

Alert System with Cameras - RFP Evaluation Sheet

Evaluation Areas

- Cost - 25%
- Product quality/appropriateness/compatibility/performance - 35%
 - As listed in the RFP Evaluation Criteria the bidder agrees to provide an on-site proof of concept (demo) if requested.
 - Demos will be used to help determine this part of the score
- Bidder's qualifications/experience - 10%
- Bidder's ability to provide support/service - 5%
- Bidder's warranty/maintenance - 5%
- Proposed product meets the district's present needs as well as future needs through enhancements and upgrades - 20%

Evaluation Details

Evaluation team will refer to RFP section "1.3 Evaluation Criteria" and grade proposals based on the criteria listed as they pertain to each area below. The criteria should be applied to "Section 3 - Technical Requirements." The total score given should be based on how the proposal meets the stated requirements in each area.

Cost

Cost is considered to be the price of the proposal including, but not limited to, individual system pricing, upgrades/downgrades pricing, installation support, warranty support, training, and any other relevant options with associated pricing.

Cost will be evaluated with the best cost getting 10 points. Remaining bids will be ranked and will receive a percentage of 10 points based on their percentage away from the best cost.

Notes:

ETC
with indicator lights → Questions on
Bluetooth
\$581,266.10
Support at on-site
\$21,420.-
\$602,686.10

Hard to determine final
pricing w/o understanding
Bluetooth APs on
ETC bid. If we
provide price could be
as high as \$714,000.

Centegix
\$591,988

Product quality/appropriateness/compatibility/performance

A score of 0-10 will be given based on how the proposal meets the RFP section "1.3 Evaluation Criteria". The criteria should be applied to "Section 3 - Technical Requirements."

Notes: Questions about Interact's security features vs. Centyx. Centyx solution is designed more for security first. Interact was driven more by cameras + instruction + security was an add-on. $\frac{C}{10}$ $\frac{E}{8}$

Bidder's qualifications/experience

A score of 0-10 will be given based on how the proposal meets the RFP section "1.3 Evaluation Criteria". The criteria should be applied to "Section 3 - Technical Requirements."

Notes: Centyx has more security experience, but not as many installs. Interact has more installs, but are less security minded. $\frac{C}{9}$ $\frac{E}{8}$

Bidder's ability to provide support/service

A score of 0-10 will be given based on how the proposal meets the RFP section "1.3 Evaluation Criteria". The criteria should be applied to "Section 3 - Technical Requirements."

Notes: Both companies can provide support. Centyx is in Metro ATL + ETC is local, but ETC doesn't support the full product. That would be done at first by phone to Interact. $\frac{C}{8}$ $\frac{E}{8}$
ETC support fees vary apply outside m/f-8-5.

Bidder's warranty/maintenance

A score of 0-10 will be given based on how the proposal meets the RFP section "1.3 Evaluation Criteria". The criteria should be applied to "Section 3 - Technical Requirements."

Notes:

Warranty + maintenance seemed similar

$\frac{C}{9}$ $\frac{E}{9}$

Proposed product meets the district's present needs as well as future needs through enhancements and upgrades

A score of 0-10 will be given based on how the proposal meets the RFP section "1.3 Evaluation Criteria". The criteria should be applied to "Section 3 - Technical Requirements."

Notes:

Etc

The Internet system seemed to be more instructional. This was part of the RFP, but not the priority. Future enhancements would be needed to catch up w/ the Century solution.

Century seemed to have a more security minded solution & their future plans were more in line with our needs.

$\frac{C}{10}$ $\frac{E}{8}$

Score Sheet

Criteria	Centegex	ETC
Cost	10	9.82
Product quality/appropriateness/compatibility/performance	10	8
Bidder's qualifications/experience	9	8
Bidder's ability to provide support/service	8	8
Bidder's warranty/maintenance	9	9
Proposed product meets the district's present needs as well as future needs through enhancements and upgrades	10	8

9.158

7.416

Name: John Cell

Date: 12/2/18

Signature: [Signature]