

CalSAWS

Central Print and Mailing Services
Request for Proposals 2020-01

Vendor Selection Report

December 23, 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
December 23, 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 Submission Compliance.....	6
2.4.2 Evaluate Business Proposals.....	6
2.5 PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS	13
2.5.1 Review Price Proposals for Submission Compliance	13
2.5.2 Evaluate Price Proposals.....	14
2.6 CALCULATE FINAL SCORES.....	14
2.7 EVALUATION TEAMS	14
3 RESULTS, RATIONALE AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION	16
3.1 PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION.....	16
3.1.1 Business Proposal Ranking and Scoring Justification	16
3.1.2 Price Proposal Scoring Justification.....	28
3.2 FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	30
Table 1 – Business and Price Proposal Scoring Summary.....	3
Table 2 – Price Summary	4
Table 3 - Evaluation Methodology	5
Table 4 – Business Proposal Scores Summary.....	16
Table 5 – Requirements Summary	17
Table 6 – Requirements Summary, Exela	18
Table 7 - Requirements Summary, DXC/Gainwell.....	19
Table 8 - Requirements Summary Xerox	20
Table 9 - Requirements Summary, KP.....	21
Table 10 - Firm Qualifications Ranks and Scoring Summary	23
Table 11 – DD&I Approach to Central Print Services Ranks and Scores	24
Table 12 – M&O Approach Ranks and Scores	25
Table 13 - Staffing Qualification Ranks and Scores.....	27
Table 14 – 5-Year Period Price Summary	29
Table 15 – BAFO Variance to Lowest Price.....	30
Table 16 - BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor Price	30
Table 17 – Business Proposal and Price Proposal Summary.....	31

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 8, 2020 the California Statewide Automated Welfare System (CalSAWS) Consortium, acting for the benefit of the 58 California Counties, requested proposals from qualified vendors for Central Print and Mailing Services supporting the new California Statewide Automated Welfare System (CalSAWS). For brevity purposes, this Vendor Selection Report (VSR) will refer to this collection of Services as Central Print Services.

This procurement solicited services including Project Management, Design and Development and Implementation (DD&I) and Maintenance and Operations (M&O).

This effort includes transitioning from multiple existing print service providers and implementing centralized print operations and mail services to the Counties in phases, and then providing ongoing Central Print Services to 56 of 58 CalSAWS Counties. It is anticipated that 56 Counties will transition to Central Print Services initially. The Contractor must agree to support the transition of the remaining Counties in the future at the request of the Consortium. The DD&I and initial M&O Phases of the Central Print Services contract duration is five (5) years. As an option to be exercised at the discretion of the Consortium, the M&O Phase may be extended for up to five (5) one (1) year increments.

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

1. Regional Managers
2. Program Analysts
3. Technical Manager

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

1. Contra Costa County
2. Los Angeles County
3. Tulare County

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team consisted of two representatives from the Consortium Project Management Office.

Based upon 70 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 four formal RFP addenda.

The Consortium received four letters of intent to respond from the vendor community. Proposals were submitted on September 23, 2020 by the following four vendors in the order of proposal receipt:

1. Exela

2. DXC Technology Services LLC (DXC), now known as DXC/Gainwell Technologies
3. Xerox
4. KP, LLC

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

The Consortium exercised its right to seek a Best and Final Offer (BAFO). An initial BAFO request was released on November 13, 2020. The purpose of the BAFO was to facilitate price reductions. All Bidders provided BAFO responses by the required due date and times of November 30, 2020. Exela, Xerox and KP provided reduced pricing. DXC/Gainwell confirmed their original pricing and elected to not provide any reductions. A second request for a BAFO was released on December 8, 2020 that asked Bidders to clarify or confirm that Price Proposals conformed with required RFP impression and envelope volumes and that unit prices for impressions included the cost of paper. All Bidders responded to the second BAFO by the required due date of December 10, 2020.

1.1 EVALUATION PROCESS RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATION

The Business and Price Proposal Evaluation Teams recommend DXC/Gainwell (proposal originally submitted as DXC) as the apparent successful vendor to deliver the CalSAWS Central Print Services. The Evaluation Team determined that DXC/Gainwell 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:

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 1 – Business and Price Proposal Scoring Summary

	Category/Subcategory	Subcategory Weight	Overall Weight	Total Possible Points	Exela	DXC	Xerox	KP
	Business Proposal		50.0%					
1	Firm Qualifications	15.0%		15.0	7.50	15.00	3.75	11.25
2	DD&I Approach	15.0%		15.0	7.50	15.00	3.75	11.25
3	M&O Approach	15.0%		15.0	7.50	15.00	7.50	11.25
4	Staff Approach and Quads, Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	5.0%		5.0	1.25	5.00	2.50	3.75
	Business Proposal Raw Scores			50.0	23.75	50.00	17.50	37.50
	Business Proposal Normalized Scores			50.0	23.75	50.00	17.50	37.50
	Price Proposal		50.0%					
5	5-Year Period: DD&I + Initial M&O	50.0%		50.0	30.33	26.26	50.00	28.40
	Price Proposal Scores			50.0	30.33	26.26	50.00	28.40
	Business Proposal + Price Proposal Total		100.0%	100.0	54.08	76.26	67.50	65.90

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

The following general observations were made based on these results:

- DXC/Gainwell had the highest scoring Business Proposal and scored first place in every category. KP had the second highest business score. Xerox had the lowest scoring Business Proposal.
- BAFO 1 responses resulted in decreased costs from Exela, Xerox and KP. DXC/Gainwell did not submit any pricing revisions in response to BAFO 1 and thus held firm on their initial Price Proposal.
- All bidders responded to BAFO 2.
 - Exela updated assumptions but did not change prices.
 - DXC/Gainwell confirmed the validity of their initial Price Proposal and assumptions and did not submit an updated second BAFO Price Proposal.
 - Xerox updated their assumptions and Price Proposal.
 - KP confirmed the validity of their BAFO Price Proposal and assumptions, dated November 30, and did not submit an updated second BAFO Price Proposal.
- DXC/Gainwell had the highest Price Proposal and received the lowest Price Proposal score for the five-year DD&I and M&O base period. Xerox provided the lowest Price Proposal for the five-year DD&I and M&O base period and received the highest Price Proposal score. Prices are summarized in the table below.
- Three bids were similarly priced: The Exela Price Proposal equates to 87% of the DXC/Gainwell price and the KP Price Proposal equates to 92% of the DXC price.
- The DXC/Gainwell Price Proposal was higher than the KP Price Proposal by \$4,276,155. The difference from the highest to the lowest total price for the DD&I and Initial M&O base period was \$26,977,504.

Table 2 – Price Summary

Vendor	5-Year Period: DD&I + Initial M&O	DD&I Price Points
Exela	\$ 49,197,010	30.33
DXC/Gainwell	\$ 56,825,210	26.26
Xerox	\$ 29,847,706	50.00
KP	\$ 52,549,055	28.40

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 Central Print Services 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 3 - Evaluation Methodology

CATEGORY/SUBCATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY WEIGHT	OVERALL WEIGHT	MAXIMUM POINTS
Business Proposal		50%	50
1. Firm Qualifications	15%		
2. DD&I Approach	15%		
3. M&O Approach	15%		
4. Staff Qualifications, Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	5%		
Price Proposal		50%	50
1. 5-Year Period: DD&I + Initial M&O	50%		
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 Central Print Services RFP, the Central Print Services 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 Central Print Services Procurement secure SharePoint site as the document management repository. The Procurement Support Team established and maintained the Central Print Services 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 Submission Compliance

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 5 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, Approach to Print Services DD&I (including Project Management, DD&I Approach and Facilities Planning and Preparation), Approach to M&O and Staffing 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 the Business Proposals. The scoring results for each Bidder were documented in the Central Print Services Business Proposal Scoring Workbook. The collective scores and results for all Bidders were documented in the Master Central Print Services 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
- DD&I Approach
 - Project Management
 - DD&I Approach
 - Facilities
- M&O Approach
- Staff Qualifications

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

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

Once all individual evaluators 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 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 two 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 Staff Individual Reference Checks

For Staff, individual reference checks were reviewed by the Evaluation Team. Completed 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 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 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 November 13, 2020, well in advance of the scheduled viewing of Oral Presentations, which occurred during December 2 - 3, 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.
- Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Oral Presentations were submitted as a video presentation. 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 two designated Key Staff positions were interviewed by a panel of Business Proposal Evaluation Team Members. (Non-key staff were not interviewed.) The Key Staff positions interviewed were:

- Project Manager
- Operations 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 Proposal Evaluation Team members and the Procurement Support Team. Although the entire panel (Procurement Manager, Business Proposal Evaluation Team and Procurement Support Team) participated in the interview process, the individuals were rated only by the Business Proposal Evaluation Team members. Each Project Manager interview was scheduled for 25 minutes; the Operations Manager 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 two required Key Staff positions.
- The average interview score for each Bidder was factored into the overall score for the Staffing category 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 6 of the RFP. The ranking and scoring process was applied to the following four categories within the Business Proposal:

- Firm Qualifications
- Approach to DD&I
- M&O Approach
- Staffing Qualifications

In addition, the average score of both the Oral Presentations and two Key Staff Interviews for each Bidder was calculated for the Staffing 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. The Master Central Print 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 (50 points). The other proposal scores were then normalized or adjusted in proportion to the maximum using the following formula:

$$(Weighted\ Business\ Proposal\ Score / Highest\ Business\ Proposal\ Score) * 50 = Business\ Proposal\ Score$$

The summary of scores and normalized proposal points for all Bidders were documented in the Master Central Print Services 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, 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 were considered. Bidders were instructed to include financial statements to demonstrate financial viability and stability; to provide two (2) 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:

- Five (5) years of Operating Print Services and facilities capable of processing the maximum capacity requirements.

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 firm references and financial statements (or key financial data points).

Firm Qualifications accounted for 15 of the 50 Business Proposal possible points.

Approach to DD&I

The purpose in evaluating the Approach to DD&I 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 DD&I category considered the extent to which the Bidder met RFP requirements in the following areas:

- Project Management
- DD&I Approach
- Facilities

The Approach to DD&I accounted for 15 of the 50 Business Proposal possible points.

Approach to M&O

The purpose in evaluating the Approach to M&O 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 Approach to M&O accounted for 15 of the 50 Business Proposal possible points.

Staffing Qualifications

The purpose in evaluating the Staffing 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 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 justification of staff types and levels proposed including the extent to which the minimum staff qualifications were met or exceeded
- Experience of proposed Staff providing Central Print Services
- Performance in Oral Presentations
- Performance in Key Staff Interviews

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 6.5.2 Staffing Qualifications.

The skills and experience levels for each proposed Staff person were assessed to determine the extent to which the required minimum qualifications defined in Section 3.2.8 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 Staff members. The Evaluation Team used the references to further verify staff qualifications and experience.

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

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 two required Key Staff positions.

The Oral Presentation score and the Key Staff interview average score were factors within the Staffing category.

The Staffing category accounted for 5 of the 50 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 establishing the eventual justification for the recommendation regarding the successful Bidder and in the preparation of this Vendor Selection Report. The requirement scores for each category 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, staff reference check results, 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, Staff reference check results, 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 Master Central Print Services 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 Submission Compliance

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 period is five years. The Consortium may, at its discretion, and depending on Contractor performance, exercise the right to extend services for up to five additional one-year options.

The price evaluated was for the initial five-year DD&I and M&O contract period, including all Deliverables and requirements defined in the RFP.

The Price Proposals represented 50% 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 6 of the RFP. The results were recorded in the Master Central Print Services 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 all Business Proposal and Price Proposal information.

As reflected in RFP Section 6, Evaluation, ranks and scores were calculated based on the predetermined methodology that assigns 50% to the scoring of the proposals based on the price of the services as represented in the Price Proposal Schedules. The other 50% was determined by review of the Business Proposals including: Firm Qualifications, Approach to DD&I, Approach to M&O and Staffing Qualifications. 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 Central Print Services 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:

- Regional Managers
- Program Analysts
- Technical Manager

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

- Contra Costa County
- Los Angeles County

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

- Tulare County

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team consisted of two representatives from the Consortium Project Management Office.

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 PROPOSAL SCORING JUSTIFICATION

3.1.1 Business Proposal Ranking and Scoring Justification

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.

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

Highest Overall Business Proposal Score: DXC/Gainwell

Lowest Overall Business Proposal Score: Xerox

The DXC/Gainwell Business Proposal received the highest rank and score in all Business Proposal Scoring areas: Firm Qualifications, DD&I Approach, M&O Approach and Staffing Qualifications. KP scored second place in all categories: Firm Qualifications, DD&I Approach, M&O Approach and Staff. Exela and Xerox tied for third place in the M&O Approach category. The Xerox Business Proposal scored last in Firm Qualifications, D&I Approach and Staff.

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

Table 4 – Business Proposal Scores Summary

Business Proposal Score		Maximum Business Points			50	
Vendor	15.0% Firm	15.0% DD&I Approach	15.0% M&O Approach	5.0% Staff, Orals, Key Staff Interviews	Total Raw Business Score	Total Normalized Business Score
Exela	7.50	7.50	7.50	1.25	23.75	23.75
DXC/Gainwell	15.00	15.00	15.00	5.00	50.00	50.00
Xerox	3.75	3.75	7.50	2.50	17.50	17.50
KP	11.25	11.25	11.25	3.75	37.50	37.50
Maximum Raw Score					50.00	

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

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

Table 5 – Requirements Summary

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score				
		Exela Total	DXC/ Gainwell Total	Xerox Total	KP Total
Requirement Exceeded	3	4	49	5	11
Requirement Met	2	100	76	97	99
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	21	0	21	12
Non-responsive	0	0	0	2	0
Total Not Applicable Requirements		0	0	0	3
Total Requirements Count		125	125	125	125
Net Requirements Count		125	125	125	122
Total Requirements Score		233	299	230	243
Adjusted Requirements Score		233	299	230	249.3
Average Requirements Score		1.86	2.39	1.84	1.94
Positive Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		4	49	5	11

The following tables provide the requirements scoring details for each category of each Business Proposal. Note that the DD&I Approach Total represents the sum of Project Management, DD&I Approach and Facilities requirements.

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 6 – Requirements Summary, Exela

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	Exela Requirements Counts and Scores							
		DD&I Approach Total					M&O Approach	Staff Approach & Quals	Total
		Firm	Project Management	DD&I Approach	Facilities	DD&I Approach Total			
Requirement Exceeded	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
Requirement Met	2	8	7	17	44	68	17	7	100
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	6	0	1	6	7	1	7	21
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Not Applicable Requirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125
Net Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125
Total Requirements Score		25	14	35	94	143	35	30	233
Adjusted Requirements Score		25	14	35	94	143	35	30	233
Average Requirements Score		1.67	1.94	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.94	1.76	1.86
Positive Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 7 - Requirements Summary, DXC/Gainwell

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	DXC/Gainwell Requirements Counts and Scores								
		DD&I Approach Total						M&O Approach	Staff Approach & Quals	Total
		Firm	Project Management	DD&I Approach	Facilities	DD&I Approach Total				
Requirement Exceeded	3	7	4	9	11	24	8	10	49	
Requirement Met	2	8	3	9	39	51	10	7	76	
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Not Applicable Requirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125	
Net Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125	
Total Requirements Score		37	18	45	111	174	44	44	299	
Adjusted Requirements Score		37	18	45	111	174	44	44	299	
Average Requirements Score		2.47	2.57	2.50	2.22	2.32	2.44	2.59	2.39	
Positive Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		7	4	9	11	24	8	10	49	

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 8 - Requirements Summary, Xerox

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	Xerox Requirements Counts and Scores							
		DD&I Approach Total					M&O Approach	Staff Approach & Quals	Total
		Firm	Project Management	DD&I Approach	Facilities	DD&I Approach Total			
Requirement Exceeded	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	2	5
Requirement Met	2	8	4	12	45	61	17	11	97
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	7	3	3	3	9	1	4	21
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
Total Not Applicable Requirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125
Net Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125
Total Requirements Score		23	11	36	93	140	35	32	230
Adjusted Requirements Score		23	11	36	93	140	35	32	230
Average Requirements Score		1.53	1.57	2.00	1.86	1.87	1.94	1.88	1.84
Positive Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		0	0	3	0	3	0	2	5

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 9 - Requirements Summary, KP

Requirements Summary	Requirements Score	KP Requirements Counts and Scores							
		DD&I Approach Total					M&O Approach	Staff Approach & Quals	Total
		Firm	Project Management	DD&I Approach	Facilities	DD&I Approach Total			
Requirement Exceeded	3	1	0	3	1	4	2	4	11
Requirement Met	2	11	7	12	45	64	14	10	99
Response Exists: Requirement partially met or not met	1	0	0	3	4	7	2	3	12
Non-responsive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Not Applicable Requirements		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total Requirements Count		15	7	18	50	75	18	17	125
Net Requirements Count		12	7	18	50	75	18	17	122
Total Requirements Score		25	14	36	97	147	36	35	243
Adjusted Requirements Score		31.3	14	36	97	147	36	35	249.3
Average Requirements Score		2.08	2.00	2.00	1.94	1.96	2.00	2.06	1.94
Positive Differentiator: Number of Requirements Scores of 3		1	0	3	1	4	2	4	11

Note: KP did not propose any Subcontractors; as a result, three of the Firm requirements did not apply. The requirements count and scores were adjusted/normalized to reflect the smaller number of applicable requirements.

The following subsections summarize the justification associated with Business Proposal evaluation categories: Firm Qualifications, DD&I Approach, M&O Approach and Staffing Qualifications.

3.1.1.1 Firm Qualifications Justification Summary

The proposal from DXC/Gainwell received the highest rank and score for the Firm Qualifications category based on the requirements score. The remaining ranks and scores were derived on the basis of requirements scores. Additional factors associated with the Firm Qualifications area included: firm reference scores, experience and financial viability. These additional factors are considered and applied as needed to further differentiate ranks and scores if requirements scores are equal or very close.

Highest Score: DXC/Gainwell

Lowest Score: Xerox

The Firm Qualifications category consisted of 15 total requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - Central Print Services Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. DXC/Gainwell had the highest requirements score in this area and was therefore awarded the first-place rank and score. KP placed second, Exela third and Xerox scored last. Additional factors that serve as further differentiators to rank and score vendors for this category are described below.

Firm Reference Average Score

Vendors were required to provide two 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 required and the scores provided by designated clients. Where Subcontractor references were provided, they were included in the calculation of the average reference score. If references were missing or disallowed, a score of 0 was applied.

DXC/Gainwell and KP both provided firm references with an average score of 10.0, followed by Exela with an average score of 6.58. Exela provided only one reference for its Subcontractor, Metrolina. Exela provided two references for another Subcontractor, Pitney Bowes, however one reference was from an internal Pitney Bowes source, which was not considered. The RFP requires client or customer references. Xerox scored an average of 5.54 in this category. Xerox failed to provide required firm references for three of its six Subcontractors, which negatively impacted this scoring.

Firm Experience

The Evaluation Team used the completed RFP Proposal Attachment E, Firm Qualifications, Experience Table to determine the applicable years of operating print services experience for both prime Bidders and applicable Subcontractors were documented in Attachment E as months. The corresponding months of experience were converted to equivalent years of experience and are reflected in the following table.

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

This information was used as indicated in the proposal; the Evaluation Team did not question the experience cited.

Financial Viability

Bidders 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. All four vendors reflected 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 just below one (1) to greater than one (10 for the two-year period). The Xerox Current Ratio was good. The Current Ratios for DXC/Gainwell and KP were acceptable. Exela had a Current Ratio of much less than one (1) for both years which signifies troubled financial viability.

It is worth noting that the Exela SEC Form 10-K Annual Report for Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2019, indicates significant negative audit findings associated with lack of internal financial controls and high risk as a future going concern.

Exela declined to provide the required D&B information. Xerox had the best D&B viability score, which indicates the lowest risk of becoming no longer viable. DXC/Gainwell and KP both had scores indicating a moderate risk of becoming no longer viable.

This information, taken together is represented by the financial viability indicator in the table below.

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

Table 10 - Firm Qualifications Ranks and Scoring Summary

Firm Qualifications		Weight	15.0%				
Vendor	Firm Rank	Firm Points	Firm Quals Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Firm Reference Average	Financial Viability and Stability	Years of Experience Operating Print Services
Exela	3	5.0	7.50	25	6.58	X	175.9
DXC/Gainwell	1	10.0	15.00	37	10.00	✓-	706.9
Xerox	4	2.5	3.75	23	5.54	✓-	63.0
KP	2	7.5	11.25	31.3	10.00	✓-	247.0

3.1.1.2 DD&I Approach Summary

The proposal from DXC/Gainwell scored the highest requirements score and requirements average score; thus, was assigned the highest rank and score for the DD&I Approach category. KP received the second highest score in this area based on requirements score, followed by Exela in third place and Xerox receiving the last place score.

The DD&I Approach to Central Print Services consisted of 75 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - Central Print Services Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. The requirements score factors in the number of requirements that were not met, partially met, met, and exceeded.

- Exela met 68 requirements and partially met seven (7) requirements.
- DXC/Gainwell met 51 requirements and exceeded 24 requirements in this category.
- Xerox met 61 requirements, exceeded three (3) requirements, partially met nine (9) requirements, and did not meet two (2) requirements.
- KP met 64 requirements, exceeded four (4) requirements and partially met seven (7) requirements.

Highest Score: DXC/Gainwell

Lowest Score: Xerox

The ranks and scores for the Central Print Services DD&I Approach are provided in the table below.

Table 11 – DD&I Approach to Central Print Services Ranks and Scores

DD&I Approach		Weight	15.0%		
Vendor	Rank	Points	Approach Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Requirements Average
Exela	3	5.0	7.50	143	1.94
DXC/Gainwell	1	10.0	15.00	174	2.32
Xerox	4	2.5	3.75	140	1.87
KP	2	7.5	11.25	147	1.96

3.1.1.3 M&O Approach Justification Summary

DXC/Gainwell received the highest overall rank and score for this category, KP received the second-place rank and score, and Exela and Xerox tied for third place with identical requirements scores.

Highest Score: DXC/Gainwell

Lowest Score Tie: Exela and Xerox

The M&O Approach category consisted of 18 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - Central Print Services Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. The requirements score factors in the number of requirements that were not met, partially met, met, and exceeded. DXC/Gainwell exceeded eight (8) requirements and met ten (10). KP exceeded two (2) requirements, met 14 requirements and partially met two (2). Exela

and Xerox tied for the third-place ranking; both met 17 requirements and partially met one (1) requirement.

Rankings were based on the requirements score. The ranks and scores for the M&O Approach are depicted in the table below.

Table 12 – M&O Approach Ranks and Scores

M&O Approach		Weight	15.0%		
Vendor	Rank	Points	Staff Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Requirements Average
Exela	3	5.0	7.50	35	1.94
DXC/Gainwell	1	10.0	15.00	44	2.44
Xerox	3	5.0	7.50	35	1.94
KP	2	7.5	11.25	36	2.00

3.1.1.4 Staffing Qualifications, Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews Justification Summary

This ranking for the Staff category is based first on the requirements score and performance in the Oral Presentations and Key Staff interviews. Key Staff reference averages are used as a further differentiating factor as needed. DXC/Gainwell received the highest overall rank and score in this category.

Highest Score: DXC/Gainwell

Lowest Score: Exela

Requirements

The Staffing Qualifications category consisted of 17 requirements that were directly mapped to RFP Attachment J - Central Print Services Requirements Cross Reference Matrix, completed and submitted as part of each Business Proposal. DXC/Gainwell exceeded ten and met the remaining seven. KP ranked second, exceeded four (4) requirements, met ten and partially met three (3) requirements. Xerox exceeded two (2) requirements, met 11 and partially met four (4); they ranked third. Exela ranked last with exceeding three (3) requirements while meeting and partially meeting seven (7) requirements.

Oral Presentations

The Oral Presentations were delivered via pre-recorded video presentations. They 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. DXC/Gainwell scored a 10. The DXC/Gainwell team fully addressed all topics and questions within the allotted time, the Key Staff performed as a cohesive, well-coordinated team and demonstrated a high degree of confidence and accountability throughout the presentation.

The KP team did not perform as well and scored a seven (7); the Evaluation Team noted that all topics were not fully addressed. The Exela and Xerox teams also did not perform as well and scored a six (6); the Evaluation Team noted that all topics were not fully addressed.

Key Staff Interview Average Scores

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 for the two required Key Staff positions.

DXC/Gainwell and KP were the highest scoring vendors in this subcategory, with average scores of 7.50. Exela scored 5.0 and KP scored 4.5. Their respective Key Staff were not as prepared to answer questions regarding their defined role, or approaches, tasks and deliverables for which their positions are responsible.

Key Staff Reference Averages

Two completed 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. DXC/Gainwell and KP provided the required references which were rated by the referencing individuals at 10, the highest mark. If references were missing or disallowed, a score of -0- was applied.

DXC/Gainwell and KP both provided staff references with an average score of 10.0, followed by Xerox with an average score of 5.0. Xerox provided two references for their proposed Project Manager, however, the individuals supplying the reference forms declined to provide the requested information, instead providing the following statement: "Due to company policy written references are prohibited. Please call for reference." It was incumbent upon the proposing bidder to supply completed references. Consequently, both references were scored as a -0-. Exela provided two references for its proposed Operations Manager. However, both references were from an internal Exela individual, not from a customer or client as required by the RFP. Both references were disallowed and a -0- score was applied. Exela's Key Staff references averaged 4.33.

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

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 13 - Staffing Qualification Ranks and Scores

Staff Approach, Qualifications, Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews				Weight	5.0%	Key Staff Interview Scores					
Vendor	Rank	Points	Staff Weighted Net Score	Requirements Score	Project Manager	Operations Manager	Total Score	Average Score	Oral Presentation Score	Key Staff Reference Average	
Exela	4	2.5	1.25	30	4	6	10.0	5.0	6	4.33	
DXC/Gainwell	1	10.0	5.00	44	10	5	15.0	7.5	10	10.00	
Xerox	3	5.0	2.50	32	6	9	15.0	7.5	6	5.00	
KP	2	7.5	3.75	35	6	3	9.0	4.5	7	10.00	

3.1.1.5 Proposal Quality

While not specifically applied as a scoring differentiator, this section summarizes the overall quality of the Business Proposal content. For each proposal, the Evaluation Team documented overall quality factors including, but not limited to the following items:

- Organization, logical flow, easy to understand.
- Ease of mapping specifically from the proposal to the requirements and the extent to which team members had to search/hunt for things.
- Painting the big picture with enough supporting detail for the Evaluation Team to be confident the proposing vendor can successfully perform this scope of work for the Consortium within the required timeframe.
- Systemic grammar or spelling issues that detracted from the proposal and/or made it more difficult to get through the content.
- General impression of content.

The Evaluation Team noted the following quality points regarding each proposal.

Exela

- The proposal was adequate and satisfactory.
- The proposal painted a good picture of what Exela planned to do to accomplish tasks and produce deliverables. They outlined solid steps and approach.
- Evaluators had to spend time using key words to search for requirements. They found it difficult to pinpoint content in response to requirements. Consequently, the proposal did not fully address a few requirements.
- Minor typos were found. The proposal contained the name of another possible customer vs. the Consortium, which was an apparent cut and paste error.

DXC/Gainwell

- The team stated they didn't realize a proposal could be this good. It contained great flow and format. It was excellent. The team was quite impressed. Navigating through the document was extremely easy.

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

- DXC/Gainwell took each requirement and addressed in detail how they would satisfy it. The narrative tagged each requirement number, so it was very easy to find requirements. The proposal met or exceeded all requirements.
- DXC/Gainwell demonstrated a very good understanding of the project and the RFP requirements. They painted a good picture of what they planned to do and supplied lots of detailed content. They provided a very thorough and detailed draft master work plan.
- The proposal contained great graphics and tables.

Xerox

- The overall quality of the proposal was rather poor. The team observed a below average to average rating and was not impressed. It was not very well organized.
- It was very difficult to find information and took a lot of hunting and searching to find requirements.
- Xerox placed quite a bit of content into appendices. The team had to traverse between the documents and appendices to try to locate and identify requirements confirmation.
- Xerox did provide deliverable examples which were helpful: work plan, status report, implementation plan and M&O Plan.
- The team recognized that Xerox is the LRS print vendor today and know they are capable, but proposal content fell short.

KP

- KP presented a good, solid proposal with good flow and organization. Content was streamlined.
- Upon the initial read, the proposal seemed strong, but when delving into requirements details the team had some difficulty finding responses. Phrasing and use of different terminology and language made it difficult to find some requirements.
- KP did paint a good picture of what they were planning to do.
- KP clearly stated it was not proposing any Subcontractors but introduced some ambiguity with references to Subcontractors (Pitney Bowes Pre-Sort and Braille supplier).

3.1.2 Price Proposal Scoring Justification

The Price Proposal Evaluation Team reviewed and scored the Price Proposals for the five-year DD&I and M&O period. During the final 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 Bidders substantially met the price-related proposal submission requirements. An initial BAFO request was released on November 13, 2020 to facilitate price reductions.

All Bidders provided BAFO responses, Exela Xerox and KP provided reduced pricing. DXC/Gainwell confirmed their original pricing and elected to not provide any reductions. A second BAFO was released on December 8, 2020 requesting bidders to clarify or confirm that pricing conformed with required pricing volumes and that unit price for impressions included the cost of paper. All bidders responded to the second BAFO by the required due date and time of December 10, 2020.

Highest Score 5-Year Period: Xerox

Lowest Score 5-Year Period: DXC/Gainwell

Xerox submitted the lowest total price for the 5-Year DD&I and M&O period of \$29,847,706 which resulted in the highest score for the Price Proposal. DXC/Gainwell submitted the highest price of \$56,825,210, which resulted in the lowest scoring Price Proposal. This represents a difference of \$26,977,504 from the lowest to highest proposal price. Three bids were similarly priced: DXC/Gainwell, Exela and KP. The Exela price is 87% of the DXC/Gainwell price. The KP price is 92% of the DXC/Gainwell price. The price summary for the 5-Year DD&I and M&O period is reflected in the following table.

Table 14 – 5-Year Period Price Summary

Price Score	Maximum Price Points	50	
Vendor	5-Year Period: DD&I + Initial M&O	DD&I Price Points	Average Price Per Month
Exela	\$ 49,197,010	30.33	\$ 819,950
DXC/Gainwell	\$ 56,825,210	26.26	\$ 947,087
Xerox	\$ 29,847,706	50.00	\$ 497,462
KP	\$ 52,549,055	28.40	\$ 875,818

While not specifically evaluated, the average price per month 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.

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 15 – 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 %
Exela	\$ 49,197,010	\$ 19,349,304	64.83%
DXC/Gainwell	\$ 56,825,210	\$ 26,977,504	90.38%
Xerox	\$ 29,847,706	\$ -	0.00%
KP	\$ 52,549,055	\$ 22,701,349	76.06%

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 16 - BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor Price

Vendor	Variance to Selected Vendor Price		
	BAFO DD&I Price	BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor	BAFO Variance to Selected Vendor %
Exela	\$ 49,197,010	\$ (7,628,200)	-14.52%
DXC/Gainwell	\$ 56,825,210	\$ -	0.00%
Xerox	\$ 29,847,706	\$ (26,977,504)	-51.34%
KP	\$ 52,549,055	\$ (4,276,155)	-8.14%

3.2 FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The DXC/Gainwell 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 DXC/Gainwell as the apparently successful Vendor. The Evaluation Teams believe the selection of DXC/Gainwell represents the best value to the Consortium, the California Department of Social Services, the Department of Health Care Services 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.

Central Print and Mailing Services Vendor Selection Report

Table 17 – Business Proposal and Price Proposal Summary

Category/Subcategory		Subcategory Weight	Overall Weight	Total Possible Points	Exela	DXC/Gain well	Xerox	KP
Business Proposal			50.0%					
1	Firm Qualifications	15.0%		15.0	7.50	15.00	3.75	11.25
2	DD&I Approach	15.0%		15.0	7.50	15.00	3.75	11.25
3	M&O Approach	15.0%		15.0	7.50	15.00	7.50	11.25
4	Staff Approach and Quals, Oral Presentations and Key Staff Interviews	5.0%		5.0	1.25	5.00	2.50	3.75
Business Proposal Raw Scores				50.0	23.75	50.00	17.50	37.50
Business Proposal Normalized Scores				50.0	23.75	50.00	17.50	37.50
Price Proposal			50.0%					
5	5-Year Period: DD&I + Initial M&O	50.0%		50.0	30.33	26.26	50.00	28.40
Price Proposal Scores				50.0	30.33	26.26	50.00	28.40
Business Proposal + Price Proposal Total			100.0%	100.0	54.08	76.26	67.50	65.90