

CalSAWS

CalWIN Implementation Support
Request for Proposals 2019-02

Vendor Selection Report

August 6, 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
August 6, 2020	Final		Procurement Support

Table of Contents

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 EVALUATION PROCESS RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATION	2
2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS	5
2.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	5
2.2 EVALUATION STEPS	5
2.3 PREPARE FOR EVALUATION	6
2.4 BUSINESS PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS	6
2.4.1 Review Proposals for Compliance with Submission Requirements	6
2.4.2 Evaluate Business Proposals.....	6
2.5 PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS	14
2.5.1 Review Price Proposals for Compliance with Submission Requirements	14
2.5.2 Evaluate Price Proposals.....	14
2.6 CALCULATE FINAL SCORES.....	14
2.7 EVALUATION TEAMS	15
3 RESULTS, RATIONALE AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION	17
3.1 BUSINESS/PRICE PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION	17
3.1.1 Business Proposals.....	17
3.1.2 Price Proposals.....	17
3.2 BUSINESS PROPOSAL RANKING AND SCORING JUSTIFICATION	17
3.2.1 Firm Qualifications Justification Summary	23
3.2.2 Approach to Implementation Support Justification Summary.....	24
3.2.3 Staff Approach and Qualifications Justification Summary	26
3.2.4 Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews Justification Summary	27
3.3 PRICE PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION.....	28
3.4 FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	30
Table 1 – Business and Price Proposal Scoring Summary.....	3
Table 2 - Evaluation Methodology	5
Table 3 – Business Proposal Scores Summary.....	18
Table 4 – Requirements Summary	18
Table 5 – Requirements Summary, CGI.....	19
Table 6 – Requirements Summary, Accenture	20
Table 7 - Requirements Summary, DXC	21
Table 8 - Requirements Summary, Deloitte.....	22
Table 9 - Firm Qualifications Ranks and Scoring Summary.....	24

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 10 – Approach to CalWIN Implementation Support Services Ranks and Scores.....	26
Table 11 -Staffing Approach and Qualification Ranks and Scores	27
Table 12 - Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview Score Summaries.....	28
Table 13 – DD&I Period Price Summary	29
Table 14 – BAFO Variance to Lowest Price	29
Table 15 – BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor Price.....	30
Table 16 – Business Proposal and Price Proposal Summary.....	31

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 17, 2019 the California Statewide Automated Welfare System (CalSAWS) Consortium, acting for the benefit of the 58 California Counties, requested proposals from qualified vendors for Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Organizational Change Management (OCM), Training and Implementation Support Services for the Migration of the 18 California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Information Network (CalWIN) Counties to the new CalSAWS.

This procurement solicited services including Project management, BPR, OCM, Training development, Training delivery and Implementation Support planning and execution of tasks and Deliverables. This effort also includes completing the transition from the CalWIN decentralized County-based support model to the CalSAWS regional structure for governance and ongoing system support. This collection of Services is referred to as Implementation Support. The RFP established a base contract period of 38 months, beginning December 2020 through January 2024. As an option to be exercised at the discretion of the Consortium, the Implementation Support may extend for up to twelve (12) additional months from February 2024 through January 2025. In conjunction with the RFP development, the Consortium designated a Procurement Manager to lead the procurement process and established a CalWIN Implementation Support Proposal Evaluation Team consisting of the following Consortium staff:

1. CalSAWS CalWIN Training, Change Management and Implementation Support Project Manager
2. Consortium Regional Manager

The Business Proposal Evaluation Team also consisted of representatives from the following counties:

1. Fresno
2. Orange
3. Placer
4. San Luis Obispo
5. Santa Clara
6. Santa Cruz
7. Solano
8. Ventura

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team consisted of representatives from the following counties:

1. Alameda
2. Fresno
3. Orange

Based upon 72 Bidder questions and other changes driven by the Consortium, the Consortium provided updates to the procurement schedule and RFP attachments, and, in consultation with legal counsel, issued five formal RFP addenda.

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

1. CGI Technology and Solutions Inc. (CGI)
2. Accenture
3. DXC Technology Services LLC (DXC)
4. Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte)

The four proposals were evaluated and scored in accordance with the established business and cost evaluation criteria defined in the RFP. Price Proposals were not accessible by the Price Proposal Evaluation Team until the evaluation of the Business Proposals was complete.

The Consortium exercised its right to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO). Two BAFOs were released, the first on June 29, 2020 and the second on July 10, 2020. The purpose of BAFO 1 was to facilitate price reductions. BAFO 2 was issued to gain pricing clarity. All Bidders provided BAFO responses by the required due dates and times for BAFO 1 and 2 on July 8, 2020 and July 14, 2020, respectively.

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 CalWIN Implementation Services. The 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:

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 1 – Business and Price Proposal Scoring Summary

	Category/Subcategory	Subcategory Weight	Overall Weight	Total Possible Points	CGI	Accenture	DXC	Deloitte
	Business Proposal		70.0%					
1	Firm Qualifications	5.0%		5.0	3.75	2.50	1.25	5.00
2	Approach	35.0%		35.0	35.00	26.25	17.50	35.00
3	Staff Approach and Qualifications	20.0%		20.0	20.00	10.00	15.00	20.00
4	Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	10.0%		10.0	9.17	6.00	3.00	8.75
	Business Proposal Raw Scores			70.0	67.92	44.75	36.75	68.75
	Business Proposal Normalized Scores			70.0	69.15	45.56	37.42	70.00
	Price Proposal		30.0%					
5	Base DD&I Period	30.0%		30.0	21.34	27.32	30.00	28.95
	Price Proposal Scores			30.0	21.34	27.32	30.00	28.95
	Business Proposal + Price Proposal Total		100.0%	100.0	90.49	72.88	67.42	98.95

The following general observations were made based on these results:

- Deloitte had the highest scoring Business Proposal. The CGI Business Proposal score was a close second place. DXC had the lowest scoring Business Proposal.
- BAFO 1 responses resulted in decreased costs from Deloitte and CGI. Accenture and DXC did not submit revisions in response to BAFO 1 and thus held firm on their initial Price Proposals. All four Bidders provided pricing clarification in BAFO 2 related to project management software; there were no changes to pricing.
- CGI had the highest Price Proposal and received the lowest Price Proposal score for the 38-month DD&I base period. DXC provided the lowest Price Proposal for the DD&I base period and received the highest Price Proposal score.
- The CGI Price Proposal was higher than the Deloitte Price Proposal by \$12,800,211. The difference from the highest to the lowest total price for the DD&I base period was \$14,061,486.

2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The Consortium Evaluation Team analyzed each Business Proposal and Price Proposal in accordance with the evaluation provisions of the RFP, as described in the CalWIN Implementation Support Proposal Evaluation Guide and as summarized below.

2.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The overall evaluation methodology, including the relative value of the Business Proposal and Price Proposal, is reflected in the table below.

Table 2 - Evaluation Methodology

CATEGORY/SUBCATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY WEIGHT	OVERALL WEIGHT	MAXIMUM POINTS
Business Proposal		70%	70
1. Firm Qualifications	5%		
2. Approach to Implementation Support	35%		
3. Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications	20%		
4. Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	10%		
Price Proposal		30%	30
1. Base DD&I Period	30%		
Total		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 were in place to aid the Team in completing their evaluation tasks.

The Evaluation Team reviewed the CalWIN Implementation Support RFP, the CalWIN Implementation Support Proposal Evaluation Guide, and participated in a virtual training session to prepare for the evaluation process and tasks. The Office of Systems Integration (OSI) established and hosted a CalWIN Implementation Support Procurement secure SharePoint site as the document management repository. The Procurement Support Team established and maintained the CalWIN Implementation Support procurement work plan, scheduled and facilitated team meetings, and prepared documents and tools for use by the Evaluation Team.

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 Approach to Implementation Support, 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 CalWIN Business Proposal Scoring Workbook. The collective scores and results for all Bidders were documented in the master CalWIN 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, as follows:

- Proposal Submission
- Firm Qualifications
- Project Management
- Approach and Deliverables
- Business Process Reengineering
- Organizational Change Management
- Training
- Implementation and Conversion
- Staffing Approach and Qualifications

The following areas, taken together, comprised the Approach to Implementation Support category:

- Project Management
- Approach and Deliverables
- Business Process Reengineering
- Organizational Change Management
- Training
- Implementation and Conversion

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, 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 discussions to reach consensus on the requirements that were exceeded, met, not met, or partially met for each Business Proposal. This resulted in an overall requirement score for each requirement in RFP Attachment J and 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 was 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 Key Staff Individual Reference Checks

For Key Staff, individual reference checks were reviewed by the Evaluation Team. Completed Key Staff 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 the proposed services and their capabilities to deliver such services. The oral presentations served to permit 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 June 12, 2020, well in advance of the scheduled viewing of oral presentations, which occurred during July 6 – 9, 2020. The topic areas and questions were identical for all Bidders.
- The oral presentations were scheduled for 45 minutes.
- 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. The oral presentations 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 or questions and answers.
- The Business Proposal Evaluation Team members, Procurement Manager and Procurement Support Team individually watched the oral presentation videos.
- At the conclusion of oral presentation 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.

2.4.2.5 Conduct Key Staff Interviews

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

- Project Manager
- Project Management Office (PMO) Lead
- Business Process Reengineering Manager
- Organizational Change Management Manager
- Training Manager
- Implementation and Conversion Manager

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 25 minutes; all other interviews were scheduled for 20 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 six 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 of the RFP. The ranking and scoring process was applied to the following three categories within the Business Proposal:

- Firm Qualifications
- Approach to Implementation Support
- Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications

In addition, the average score of both the Oral Presentations and six 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 three 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 three categories listed above plus the combined average of the Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interview scores. The CalWIN 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 CalWIN 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:

- Health and Human Services
- Business Process Reengineering
- Organizational Change Management
- Training
- Implementation Support

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 Implementation Support

The purpose in evaluating the Approach to Implementation Support 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 Implementation Support category considered the extent to which the Bidder met RFP requirements in the following areas:

- Project Management
- Approach and Deliverables
- Business Process Reengineering
- Organizational Change Management
- Training
- Implementation

The Approach to CalWIN Implementation Support Services accounted for 35 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 Implementation Support 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 6.3.3.6, 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 4.5 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 and 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 45-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 six 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 Equivalents (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 CalWIN Proposal Scoring Summary Workbook, access to the BAFO 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 corresponding 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 base period is 38 months. The Consortium may, at its discretion, and depending on Contractor performance, exercise the option to extend implementation support for up to 12 additional months. The Price Proposals also contained, as an option, prices for Training Facilities in each county.

The price evaluated was the price for the base 38-month contract period, including all Deliverables and requirements defined in the RFP, hardware and software.

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 CalWIN Proposal Summary Scoring Workbook, which combines the results of all Business and Price Proposals ranks and scores. Justification documentation was also recorded to provide a complete basis for the scores and recommendation of the Evaluation Team.

During the final 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 Implementation Support, Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications, and Oral Presentations and 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 CalWIN Implementation Support 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. CalSAWS CalWIN Training, Change Management and Implementation Support Project Manager
2. Consortium Regional Manager

The Business Proposal Evaluation Team also consisted of representatives from the following counties:

1. Fresno
2. Orange
3. Placer
4. San Luis Obispo
5. Santa Clara
6. Santa Cruz
7. Solano
8. Ventura

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team consisted of representatives from the following counties:

1. Alameda
2. Fresno
3. Orange

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

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

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/PRICE 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 Business Proposals met or substantially met submission requirements.

3.1.2 Price Proposals

All Bidders submitted compliant Price Proposals. The Consortium exercised its right to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO). Two BAFOs were released, the first on June 29, 2020 and the second on July 10, 2020. The purpose of BAFO 1 was to facilitate price reductions. BAFO 2 was issued to gain pricing clarity regarding project management software. All Bidders provided BAFO responses by the required due dates and times for BAFO 1 and 2 on July 8, 2020 and July 14, 2020, respectively.

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: DXC

The Deloitte Business Proposal received the highest rank and score in the Firm Qualifications area. Deloitte and CGI tied for first place in both the Approach to Implementation Support, and Staff Approach and Staff Qualifications categories. Deloitte received the second highest score for the Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews.

CGI received the highest scores for the Oral Presentation and Key Staff Interviews categories and the second highest rank and score for Firm Qualifications.

Taken together, this resulted in the highest overall Business Proposal score for Deloitte and a close second place Business Proposal score for CGI.

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Accenture received the third highest rank and score in Firm Qualifications, and the second highest rank and score in Approach to Implementation Support. For Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews, Accenture received third place scores, and received the lowest rank and score in Staff Approach and Staff Qualifications.

DXC received the second highest rank and score in Staff Approach and Staff Qualifications. DXC received the lowest scores in Firm Qualifications, Approach to Implementation Support, and Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews.

The following table presents the summary of the Business Proposal Scores.

Table 3 – Business Proposal Scores Summary

Business Proposal Score		Maximum Business Points			70	
Vendor	5.0% Firm	35.0% Approach	20.0% Staff Approach and Qualifications	10.0% Orals + Key Staff Interviews	Total Raw Business Score	Total Normalized Business Score
CGI	3.75	35.00	20.00	9.17	67.92	69.15
Accenture	2.50	26.25	10.00	6.00	44.75	45.56
DXC	1.25	17.50	15.00	3.00	36.75	37.42
Deloitte	5.00	35.00	20.00	8.75	68.75	70.00
Maximum Raw Score					68.75	

The table below provides the summary of requirement scores for each Bidder.

Table 4 – Requirements Summary

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	CGI	Accenture	DXC	Deloitte
		Total	Total	Total	Total
Requirement Exceeded	3	17	7	5	22
Requirement Met	2	115	104	82	106
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	1	19	37	5
Non-responsive	0	0	3	9	0
Total Requirements Count		133	133	133	133
Total Requirements Score		282	248	216	283
Average Requirements Score		2.12	1.86	1.62	2.13
Positive Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		17	8	5	22
Negative Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 0 or 1		1	22	46	5

The following tables provide the requirements scoring details for each category of each Business Proposal.

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 5 – Requirements Summary, CGI

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	CGI Requirements Counts and Scores									
		Approach								Staffing	Total
		Firm	Project Management	Approach & Deliverables	BPR	OCM	Training	Implementation & Conversion	Approach Total		
Requirement Exceeded	3	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	9	6	17
Requirement Met	2	11	10	20	8	1	32	5	76	28	115
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Requirements Count		13	10	23	8	4	34	7	86	34	133
Total Requirements Score		28	20	47	16	11	70	16	180	74	282
Average Requirements Score		2.15	2.00	2.04	2.00	2.75	2.06	2.29	2.09	2.18	2.12
Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		2	0	2	0	3	2	2	9	6	17

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 6 – Requirements Summary, Accenture

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	Accenture Requirements Counts and Scores										
		Approach									Staffing	Total
		Firm	Project Management	Approach & Deliverables	BPR	OCM	Training	Implementation & Conversion	Approach Total			
Requirement Exceeded	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	7
Requirement Met	2	11	8	21	8	4	27	7	75	18	104	
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	8	11	19	
Non-responsive	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	
Total Requirements Count		13	10	23	8	4	34	7	86	34	133	
Total Requirements Score		28	19	43	16	8	61	14	161	59	248	
Average Requirements Score		2.15	1.90	1.87	2.00	2.00	1.79	2.00	1.87	1.74	1.86	
Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 7 - Requirements Summary, DXC

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	DXC Requirements Counts and Scores									
		Approach								Staffing	Total
		Firm	Project Management	Approach & Deliverables	BPR	OCM	Training	Implementation & Conversion	Approach Total		
Requirement Exceeded	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5
Requirement Met	2	11	9	12	4	1	14	7	47	24	82
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	1	11	2	3	16	0	33	4	37
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	6	3	9
Total Requirements Count		13	10	23	8	4	34	7	86	34	133
Total Requirements Score		28	19	35	10	5	44	14	127	61	216
Average Requirements Score		2.15	1.90	1.52	1.25	1.25	1.29	2.00	1.48	1.79	1.62
Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 8 - Requirements Summary, Deloitte

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	Deloitte Requirements Counts and Scores										
		Approach									Staffing	Total
		Firm	Project Management	Approach & Deliverables	BPR	OCM	Training	Implementation & Conversion	Approach Total			
Requirement Exceeded	3	3	1	2	2	1	4	2	12	7	22	
Requirement Met	2	10	9	18	6	3	29	5	70	26	106	
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	1	5	
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Requirements Count		13	10	23	8	4	34	7	86	34	133	
Total Requirements Score		29	21	45	18	9	71	16	180	74	283	
Average Requirements Score		2.23	2.10	1.96	2.25	2.25	2.09	2.29	2.09	2.18	2.13	
Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		3	1	2	2	1	4	2	12	7	22	

The following subsections summarize the justification associated with Business Proposal evaluation categories: Firm Qualifications, Approach to Implementation Support Services, Staffing Approach and Qualifications, and Oral Presentations 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 based on the requirements score. The remaining ranks and scores were derived by taking additional key differentiators into consideration. Key differentiators for the Firm Qualifications area included the following items applied in the following order: firm reference scores, experience and financial viability.

Highest Score: Deloitte

Lowest Score: DXC

The Firm Qualifications category consisted of 13 total requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - CalWIN Implementation Support Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. Deloitte had the highest requirements score in this area and was therefore awarded the first-place rank and score. The remaining Bidders, CGI, Accenture, and DXC, tied for second place based on the 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. CGI provided firm references with an average score of 10.0, followed by Accenture with an average score of 9.9, followed by Deloitte with an average score of 9.89, and finally, followed by DXC with an average score of 9.22.

Firm 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
- BPR, OCM, Training and Implementation Support experience

This information was used as indicated in the proposal; the Evaluation Team did not officially question the experience cited. Deloitte documented the most years of experience in both the HHS and combined category for all Implementation Services. Accenture had the second highest number of years of HHS experience followed by

DXC, then CGI. In the consolidated Implementation Support experience category, DXC had the second highest number of years of experience, followed by Accenture, then CGI. It should be noted that the total years of experience in both categories is remarkably high for all Bidders. The lowest amount of HHS experience was 81 years. For the combined Implementation support experience, 186 years was documented as the lowest amount.

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 Bidder 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.

CGI had the highest D&B viability score of a 1, which indicates the lowest risk of becoming no longer viable. The remaining three Bidders 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 9 - Firm Qualifications Ranks and Scoring Summary

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 Combined Implementation Support Experience
CGI	2	7.5	3.75	28	10.0	✓	81.0	186.1
Accenture	3	5.0	2.50	28	9.90	✓	110.8	366.6
DXC	4	2.5	1.25	28	9.22	✓-	105.6	432.1
Deloitte	1	10.0	5.00	29	9.89	✓	391.5	1,067.7

3.2.2 Approach to Implementation Support Justification Summary

The proposals from Deloitte and CGI scored identically in both the requirements score and requirements average score; thus, were both assigned the highest rank and score for the Approach to CalWIN Implementation Support Services category. Accenture received the second highest score in this area based on requirements score, followed by DXC receiving the last place score.

The requirements score factors in the number of requirements that were not met, partially met, met, and exceeded. CGI met or exceeded all requirements in this category except for one requirement that was partially met. Deloitte met or exceeded all requirements except for four requirements that were partially met. Accenture met or exceeded all requirements except for eight requirements that were partially met and two requirements that were not met, meaning that no response could be found. DXC

met a little more than half of the requirements in this area, did not exceed any requirements, but was only partially responsive to 33 requirements and non-responsive to six requirements.

While not specifically applied as a scoring differentiator, this section also summarizes the overall quality of the Business Proposal content.

Highest Score: Deloitte and CGI

Lowest Score: DXC

The Approach to CalWIN Implementation Support Services consisted of 86 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - CalWIN Implementation Support Application Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal.

The Evaluation Team noted the following points regarding the Deloitte Approach section and the overall proposal: it was professionally written, well-structured, easy to read and comprehensive. Requirements were easy to map to the proposal content with elaboration on each requirement. Content was summarized at the end of each section, which was helpful. There was some redundancy in the training section; however, this was not perceived as a detraction from the overall quality. Deloitte exceeded 12 requirements and addressed all but four requirements in a comprehensive manner.

The Evaluation Team noted the following points associated with the CGI Approach section: Overall, this was a high-quality proposal, well-structured, easy to read and understand, and information was easy to find. Mapping of requirements was done correctly and navigating large sections of information was easily accomplished. The proposal response was comprehensive and thorough, and contained good explanations for their approach. The "pre-work" demonstrated initiative. Use of visuals and artifact examples, such as posters added to the understanding of how services would be delivered. The proposal did appear to have multiple authors, however, that did not result in loss of quality. CGI exceeded nine requirements and addressed all but one in a comprehensive manner.

The Evaluation Team noted the following points regarding this section of the Accenture proposal and the proposal in general: The visual appearance of this proposal was professional but lacked substance. Requirements were cited but responses were vague and lacked detailed supporting information. There were structural errors such as references to incorrect page numbers, copying and pasting inaccuracies, and in one instance information was pasted into the wrong deliverable. The training area was well done and exhibited a superior level of quality to other areas of the proposal. Accenture exceeded one requirement in this area.

For this section of the DXC proposal and the overall proposal, the Evaluation Team documented the following points: This proposal was difficult to read and navigate due to its organization. Evaluators had to use the search capability to locate responses since a large number of page references were cited for requirements. The proposal contained many grammatical errors and lacked a single voice. The proposal was

vague and lacked the appropriate level of detail. The DXC response did not exceed any requirements in this area.

The ranks and scores for the Approach to CalWIN Implementation Support Services are provided in the table below.

Table 10 – Approach to CalWIN Implementation Support Services Ranks and Scores

Approach		Weight	35.0%		
Vendor	Rank	Points	Approach Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Requirements Average
CGI	1	10.0	35.00	180	2.09
Accenture	2	7.5	26.25	161	1.87
DXC	3	5.0	17.50	127	1.48
Deloitte	1	10.0	35.00	180	2.09

3.2.3 Staff Approach and Qualifications Justification Summary

The proposals from Deloitte and CGI both received the highest overall rank and score for the Staff Approach and Staff Qualifications category first, based on the requirements score and, secondarily, the key staff reference scores.

Additional points of information that were discussed included the level of effort in hours and average number of Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) proposed for the 38-month DD&I period; however, this information did not impact the ranks or scores.

Highest Score: Deloitte and CGI

Lowest Score: Accenture

The Staffing Approach and Staff Qualifications category consisted of 34 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - CalWIN Implementation Support 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 one requirement in the overall category. CGI exceeded six requirements and met all remaining requirements. Accenture scored third in this category; Accenture exceeded four of the requirements associated with Key Staff minimum qualifications, partially met eleven requirements, and was not responsive to one requirement in the overall category. The DXC proposal scored fourth in this category and exceeded three of the Key Staff minimum qualification requirements, partially met four requirements, and was not responsive to three requirements.

In terms of overall quality, both the Deloitte and CGI 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.

All four vendors Key Staff scores were remarkably high. Key Staff from both Deloitte and CGI received the highest possible scores in this area, closely followed by Accenture and DXC.

Proposed Hours and FTEs

DXC proposed the highest overall level of effort and number of staff. Deloitte proposed the second highest level of effort and staff, followed by CGI and Accenture, with the lowest level of effort and staff.

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 8: Staff Loading Plan 38 Months: 12/2020-1/2024		
Vendor	Rank	Points	Staff Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Key Staff Reference Average	Total Level of Effort (Hours)	Average Monthly FTEs	
CGI	1	10.0	20.00	74	10.00	252,904.0	41.6	
Accenture	3	5.0	10.00	59	9.90	239,556.0	39.4	
DXC	2	7.5	15.00	61	9.89	293,120.0	48.2	
Deloitte	1	10.0	20.00	74	10.00	264,355.0	43.5	

3.2.4 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 CGI tied for first place with scores of ten on the Oral Presentation. Both teams 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 did not perform as well and scored a seven; the Evaluation Team noted that all topics were not fully addressed. The DXC team also did not perform as well and scored a three; the Evaluation Team noted that all topics were not fully addressed.

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 six required CalWIN Implementation Support Key Staff positions.

CGI and Deloitte were the highest scoring vendors in this subcategory, with average scores of 8.33 and 7.50, respectively. It should be noted that of the 24 total Key Staff who were interviewed, only five scored a 9 and no one scored a 10. Three of the six Accenture Key Staff were not as prepared to answer questions regarding their defined role, or approaches, tasks and deliverables for which their positions are responsible. All six of the 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	PMO Lead	BPR Manager	OCM Manager	Training Manager	Implementation Manager	Total Score	Average Score	Oral Presentation Score	Interviews + Oral Presentation Average
CGI	9.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	50.0	8.33	10.0	9.17
Accenture	7.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	4.0	6.0	30.0	5.00	7.0	6.00
DXC	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	18.0	3.00	3.0	3.00
Deloitte	8.0	6.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	45.0	7.50	10.0	8.75

3.3 PRICE PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team reviewed and scored the Price Proposals for the 38-month DD&I Period. During the final CalWIN Implementation Support 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.

The Consortium exercised its right to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO). Two BAFOs were released, the first on June 29, 2020 and the second on July 10, 2020. The purpose of BAFO 1 was to facilitate price reductions. All Bidders provided responses to BAFO 1 by the required due date of July 8, 2020. CGI and Deloitte presented price reductions in their BAFOs. Accenture and DXC did not submit a price reduction and confirmed their

original Price Proposal. The average price reduction from the original Price Proposal to BAFO 1 was 3.66%.

BAFO 2 was issued to gain pricing clarity regarding project management software. All Bidders provided BAFO responses by the required due dates and time for BAFO 2 on July 14, 2020 and provided the requested clarification.

Highest Score DD&I Period: DXC

Lowest Score DD&I Period: CGI

DXC submitted the lowest total price for DD&I Period of \$34,641,302 which resulted in the highest score for the Price Proposal. CGI submitted the highest price for the DD&I Period: \$48,702,788, which resulted in the lowest scoring Price Proposal. This represents a difference of \$14,061,486 from the lowest to highest proposal price.

The price summary for the base DD&I period is reflected in the following table.

Table 13 – DD&I Period Price Summary

Price Score	Maximum Price Points	30	
Vendor	DD&I Period: 12/2020 - 1/2024 38 Months	DD&I Price Points	Average Hourly Rate
CGI	\$ 48,702,788	21.34	\$ 187.00
Accenture	\$ 38,039,000	27.32	\$ 158.79
DXC	\$ 34,641,302	30.00	\$ 118.06
Deloitte	\$ 35,902,577	28.95	\$ 135.31

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 Price	BAFO Total Variance to Low Price	BAFO Total Variance to Low Price %
CGI	\$ 48,702,788	\$ 14,061,486	40.59%
Accenture	\$ 38,039,000	\$ 3,397,698	9.81%
DXC	\$ 34,641,302	\$ -	0.00%
Deloitte	\$ 35,902,577	\$ 1,261,275	3.64%

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

	Variance to Selected Vendor Price		
Vendor	BAFO DD&I Price	BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor	BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor
CGI	\$ 48,702,788	\$ 12,800,211	35.65%
Accenture	\$ 38,039,000	\$ 2,136,423	5.95%
DXC	\$ 34,641,302	\$ (1,261,275)	-3.51%
Deloitte	\$ 35,902,577	\$ -	0.00%

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. The Evaluation Teams believe the selection of Deloitte represents the best value to the Consortium, the 18 CalWIN 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.

CalWIN Implementation Support Vendor Selection Report

Table 16 – Business Proposal and Price Proposal Summary

	Category/Subcategory	Subcategory Weight	Overall Weight	Total Possible Points	CGI	Accenture	DXC	Deloitte
	Business Proposal		70.0%					
1	Firm Qualifications	5.0%		5.0	3.75	2.50	1.25	5.00
2	Approach	35.0%		35.0	35.00	26.25	17.50	35.00
3	Staff Approach and Qualifications	20.0%		20.0	20.00	10.00	15.00	20.00
4	Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	10.0%		10.0	9.17	6.00	3.00	8.75
	Business Proposal Raw Scores			70.0	67.92	44.75	36.75	68.75
	Business Proposal Normalized Scores			70.0	69.15	45.56	37.42	70.00
	Price Proposal		30.0%					
5	Base DD&I Period	30.0%		30.0	21.34	27.32	30.00	28.95
	Price Proposal Scores			30.0	21.34	27.32	30.00	28.95
	Business Proposal + Price Proposal Total		100.0%	100.0	90.49	72.88	67.42	98.95