and Operations period (M&O), beginning in September 2021 and continuing through August 2022. The Consortium may, at its discretion and depending on Contractor performance during Phase 1, approve Phase 2 for Optional Enhancements. The Consortium may also exercise up to two (2) optional one-year options to extend the M&O period.

In conjunction with the RFP development, the Consortium designated a Procurement Manager to lead the procurement process and established a Portal/Mobile Proposal Evaluation Team consisting of the following Consortium staff:

1. Regional Manager
2. Lead Business Analyst
3. Business Analyst
4. Information Technology Manager
5. Cloud Manager

The Business Proposal Evaluation Team also consisted of a Principal Information System Analyst from Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS).

The following two State representatives participated as part of the Business Proposal Evaluation Team:

1. California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Deputy Director, Research, Automation and Data Division
2. Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) Assistant Division Chief, Medi-Cal Eligibility Division

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team consisted of a CalSAWS Project Management Office representative from Los Angeles County.

Based upon 155 Bidder questions, the Consortium provided updates to the procurement schedule and RFP attachments, and, in consultation with legal counsel, issued three formal RFP addenda.

The Consortium received five letters of intent to respond. Proposals were submitted on January 22, 2020 by the following five vendors in the order of proposal receipt:

1. DXC Technology
2. Deloitte Consulting LLP
3. Accenture LLP
4. Alluma
5. AgreeYa Solutions Inc.

The AgreeYa Solutions proposal was disqualified during the initial proposal evaluation due to lack of minimum corporate experience. The four remaining proposals were evaluated and scored in accordance with the established business and cost evaluation criteria defined in the RFP. Price Proposals were not opened until the evaluation of the Business Proposals was complete.

The Consortium exercised its right to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO), which was released on March 30, 2020. The purpose of the BAFO was to facilitate price reductions. Three bidders provided BAFO responses by the required due date and time of April 1, 2020, 3:00 PM Pacific Time.

1.1 EVALUATION PROCESS RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATION

The Business and Price Proposal Evaluation Teams recommend Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte) as the apparently successful vendor to deliver the CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Application Services. The combined Evaluation Team determined that Deloitte provides the overall best value taking requirements, evaluation criteria, and price into consideration. This recommendation is based on the overall vendor scores as depicted in the following table:

CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Application Vendor Selection Report

Table 1 - Evaluation Results and Recommended Vendor

	Category/Subcategory	Subcategory Weight	Overall Weight	Total Possible Points	DXC	Deloitte	Accenture	Alluma
	Business Proposal		70.0%					
1	Firm Qualifications	5.0%		5.0	1.25	5.00	3.75	2.50
2	Approach	15.0%		15.0	11.25	15.00	7.50	3.75
3	Solution	20.0%		20.0	15.00	20.00	10.00	5.00
4	Staff Approach and Qualifications	20.0%		20.0	10.00	20.00	15.00	5.00
5	Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	10.0%		10.0	4.38	8.00	7.88	4.50
	Business Proposal Raw Scores			70.0	41.88	68.00	44.13	20.75
	Business Proposal Normalized Scores			70.0	43.11	70.00	45.42	21.36
	Price Proposal		30.0%					
6	DD&I Phase 1	25.0%		25.0	20.34	13.74	25.00	15.80
7	DD&I Phase 2	5.0%		5.0	2.48	0.35	1.35	5.00
	Price Proposal Scores			30.0	22.82	14.10	26.35	20.80
	Business Proposal + Price Proposal Total		100.0%	100.0	65.92	84.10	71.78	42.16

Table 2 below provides a summary of the proposed Design, Development and Implementation (DD&I) Phase 1 and DD&I Phase 2 price and normalized price points.

CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Application Vendor Selection Report

Table 2 -DD&I Phase 1 and Phase 2 Price and Normalized Price Points

Price Score	Maximum Price Points			25	5	30
Vendor	DD&I Phase 1 Price	DD&I Phase 2 Price	Total Price Phase 1 and Phase 2	Phase 1 Price Points	Phase 2 Price Points	Total Price Points
DXC	\$ 4,479,133.00	\$ 976,787.00	\$ 5,455,920.00	19.10	2.14	21.23
Deloitte	\$ 6,224,681.00	\$ 5,900,000.00	\$ 12,124,681.00	13.74	0.35	14.10
Accenture	\$ 3,421,438.00	\$ 1,543,067.00	\$ 4,964,505.00	25.00	1.35	26.35
Alluma	\$ 5,695,564.00	\$ 417,641.00	\$ 6,113,205.00	15.02	5.00	20.02
Lowest Price	\$ 3,421,438.00	\$ 417,641.00	\$ 4,964,505.00			

The following general observations were made based on these results:

- Deloitte had the highest scoring Business Proposal. Accenture had the second highest scoring Business Proposal. Alluma had the lowest scoring Business Proposal.
- BAFO responses resulted in decreased costs from Deloitte, DXC and Alluma. Accenture did not submit a BAFO and thus held firm on their initial Price Proposal.
- The difference from the highest to the lowest total price for DD&I Phases 1 and 2 was \$7,160,176.
- Deloitte had the highest Price Proposal and received the lowest Price Proposal score for DD&I Phases 1 and 2. Accenture provided the lowest Price Proposal for DD&I Phase 1 and received the highest Price Proposal score for that phase. Alluma had the lowest Price Proposal for DD&I Phase 2 and received the highest score for Phase 2.

Table 3 summarizes the total business requirements that were exceeded, met, partially met/not met and for which there was no response by proposing vendors.

Table 3 -Requirements Summary

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	DXC	Deloitte	Accenture	Alluma
		Total	Total	Total	Total
Requirement Exceeded	3	6	15	5	4
Requirement Met	2	219	280	217	182
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	72	14	60	70
Non-responsive	0	15	0	27	56
Total Not Applicable Requirements		1	4	4	1
Total Requirements Count		313	313	313	313
Net Requirements Count		312	309	309	312
Total Requirements Score		528	619	509	446
Adjusted Requirements Score		530	627	517	448
Average Requirements Score		1.69	2.00	1.63	1.42

2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The Consortium Evaluation Team analyzed each Business Proposal and Price Proposal in accordance with the procurement and evaluation provisions of the RFP, as described in the CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Proposal Evaluation Guide and as summarized below.

2.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The overall evaluation methodology, including the relative value of the business proposal and cost proposal, is reflected in the table below.

Table 4 - Evaluation Methodology

CATEGORY/SUBCATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY WEIGHT	OVERALL WEIGHT	MAXIMUM POINTS
Business Proposal		70%	70
Firm Qualifications	5%		
Approach to Statewide Portal/Mobile App Services	15%		
Statewide Portal/Mobile App Solution	20%		
Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications	20%		
Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	10%		
Price Proposal		30%	30
1. Phase 1 DD&I	25%		
2. Phase 2 Optional Enhancements	5%		
Total	100%	100%	100

2.2 EVALUATION STEPS

The proposal evaluation process is comprised of the following steps. The process for each of these steps is described in further detail in subsequent sections.

Step 1 – Prepare for Evaluation

Step 2 – Business Proposal Evaluation Process

- Part 1: Initial Review for Compliance with Submission Requirements
- Part 2: Evaluation and Scoring of Business Proposals

Step 3 – Price Proposal Evaluation Process

- Part 1: Initial Review for Compliance with Submission Requirements
- Part 2: Evaluation and Scoring of Price Proposals

Step 4 – Calculate Final Scores

Step 5 – Final Selection Recommendation

2.3 PREPARE FOR EVALUATION

The key aspects of preparing for evaluation included:

- Getting the Evaluation Team ready to perform their responsibilities, and
- Ensuring that documents, tools and procedures are in place to aid the Team in completing their evaluation tasks.

The Evaluation Team reviewed the Portal/Mobile RFP, the Portal/Mobile Proposal Evaluation Guide and participated in a one-day training session in Sacramento to prepare for the evaluation process and tasks. The Office of Systems Integration (OSI) established and hosted a Portal/Mobile Procurement SharePoint site as the document management repository. The Procurement Support Team established and maintained the Portal/Mobile procurement work plan, scheduled and facilitated team meetings and consolidated individual review results into team-based workbooks to enable the review and analysis process at the team level.

2.4 BUSINESS PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

2.4.1 Review Proposals for Compliance with Submission Requirements

This initial phase of the evaluation determined compliance with submission requirements, including format and content, and inclusion of all required forms and signatures. The proposal submission requirements are defined in Section 6 of the RFP and are included in the Requirements Cross-Reference Matrix. Using the Requirements Cross-Reference Matrix, the Procurement Support Team reviewed each proposal and determined the extent to which each of the submission requirements were met.

2.4.2 Evaluate Business Proposals

The Evaluation Team reviewed proposals in the same order as submitted to help ensure the evaluators were focused on the same materials at the same time and to facilitate the identification and resolution of questions and inconsistencies.

The Evaluation Team reviewed all sections of the proposals with a focus on firm qualifications, the Portal/Mobile App Services Approach; the Portal/Mobile App Solution and Staffing Approach and Qualifications. As a key part of the review, each evaluator used the Requirements Cross-Reference Matrix to indicate the extent to which each RFP requirement was met. The Evaluation Team also used the results of the oral presentations, key staff interviews, firm reference checks and individual reference checks to determine scores for each area of the Business Proposals. The scoring results for each Bidder were documented in the Portal/Mobile Business Proposal Scoring Workbook. The collective scores and results for all Bidders were documented in the master Portal/Mobile Proposal Scoring Summary Workbook.

2.4.2.1 Review Proposals to Determine Whether RFP Requirements Were Met

The Requirements Cross-Reference Matrix, provided as RFP Attachment J, captures all RFP requirements in a standard form and logically groups them together, based on:

- Proposal Submission
- Firm Qualifications
- Approach, SOW and Deliverables
- Phase 1 – DD&I Technical
- Phase 1 – DD&I Functional
- Phase 2 – Optional Enhancements
- Staffing Approach and Qualifications
- Required Attachments

Using the Requirements Cross-Reference Matrix, each evaluator reviewed the proposals to determine the extent to which each requirement was met. Evaluators indicated scores using whole numbers in accordance with the following standard scoring criteria for each requirement:

- 0 = no response to requirement
- 1 = response exists but requirement not met
- 2 = requirement met
- 3 = response exceeds the requirement

If a requirement was not fully met or was exceeded, the evaluator documented the reason the requirement was not met or only partially met or exceeded in the Reviewer Comment column. If evaluators had questions or concerns about a requirement, those were also documented in the Reviewer Comment column.

Once each individual evaluator completed the matrix for a given proposal, the results were consolidated into a single master matrix for that proposal and made available for team review. This allowed the Evaluation Team to quickly identify any differences in how the response to a requirement was understood. The Evaluation Team engaged in team discussions to reach consensus on the requirements that were exceeded, met, not met, and partially met for each Business Proposal. This resulted in an overall requirement score for each category of the Business Proposal.

2.4.2.2 Review Firm Reference Checks

The Evaluation Team reviewed the Firm Reference Forms completed by the references and as submitted as part of the Business Proposal. The firm reference questionnaires were provided in RFP Attachment F – Firm References. Each Bidder and each subcontractor were required to provide three completed firm references. The RFP instructions clearly indicated that client references were required.

- Evaluation Team members used the completed references in their respective reviews of firm qualifications.
- The Procurement Support Team documented the reference check scores for all Bidders.

2.4.2.3 Review Individual Reference Checks

Individual reference checks were reviewed by the Evaluation Team. Completed Individual Reference Check Forms from RFP Attachment H were submitted with the Business Proposal. Each Bidder was required to provide two completed individual references for Key Staff.

- The Evaluation Team used the completed individual references in their reviews of staff qualifications.
- The Procurement Support Team documented the individual reference check scores for all proposed Key Staff.

2.4.2.4 Conduct Oral Presentations

The purpose of the oral presentations was to enable Bidders to introduce their company, their proposed Key Staff and demonstrate their understanding of and capabilities to deliver the proposed services, and for the Evaluation Team to gain a better understanding of the Vendor capabilities. The oral presentations were designed to address specific areas of the Business Proposals and to validate information documented in those proposals. Key aspects of the oral presentations included:

- The Procurement Manager provided the topic areas and questions to all Bidders on February 26, 2020, well in advance of the scheduled oral presentations. The topic areas and questions were identical for all Bidders.
- The oral presentations were scheduled for a 50-minute period. An optional 10-minute system demonstration was allowed.
- All proposed Key Staff were requested to participate in the delivery of the oral presentation.
- Originally the oral presentations were scheduled as in-person meetings; however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Procurement Manager provided revised instructions to the proposing vendors. Both the oral presentation and optional system demonstration were submitted as a video. No in-person meetings were conducted.
- The Procurement Manager initiated the oral presentations via a conference call, where both the Consortium and Vendor participants were introduced. To ensure consistency across the oral presentations, at the start of each session the Procurement Manager indicated to each Bidder that there would be no follow-up discussion, questions and answers.

- The Business Proposal Evaluation Team members, Procurement Manager and Procurement Support Team individually viewed the oral presentations and optional system demonstration videos.
- At the conclusion of oral presentation and system demonstration viewing, the Evaluation Team convened via a conference call to determine and document an overall score using a 1 to 10 scale with a score of 1 indicating: very strong evidence that the majority of topics were not addressed, to a score of 10 indicating: very strong evidence that all topics were fully addressed. The optional system demonstration was not subject to scoring.

2.4.2.5 Conduct Key Staff Interviews

Immediately following the oral presentation, the candidates for the four designated Key Staff positions were interviewed by a panel of Business Proposal Evaluation Team Members. The Key Staff positions interviewed were:

- Portal/Mobile Project Manager
- Application Development Lead
- Test Lead
- User Interface Lead

Interviews of proposed Key Staff were used to confirm staff experience and qualifications. The interviews provided information regarding the proposed individual's understanding of their assigned role and relevant experience. The major steps within the Key Staff interview process included:

- A standard set of interview topics and questions were developed for each Key Staff position in advance of the scheduled interviews. The questions were not provided to the proposed Key Staff prior to the interview. The questions asked included background and relevant experience designed to demonstrate their experience and ability to perform their role.
- Interviews were conducted via a Skype Webinar by a panel led by the Procurement Manager. The interview panel included the Business Evaluation Team members and the Procurement Support Team. Although the entire panel (Procurement Manager, Business Evaluation Team and Procurement Support Team) participated in the interview process, the individuals were rated only by the Business Evaluation Team members. Each Project Manager interview was scheduled for 30 minutes; all other interviews were scheduled for 25 minutes.
- At the conclusion of each interview, the panel rated the individual on a scale from 1-10 with a score of 1 indicating: very strong evidence that the required skills/experience are not present, to a score of 10 indicating: very strong evidence that the required skills/experience are present.
- For each Bidder, an average interview score was calculated across the four required Key Staff positions.

- The average interview score for each Bidder was factored into the overall score of the Business Proposal.

2.4.2.6 Document Final Business Proposal Team Score and Justification

Once the reviews of the Business Proposals and Requirements Cross Reference Matrices were completed for all vendors, the Evaluation Team met to review and reach consensus on the ranking of each section or category of each Business Proposal. It is important to note that individual evaluators did not rank or score proposals; the collective Evaluation Team ranked each section of each Business Proposal. Each section in the proposal was evaluated, using the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 7.3 of the RFP. The ranking and scoring process was applied to the following four categories within the Business Proposal:

- Firm Qualifications
- Approach to Statewide Portal/Mobile App Services
- Portal/Mobile App Solution
- Staffing Approach and Qualifications

In addition, the average score of both the Oral Presentations and four Key Staff Interviews for each Bidder was calculated for the Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interviews category.

Using the requirements score and other evaluation factors for each of the four categories listed above, the Evaluation Team assigned an ordinal rank to each proposal for that category. The following point values were assigned to each ordinal ranking:

1. First = 10 points
2. Second = 7.5 points
3. Third = 5 points
4. Fourth = 2.5 points

The total Business Proposal score is the sum of the Business Proposal points earned by each Bidder for the four categories listed above plus the combined average of the Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview scores. The Portal/Mobile Proposal Scoring Summary Workbook was used to document the scores for each category of a Business Proposal. The resultant points for each category were multiplied by the category weight and totaled to create a weighted raw Business Proposal score.

The Bidder with the highest Business Proposal score received the maximum allowable score (70 points). The other proposal scores were then normalized or adjusted in proportion to the maximum using the following formula:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Weighted Business Proposal Score}}{\text{Highest Business Proposal score}} \right) * 70 = \text{Business Proposal Score}$$

The summary of scores and normalized proposal points for all Bidders were documented in the Portal/Mobile Proposal Scoring Summary Workbook.

The following subsections provide additional detail for each category that was evaluated, ranked and scored in the Business Proposal.

Firm Qualifications

The objective in evaluating the Firm Qualifications was to verify that the Bidder described a comprehensive approach specific to the RFP requirements for this category and has a proven track record of providing the desired and similar services in a satisfactory manner, and is financially viable. The proposals were assessed to determine whether the Bidder agreed to and committed to fulfilling each requirement. When a description of the Bidder's approach to a requirement was indicated, the proposals were reviewed to determine whether a well-organized, understandable, detailed and reasonable response was provided.

Firm experience, resources and qualifications as well as customer references and information received through other sources were considered. Bidders were instructed to include financial statements to demonstrate financial viability and stability; to provide three (3) completed corporate reference checks in which the Bidder was awarded a contract to provide services similar in scope to the requirements of this proposed project; and detailed tables to summarize their experience in the following areas:

- Experience in User Centered Design (UCD) and user engagement as part of UCD.
- Experience in the Health and/or Human Services systems area.
- AWS cloud architecture and/or deployment experience.
- Real-time web-based application experience in JAVA environment of similar size and complexity to the Portal/Mobile App.
- Mobile application development and/or deployment experience using ILS and Android technologies.

If the primary Bidder used a subcontractor, the RFP clearly delineated that subcontractors were also required to complete and provide certain forms and information including completed firm references, financial statements and experience tables.

Firm qualifications accounted for five (5) of the 70 Business Proposal possible points.

Approach to Statewide Portal/Mobile App Services

The purpose in evaluating the Approach to Portal/Mobile App Services was to validate that the Bidder described a comprehensive approach specific to the RFP requirements for this category. The proposals were assessed to determine whether the Bidder agreed to and committed to fulfilling each requirement. When a description of the Bidder's approach to a requirement was indicated, the proposals were reviewed to determine whether a well-organized, understandable, detailed and reasonable response was provided.

The description of the approach for each area and item was scored according to the standard criteria. The Approach to Portal/Mobile App Services category considered the extent to which the Bidder met RFP requirements in the following areas:

- Project Management,
- Deliverable development,
- Proposed approach to user engagement and UCD, and
- Key interaction with Consortium, state, County, advocate, client and other Contractor staff.

The Approach to Portal/Mobile App Services accounted for 15 of the 70 Business Proposal possible points.

Statewide Portal/Mobile App Solution

The purpose in evaluating the Statewide Portal/Mobile App Solution was to validate that the Bidder described a comprehensive approach specific to the RFP requirements for this category. The proposals were assessed to determine whether the Bidder agreed to and committed to fulfilling each requirement. When a description of the Bidder's approach to a requirement was indicated, the proposals were reviewed to determine whether a well-organized, understandable, detailed and reasonable response was provided.

The description of the Solution for each area and item was scored according to the standard criteria. The Statewide Portal/Mobile App Solution category considered the extent to which the Bidder met RFP requirements by demonstrating how the Solution will enable the Consortium to achieve the goals and objectives defined for the Statewide Portal/Mobile App Project and how clearly the response demonstrated and prioritized an understanding of end-user and stakeholder needs, including accessibility, a user-friendly interface, and simple and clear language.

The Statewide Portal/Mobile App Solution accounted for 20 of the 70 Business Proposal possible points.

Staffing Approach and Qualifications

The purpose in evaluating the Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications was to validate that the Bidder described a comprehensive approach specific to the RFP requirements for this category and to validate that the staff proposed by the Bidder have the mandatory experience and qualifications necessary to perform the required tasks defined in the RFP. The proposals were assessed to determine whether the Bidder agreed to and committed to fulfilling each requirement. When a description of the Bidder's approach to a requirement was indicated, the proposals were reviewed to determine whether a well-organized, understandable, detailed and reasonable response was provided.

The Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications category was assessed based on the following components:

- The approach to Project Organization and Staffing;
- The methodology for estimating staff types and levels;

- The adequate justification of staff types and levels proposed including the extent to which the minimum staff qualifications were met or exceeded; and
- Experience of proposed Staff providing Portal/Mobile services.

The approach to project organization and staffing and the methodology for estimating staff types and levels were to address all required elements of the RFP Section 6.2.3.7, Staffing Approach.

The skills and experience levels for each proposed Key Staff person were assessed to determine the extent to which the required minimum qualifications defined in Section 4.7 of the RFP were met or exceeded. The Evaluation Team compared the Staff Minimum Qualifications against the qualifications of the staff as documented on resumes (RFP/Proposal Attachment G) and determined scores for each proposed individual based on the defined criteria. Information contained in the resume was subject to verification through the completed individual reference check forms or other sources.

As indicated by RFP Attachment H, Bidders (and any subcontractors) were required to submit two (2) completed references for proposed Key Staff members. The Evaluation Team used the references to further verify staff qualifications and experience.

Subcontractor Key Staff qualifications were reviewed in the same manner as for the Key Staff of the primary Bidder.

The Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications category accounted for 20 of the 70 Business Proposal possible points.

Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews

All Bidders were required to participate in an oral presentation. The intent of the oral presentation was to validate the information provided by the Bidder in its proposal. The oral presentation was designed to address specific areas of the Bidders proposals; the Consortium provided the topic areas and questions to all Bidders invited to participate in oral presentations. The topic areas and questions were identical for all Bidders. The oral presentations were scheduled for a 50-minute period. For each Bidder, an average score was calculated by the Evaluation Team for the Oral Presentation using a standard scale of 1 to 10.

Interviews of Key Staff were used to confirm staff experience and qualifications. The proposed Key Staff were interviewed by a panel composed of Evaluation Team members, the Procurement Manager and the Procurement Support Team. Key Staff interviews were scored using a standard scale of 1 to 10. For each Bidder, an average interview score was calculated across the four required Key Staff positions.

The average score for the Oral Presentation and the Key Staff interview was calculated to determine the consolidated average for this category. The combined average score for the Oral Presentations and Key Staff interviews accounted for 10 of the 70 Business Proposal possible points.

Evaluation Team Justification

As the collective Business Proposal Evaluation Team discussed and assigned ranks for each category described above, team members identified key aspects of each proposal to be used in the eventual justification of the recommended Bidder and in the preparation of this Vendor Selection Report. The number of exceeded, met, and unmet requirements, combined with the Oral Presentation and Key Staff interview scores, served as the primary basis for allocating ranks. In addition, the Evaluation Team considered other differentiating factors and areas of concern to reach consensus on ranks. The team discussed and documented:

- Positive differentiating factors: criteria addressed completely and comprehensively by each of the proposals, including the number of requirements that were met or exceeded, firm experience, firm reference check results, Key Staff reference check results, proposed hours and average Full Time Equivalent (FTEs), and overall quality of the proposals
- Negative differentiating factors: deficiencies present in each of the proposals, including a summary of any requirements that were not met or that were partially met, firm experience, firm reference check results, Key Staff reference check results, proposed hours and average FTEs, and overall quality of the proposals.
- Any additional issue, component, or facet, of one or more of the proposals that particularly differentiated the value of the Business Proposal in a positive or negative manner, including the ability to map requirements to proposal content, and evidence that proposers understood basic business concepts.

2.5 PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

After the requirements scores for all Business Proposals were finalized and documented in the Evaluation Team Scoring Workbook, access to the Price Proposals was provided to the Price Proposal Evaluation Team.

2.5.1 Review Price Proposals for Compliance with Submission Requirements

Bidders were required to submit a Price Proposal Schedule (Attachment A of the RFP) detailing their proposed prices, as well as documenting any assumptions, conditions and constraints. Each Price Proposal was reviewed for compliance with proposal submission requirements.

2.5.2 Evaluate Price Proposals

As defined in the RFP, the initial contract duration for DD&I Phase 1 is 14 months with a one-year M&O period. The Consortium may, at its discretion, and depending on Contractor performance during Phase 1, approve Phase 2 for Optional Enhancements. The Consortium may also extend the M&O period for up to two (2) optional one-year extensions. Bidders were required to provide Price Proposals for DD&I Phase 1, DD&I Phase 2 and one year of M&O.

After the requirements scores for all Business Proposals were finalized and documented in the Evaluation Team Scoring Workbook, access to the Price Proposals and BAFOs was provided to the Price Proposal Evaluation Team for its evaluation.

Each Bidder's DD&I Phase 1 price accounted for 25% of the total proposal score. Each Bidder's DD&I Phase 2 price accounted for 5% of the total score. Taken together, the Price Proposals represented 30% of the total proposal score.

2.6 CALCULATE FINAL SCORES

Once all Business Proposal and Price Proposal reviews were completed, the results were consolidated and a final score calculated for each overall proposal in accordance with the evaluation methodology specified in Section 7 of the RFP. The results were recorded in the Portal/Mobile Evaluation Team Total Proposal Scoring Workbook, which combines the results of all Business and Price Proposals ranks and scores; the justification documentation was also recorded in this workbook to provide a complete basis for the scores and recommendation of the Evaluation Team.

During the Final Portal/Mobile Evaluation Team meeting, price information was also provided to the Business Proposal Evaluation Team. The Business and Price Proposal Teams jointly reviewed the review of the Price Proposal information.

As reflected in RFP Section 7, Evaluation, ranks and scores were calculated based on the predetermined methodology that assigns 30% to the scoring of the proposals based on the price of the services as represented in the Price Proposal Schedules. The other 70% was determined by review of the Business Proposals including: firm qualifications, approach to Portal/Mobile services, Portal/Mobile solution, staffing approach and staff qualifications, and Oral Key Staff interviews. The Proposal with the highest combined score was recommended for selection.

2.7 EVALUATION TEAMS

The CalSAWS North Project Director served as the Procurement Manager for this effort; the Procurement Manager led the evaluation process and served as the point of contact for interactions with the Vendors and Evaluation Teams. The Portal/Mobile Evaluation Team consisted of two teams: the Business Proposal Evaluation Team and the Price Proposal Evaluation Team. The Business Proposal Team included the following Consortium staff:

1. Regional Manager
2. Lead Business Analyst
3. Business Analyst
4. Information Technology Manager
5. Cloud Manager

The Business Proposal Evaluation Team also consisted of a Principal Information System Analyst from Los Angeles County DPSS.

The following two State representatives participated as part of the Business Proposal Evaluation Team:

1. CDSS Deputy Director, Research, Automation and Data Division
2. DHCS Assistant Division Chief, Medi-Cal Eligibility Division

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team consisted of a CalSAWS Project Management Office representative from Los Angeles County.

In addition to the formal evaluators, the Procurement Support Team provided administrative and general support to assist the Evaluation Teams and to help facilitate the evaluation process and consolidate Evaluation Team findings. Neither the CalSAWS Procurement Manager nor Procurement Support Team members evaluated Business Proposals or Price Proposals.

3 RESULTS, RATIONALE AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION

The following sections provide the detailed results and rationale for ranking and scoring in each major area/category of the Business Proposals and Price Proposals, along with the justification documentation prepared by the Evaluation Team. The justification documentation includes positive and negative differentiators in each category.

This section concludes with the final recommendation of the Business and Price Proposal Evaluation Teams.

3.1 BUSINESS PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION

3.1.1 Business Proposals

The Procurement Support Team conducted the initial review of Business Proposals to determine compliance with Proposal Submission requirements as documented in the RFP. The Procurement Manager then examined the results of the initial review and informed the Evaluation Team that four of the five Business Proposals met or substantially met submission requirements.

The Procurement Support Team determined that one bidder failed to meet initial proposal compliance requirements. Specifically, the AgreeYa proposal failed to demonstrate the required level of corporate experience as defined in RFP Section 1.4, Minimum Contractor Requirements. The Procurement Manager, in consultation with Consortium Legal Counsel, determined that the AgreeYa response to the RFP failed to comply with the requirements of the RFP and, therefore, it was rejected for such non-compliance.

The Procurement Manager examined the results of the initial review and informed the Evaluation Team that the remaining four proposals met or substantially met submission requirements.

3.1.2 Price Proposals

The four Bidders who met the initial proposal submission requirements all submitted compliant Price Proposals.

DXC, Deloitte and Alluma submitted BAFO responses by the required due date and time of April 1, 2019, 3:00 PM Pacific Time. The DXC and Deloitte BAFO Price Proposals met the Price Proposal submission requirements. Alluma submitted two BAFO options. Option 1 was accepted as it was compliant with RFP requirements; BAFO Option 2 was not considered as it contained conditions in conflict with RFP requirements.

Accenture declined to submit a BAFO and held firm to their initial Price Proposal.

3.2 BUSINESS PROPOSAL RANKING AND SCORING JUSTIFICATION

The information below presents the detailed Business Proposal scores for each category.

Highest Overall Business Proposal Score: Deloitte

Lowest Overall Business Proposal Score: Alluma

The Deloitte Business Proposal received the highest ranks and scores in all scoring categories: Firm Qualifications, Approach to Portal/Mobile Services, Portal/Mobile Solution, Staff Approach and Qualifications, and Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview categories. Taken together, this resulted in the highest overall Business Proposal score for Deloitte.

Accenture received the second highest ranks and scores in Firm, Staff Approach and Qualifications, and Orals and Key Staff Interviews. Accenture scored third place in the Approach and Solution areas. Altogether, this resulted in an overall second place Business Proposal score for Accenture.

DXC received the second highest ranks and scores in Approach and Solution, and received the lowest scores in Firm Qualifications, and Orals and Key Staff Interviews. DXC placed third in Staff Approach and Qualifications. Taken together, this resulted in an overall third place Business Proposal score for DXC.

Alluma received the third highest score in Firm Qualifications, and Orals and Key Staff Interviews; however, Alluma received the lowest ranks and scores in Approach, Solution, and Staff Approach and Qualifications. In total, this resulted in the last place Business Proposal score for Alluma.

The following table summarizes the overall Business Proposal scores for each category.

Table 5 – Business Proposal Scores Summary

Business Proposal Score		Maximum Business Points				70	
Vendor	5.0% Firm	15.0% Approach	20.0% Solution	20.0% Staff Approach and Qualifications	10.0% Orals + Key Staff Interviews	Total Raw Business Score	Total Normalized Business Score
DXC	1.25	11.25	15.00	10.00	4.38	41.88	43.11
Deloitte	5.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	8.00	68.00	70.00
Accenture	3.75	7.50	10.00	15.00	7.88	44.13	45.42
Alluma	2.50	3.75	5.00	5.00	4.50	20.75	21.36
Maximum Raw Score						68.00	

The following two tables provide the requirements scoring details for each Business Proposal. The adjusted requirements scores account for the firm requirements which were not applicable for each Bidder.

CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Application Vendor Selection Report

Table 6 – Requirements Summary, DXC and Deloitte

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	DXC Requirements Counts and Scores							Deloitte Requirements Counts and Scores						
		Solution							Solution						
		Firm	Approach	Phase 1 Tech	Phase 1 Functional	Phase 2 Optional	Staffing	Total	Firm	Approach	Phase 1 Tech	Phase 1 Functional	Phase 2 Optional	Staffing	Total
Requirement Exceeded	3	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	0	8	0	0	0	7	15
Requirement Met	2	14	41	26	75	34	29	219	12	45	55	103	39	26	280
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	1	11	34	22	4	0	72	0	1	5	6	0	2	14
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	12	1	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Not Applicable Requirements		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Total Requirements Count		16	54	60	109	39	35	313	16	54	60	109	39	35	313
Net Requirements Count		15	54	60	109	39	35	312	12	54	60	109	39	35	309
Total Requirements Score		29	99	86	172	72	70	528	24	115	115	212	78	75	619
Adjusted Requirements Score		31	99	86	172	72	70	530	32	115	115	212	78	75	627

Table 7 – Requirements Summary, Accenture and Alluma

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	Accenture Requirements Counts and Scores							Alluma Requirements Counts and Scores						
		Solution							Solution						
		Firm	Approach	Phase 1 Tech	Phase 1 Functional	Phase 2 Optional	Staffing	Total	Firm	Approach	Phase 1 Tech	Phase 1 Functional	Phase 2 Optional	Staffing	Total
Requirement Exceeded	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Requirement Met	2	12	44	54	43	35	29	217	15	41	27	67	6	26	182
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	10	6	39	4	1	60	0	12	22	34	0	2	70
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	27	0	1	11	8	33	3	56
Total Not Applicable Requirements		4	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total Requirements Count		16	54	60	109	39	35	313	16	54	60	109	39	35	313
Net Requirements Count		12	54	60	109	39	35	309	15	54	60	109	39	35	312
Total Requirements Score		24	98	114	125	74	74	509	30	94	76	168	12	66	446
Adjusted Requirements Score		32	98	114	125	74	74	517	32	94	76	168	12	66	448

The following subsections summarize the justification associated with Business Proposal evaluation categories: Firm Qualifications, Approach to Portal/Mobile App Services, Solution, Staffing Approach and Qualifications, and Key Staff Interviews.

3.2.1 Firm Qualifications Justification Summary

The proposal from Deloitte received the highest rank and score for the Firm Qualifications category primarily based on the requirements score and, secondarily, taking key differentiators into consideration. Key differentiators for the Firm Qualifications area were applied in the following areas: firm references, experience and financial viability.

Highest Score: Deloitte

Lowest Score: DXC

The Firm Qualifications category consisted of 16 total requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J, Portal/Mobile Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. Three Bidders, Deloitte, Accenture, and Alluma tied for first place based on the adjusted requirements score. The Evaluation Team used additional factors as differentiators to rank and score vendors for this category as follows.

Firm Reference Average Score

Vendors were required to provide three completed firm references for both prime contractors and any applicable subcontractors. The firm reference check forms were part of RFP Attachment F. The average scores were calculated using the number of references provided and completed by designated clients. Where subcontractor references were provided, they were included in the calculation of the average reference score. Deloitte and Accenture both provided firm references with an average score of 10.0, followed by DXC with an average score of 9.4, and followed by Alluma with an average score of 9.3. It should be noted that the DXC average firm reference score was much improved by the inclusion of their subcontractor references.

Experience

The Evaluation Team used the completed RFP/Proposal Attachment E, Firm Qualifications, Experience Table to determine the applicable years of experience for both prime Bidders and applicable subcontractors.

The corresponding months of experience were converted to equivalent years of experience for the following areas:

- Health and Human Services (HHS) experience
- UCD experience
- Mobile Application experience
- AWS experience

This information was used as indicated in the proposal; the Evaluation Team did not officially question or attempt to interpret the experience cited. Deloitte had the most

years of experience across all areas by far. Deloitte and Alluma had the most HHS experience. Deloitte and DXC had the most UCD experience. Deloitte and Alluma had the most AWS experience. Based on the information provided, Accenture had the least amount of UCD, Mobile Application and AWS experience. It should be noted that Accenture only included months of experience for their specific firm references; Accenture did not include experience for other projects.

Financial Viability

Vendors and applicable subcontractors were required to provide two completed years of financial statements. The financial viability and stability criterion were assessed using a simple financial analysis model as well as the firm's Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) viability rating. The prime contractor revenue was reviewed to determine whether revenue increased or declined year over year for the two-year period. Three of the four vendors reflected increased revenue; only DXC exhibited declining revenue for the period. The Current Ratio was also calculated for each contractor using the following formula:

$$\text{Current Ratio} = \text{Current Assets} / \text{Current Liabilities}$$

Three of four firms had current ratios of greater than 1 for the two-year period. DXC had a current ratio of less than 1 for both years.

All four vendors had a D&B viability score of 3, which indicates a low risk of becoming no longer viable.

A summary of the ranks, scores, requirements scores and differentiating factors follows.

Table 8 Firm Qualifications Ranks and Scoring Summaries

Firm Qualifications			Weight	5.0%						
Vendor	Firm Rank	Firm Points	Firm Quals Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Firm Reference Average	Financial Viability and Stability	Years of HHS Experience	Years of UCD Experience	Years of Mobile App Experience	Years of AWS Experience
DXC	4	2.5	1.25	31	9.4	√-	26.3	38.6	8.7	8.5
Deloitte	1	10.0	5.00	32	10.0	√	343.0	128.5	76.2	90.8
Accenture	2	7.5	3.75	32	10.0	√	30.9	12.3	8.3	6.7
Alluma	3	5.0	2.50	32	9.3	√	191.3	32.3	31.3	14.3

3.2.2 Approach to Portal/Mobile Services Justification Summary

The proposal from Deloitte received the highest score for the Approach to Portal/Mobile Services category primarily based on the requirements score and, secondarily, taking key differentiators into consideration. The scores for the remaining vendors in this category were significantly lower than that of Deloitte.

The key differentiator for the Approach to Portal/Mobile Services area was found in the overall quality of the content.

Highest Score: Deloitte

Lowest Score: Alluma

The Approach to Portal/Mobile Services consisted of 54 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J, Portal/Mobile Application Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Bidder's Business Proposal. Overall quality, in part, correlates to the overall requirements score for this category.

The Evaluation Team noted the following points regarding the Deloitte Approach to Portal/Mobile Services section: very well written, fully embraced UCD throughout the section (and entire proposal), requirements were easy to map to the proposal content, and a lot of clarity and elaboration on each requirement. Deloitte exceeded eight requirements and addressed all but one requirement in a comprehensive manner.

The requirements scores for the remaining three vendors were very close in relation to each other. The requirements score for the Accenture proposal of 98 was only a single point lower than the DXC requirements score of 99, followed closely by Alluma with a score of 94.

For this section of the DXC proposal (and the overall proposal), the Evaluation Team documented the following points: difficult to trace requirements to supporting detail in the proposal, frequent basic grammatical errors, jarring to read, numerous incorrect page and section references, and content appeared to be "cut and pasted" from other sources. The DXC response exceeded two requirements in this area.

The Evaluation Team noted the following points regarding this section of the Accenture proposal (and the proposal in general): Well written but lacked depth and detail, understood the needs of the Consortium, State and advocates with respect to UCD, "checked the box" on requirements but not enough detail to differentiate, and had to search for supporting detail on some requirements. None of the Accenture requirements were exceeded in this area.

For this section of the Alluma proposal, the Evaluation Team documented the following points: addressed requirements at a high level; not a lot of supporting detail, difficult to trace requirements to detail in proposal, especially on functional requirements, had to hunt and search to try to find responses to requirements, numerous incorrect page number references, and a lack of understanding of some basic concepts, i.e., timeclock. The Evaluation Team also noted that they were not confident that Alluma can deliver on their approach. None of the Alluma requirements were exceeded in this area. One of the Alluma requirements responses was determined non-responsive.

The ranks and scores for the Approach to Portal/Mobile Services are provided in the table below.

Table 9 – Approach to Portal/Mobile Services Ranks and Scores

Approach		Weight	15.0%	
Vendor	Rank	Points	Approach Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score
DXC	2	7.5	11.25	99
Deloitte	1	10.0	15.00	115
Accenture	3	5.0	7.50	98
Alluma	4	2.5	3.75	94

3.2.3 Portal/Mobile Solution Justification Summary

The proposal from Deloitte received the highest score for the Solution category primarily based on the requirements score and, secondarily, taking key differentiators into consideration. The DXC proposal placed second in this category.

Key differentiators for the Solution area were found in the overall quality of the content.

Highest Score: Deloitte

Lowest Score: Alluma

The Solution section consisted of 208 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J, Portal/Mobile Application Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, which was completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. Three categories of requirements comprise this area:

- Phase 1 Technical consists of 60 requirements
- Phase 1 Functional consists of 109 requirements
- Phase 2 Optional consists of 39 requirements

Overall quality, in part, correlates to the overall requirements score for this category.

While no vendor exceeded any requirements in the Solution category, the Deloitte response was detailed and complete and fully met 197 requirements, with 11 partially met. The DXC proposal scored second place but only partially addressed 60 requirements and was not responsive to 13 requirements. The Accenture proposal contained 49 requirements that were only partially addressed and was non-responsive to 27 requirements. For the Alluma proposal, 56 requirements were partially met and 52 requirements were non-responsive, resulting in the lowest requirements score.

The ranks and scores for the Solution category are provided in the table below.

Table 10 – Portal/Mobile Solution Ranks and Scores

Solution		Weight	20.0%	
Vendor	Rank	Points	Solution Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score
DXC	2	7.5	15.00	330
Deloitte	1	10.0	20.00	405
Accenture	3	5.0	10.00	313
Alluma	4	2.5	5.00	256

3.2.4 Staff Approach and Qualifications Justification Summary

The proposal from Deloitte received the highest overall score for the Staff Approach and Staff Qualifications category primarily based on the requirements score and, secondarily, taking key differentiators into consideration. The Accenture proposal was a very close second in this category.

Key differentiators for the Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications category were found across the following areas: overall quality, Key Staff references, and the level of effort in hours and average number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) proposed for the DD&I Phase 1.

Highest Score: Deloitte

Lowest Score: Alluma

The Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications category consisted of 35 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J, Portal/Mobile Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal.

Deloitte exceeded seven of the requirements associated with Key Staff minimum qualifications and partially met two requirements in the overall category. Accenture exceeded five of the requirements associated with Key Staff minimum qualifications and partially met one requirement in the overall category. The DXC proposal scored third in this category and exceeded four of the Key Staff minimum qualification requirements, but was not responsive to two requirements. The Alluma proposal was ranked last although four of the requirements associated with Key Staff minimum qualifications were exceeded. The Alluma proposal partially met two requirements and was deemed non-responsive for three requirements.

In terms of overall quality, both the Deloitte and Accenture proposals ranked high in this category and were logically organized, fully addressed most requirements and were easy to follow and understand.

Key Staff References

Two completed Key Staff references were required as part of RFP Attachment H, Individual Reference Checks. The instructions were clear that the references must be completed by customers or clients.

Key Staff from both Deloitte and Accenture received very high scores in this area.

DXC provided three references for their proposed Project Manager. One reference for the DXC Project Manager was acceptable but the other references were completed by internal DXC staff, not by a client or customer; and thus, only one score could be counted. This resulted in a lower overall average Key Staff reference score. Similarly, one of the references for the UI Lead was not acceptable because it was completed by an internal staff person, not a customer or client. This also contributed to the lower overall average Key Staff reference score for DXC.

Both references for the Alluma Project Manager were completed by internal Alluma staff, not by a client or customer; and thus, the scores could not be counted. When the Project Manager average reference score of 0 was then averaged with the other Key Staff reference scores, this resulted in a lower overall average Key Staff reference score.

Proposed Hours and FTEs

Three of the four Bidders, DXC, Deloitte and Alluma, estimated very similar levels of effort for DD&I Phase 1, ranging from 17.5 to 18.9 average FTEs. Deloitte proposed the highest overall level of effort and number of staff. Accenture proposed an average of 8.94 FTEs for DD&I Phase 1. The Evaluation Team recognized, that as the CalSAWS existing DD&I contractor, the Accenture hours should be lower, but expressed concerns regarding the allocation of approximately half of the number of resources to complete the required tasks and deliverables for this complex DD&I effort.

The ranks and scores for the Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications category are provided in the table below, along with the key differentiating factors.

Table 11 -Staffing Approach and Qualification Ranks and Scores

Staff Approach and Qualifications				Weight	20.0%	Attachment A - Schedule 9: Staff Loading Plan DD&I Phase Through 9/2021		
Vendor	Rank	Points	Staff Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Key Staff Reference Average	Total Level of Effort (Hours)	Average Monthly FTEs	
DXC	3	5.0	10.00	70	7.29	36,314.2	17.46	
Deloitte	1	10.0	20.00	75	10.00	50,099.0	18.90	
Accenture	2	7.5	15.00	74	9.75	19,942.0	8.94	
Alluma	4	2.5	5.00	66	7.31	40,288.7	17.99	

3.2.5 Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews Justification Summary

The scores for the Oral Presentations and the average Key Staff Interview score for each Vendor were averaged together to produce the combined Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview score.

Oral Presentations

The Oral Presentations were scored using a 1 to 10 scale with a score of 1 indicating: very strong evidence that the majority of topics were not addressed, to a score of 10

indicating: very strong evidence that all topics were fully addressed. The Evaluation Team reached unanimous agreement on each score assigned for the Oral Presentations.

Deloitte and Accenture tied for first place with scores of 8 on the Oral Presentation. The Evaluation Team noted that Deloitte fully addressed all topics and questions within the allotted time, the Key Staff performed as a cohesive, well-coordinated team with references to other members of the team and demonstrated a high degree of confidence and accountability throughout the presentation. The Accenture team addressed all topics and questions within the allotted time, took responsibility for their tasks and positions, and demonstrated their ability to perform as a capable, well-coordinated, cohesive unit.

The DXC team did not perform as well and scored a 5; the Evaluation Team noted that all topics were not fully addressed. The Alluma team also did not perform as well and scored a 4; the Evaluation Team noted that all topics were not fully addressed and one topic on communication and relationships was addressed by a non-key staff person. The Alluma Project Manager participated in a very limited manner.

Key Staff Interviews

Key staff interviews were scored using a standard 1 to 10 scale with a score of 1 indicating: very strong evidence that the required skills/experience are not present, to a score of 10 indicating: very strong evidence that the required skills/experience are present. The Evaluation Team reached unanimous agreement on each score assigned for each position. For each Vendor, an average interview score was calculated across the four required Portal/Mobile Key Staff positions.

Deloitte and Accenture were the highest scoring vendors in this subcategory; with average scores of 8 and 7.75, respectively. It should be noted, that of the 16 total Key Staff who were interviewed, only three scored a 9 and no one scored a 10. Three of the four Alluma Key Staff were not as prepared to answer questions regarding their defined role, or approaches, tasks and deliverables for which their positions are responsible. Three of the four DXC Key Staff were ill prepared to answer questions regarding their defined role, or approaches, tasks and deliverables for which their positions are responsible.

A summary of the Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview scores is provided in the table below.

Table 12 - Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview Score Summaries

Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews		Weight	10.0%								
		Key Staff Interview Scores									
Vendor	Project Manager	Application Development Lead	Test Lead	User Interface Lead	Total Score	Average Score	Oral Presentation Score	Interviews + Oral Presentation Average	Net Combined Score		
DXC	2.0	1.0	4.0	8.0	15.0	3.75	5.0	4.38	4.38		
Deloitte	9.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	32.0	8.00	8.0	8.00	8.00		
Accenture	9.0	6.0	9.0	7.0	31.0	7.75	8.0	7.88	7.88		
Alluma	4.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	20.0	5.00	4.0	4.50	4.50		

3.3 PRICE PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team reviewed and scored the Price Proposals for the 14-month DD&I Phase 1 period through September 2021 as well as the Phase 2 Optional Enhancements. During the final Portal/Mobile Evaluation Team meeting, the Business Proposal Evaluation Team also participated in the review of the Price Proposal information in conjunction with the Price Proposal Evaluation Team.

All four Vendors substantially met the price-related proposal submission requirements.

Three of the four vendors submitted BAFO responses by the required due date and time of April 1, 2020, 3:00 PM Pacific Time. Accenture did not submit a BAFO and confirmed the original Price Proposal. The DXC and Alluma BAFOs resulted in decreases to the DD&I Phase 1 and Phase 2 prices. The Deloitte BAFO only contained reductions for the M&O Phase 3 period, and thus the reduction was not factored into the Price Proposal scoring. The average price reduction across the four Bidders from the original Price Proposal to BAFO Price Proposal was 3.02% (including no reductions from two Bidders).

Highest Score DD&I Phase 1: Accenture

Lowest Score DD&I Phase 1: Deloitte

Accenture submitted the lowest total price for DD&I Phase 1 of \$3,421,438 which resulted in the highest score for the Phase 1 Price Proposal. Deloitte submitted the highest price for the DD&I Phase 1: \$6,224,681, which resulted in the lowest scoring Price Proposal. This represents a difference of \$2,803,243 from the lowest to highest proposal price.

Highest Score DD&I Phase 2: Alluma

Lowest Score DD&I Phase 2: Deloitte

Alluma submitted the lowest total price for DD&I Phase 2 of \$417,641 which resulted in the highest score for the Phase 2 Price Proposal. Deloitte submitted the highest price for the DD&I Phase 2: \$5,900,000, which resulted in the lowest scoring Price Proposal. This represents a difference of \$5,482,359 from the lowest to highest proposal price.

The price summary for both DD&I Phase 1 and 2 is reflected in the following table.

CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Application Vendor Selection Report

Table 13 – DD&I Phase 1 Price Summary

Price Score	Maximum Price Points			25	5	30	
Vendor	DD&I Phase 1 Price	DD&I Phase 2 Price	Total Price Phase 1 and Phase 2	Phase 1 Price Points	Phase 2 Price Points	Total Price Points	Average Hourly Rate
DXC	\$ 4,205,157.00	\$ 843,477.00	\$ 5,048,634.00	20.34	2.48	22.82	\$ 96.84
Deloitte	\$ 6,224,681.00	\$ 5,900,000.00	\$ 12,124,681.00	13.74	0.35	14.10	\$ 106.51
Accenture	\$ 3,421,438.00	\$ 1,543,067.00	\$ 4,964,505.00	25.00	1.35	26.35	\$ 151.07
Alluma	\$ 5,412,989.00	\$ 417,641.00	\$ 5,830,630.00	15.80	5.00	20.80	\$ 125.87
Lowest Price	\$ 3,421,438.00	\$ 417,641.00	\$ 4,964,505.00				

While not specifically evaluated, the average hourly rate was also calculated since it must be reflected in the CalSAWS Implementation Advance Planning Document (IAPD), the budget document used for state and federal approvals and ongoing reporting.

The following table summarizes the total BAFO prices and shows the variance from each Bidder's total price to the lowest total price.

Table 14 – BAFO Variance to Lowest Price

Vendor	Variance to Low Price		
	BAFO DD&I Phase 1 & 2 Price	BAFO Total Variance to Low Price	BAFO Total Variance to Low Price %
DXC	\$ 5,048,634	\$ 84,129	1.69%
Deloitte	\$ 12,124,681	\$ 7,160,176	144.23%
Accenture	\$ 4,964,505	\$ -	0.00%
Alluma	\$ 5,830,630	\$ 866,125	17.45%

The following table summarizes the total BAFO prices and shows the variance from each Bidder's total price to the total price of the selected Vendor.

Table 15 – BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor Price

Vendor	Variance to Selected Vendor Price		
	BAFO DD&I Phase 1 & 2 Price	BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor	BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor %
DXC	\$ 5,048,634	\$ (7,076,047)	-121.36%
Deloitte	\$ 12,124,681	\$ -	0.00%
Accenture	\$ 4,964,505	\$ (7,160,176)	-122.80%
Alluma	\$ 5,830,630	\$ (6,294,051)	-107.95%

3.4 FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Deloitte proposal received the highest overall score when combining both the Business Proposal scores and Price Proposal scores. Therefore, the Business and Price Proposal Evaluation Teams recommend Deloitte as the apparently successful Vendor to the CalSAWS Executive Director. Even in consideration of the higher Price Proposal, the Evaluation Teams believe the selection of Deloitte represents the best value to the 58 California counties, the California CDSS, the California DHCS and the federal program sponsoring agencies.

The summary of Business Proposal and Price Proposal scores which comprise the basis of this recommendation is presented in the table below.

CalSAWS Portal/Mobile Application Vendor Selection Report

Table 16 – Business Proposal and Price Proposal Summary

Category/Subcategory		Subcategory Weight	Overall Weight	Total Possible Points	DXC	Deloitte	Accenture	Alluma
Business Proposal			70.0%					
1	Firm Qualifications	5.0%		5.0	1.25	5.00	3.75	2.50
2	Approach	15.0%		15.0	11.25	15.00	7.50	3.75
3	Solution	20.0%		20.0	15.00	20.00	10.00	5.00
4	Staff Approach and Qualifications	20.0%		20.0	10.00	20.00	15.00	5.00
5	Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	10.0%		10.0	4.38	8.00	7.88	4.50
Business Proposal Raw Scores				70.0	41.88	68.00	44.13	20.75
Business Proposal Normalized Scores				70.0	43.11	70.00	45.42	21.36
Price Proposal			30.0%					
6	DD&I Phase 1	25.0%		25.0	20.34	13.74	25.00	15.80
7	DD&I Phase 2	5.0%		5.0	2.48	0.35	1.35	5.00
Price Proposal Scores				30.0	22.82	14.10	26.35	20.80
Business Proposal + Price Proposal Total			100.0%	100.0	65.92	84.10	71.78	42.16