

MIS System Proposal Evaluation Summary

<u>Project:</u>	County Board Voting System	<u>Author:</u>	Steve Pate
<u>Budget:</u>	\$106,000*	<u>Date:</u>	5/28/19
<u>Stakeholders:</u>	County Board, Board Chair, County Clerk's Office		

*Budget includes: \$76,000 in MIS funding and \$30,000 from Building Services budget

This document is intended to serve as a summary of the information collected by MIS during the proposal evaluation process. It is not to be construed as a recommendation or endorsement of any particular system or vendor. The ranking information in the last section is based upon the evaluation criteria published in the RFP and is not binding upon Sauk County.

Project Summary

The goal of this project is to procure and implement a fully integrated voting, audio and video system, to replace the current voting system in the county board chamber. Requirements for the new system include the following capabilities: control of individual microphones, management of requests to speak, tracking for who has spoken, capture of votes and support for the required audio/visual outputs for the recording or live streaming of board proceedings. The implementation of this system will be performed in conjunction with the replacement of the existing room audio system by Building Services.

For the purpose of this project, Sauk County developed a Request for Proposal (RFP) in order to obtain proposals from qualified vendors. Three proposals were received and evaluated. Each of the proposed systems provides somewhat different functionality and, for this reason, will require different levels of functionality from the new board room audio system to be installed, in order to obtain the desired functionality from the selected system. Anticipating this, the upgrade of the audio system has been postponed until the new voting system is selected.

Functional Evaluation

The functional review of the proposals involved determining the degree of functionality provided, based upon the specifications put forth in the RFP. This was accomplished by comparing the specifications in the proposals with the RFP and viewing live system demos.

To determine compliance with functional specifications, each system was scored based on the number of written specs it supported. Each system was given one point for each specification from the RFP that the proposed system met, per the vendor's written proposal. The results of this evaluation process are as follows.

MIS Proposal Evaluation Summary

County Board Voting System

5/28/19

Written Specification Functional Scores			
Functional Area	System Vendor		
	AVI	Roll Call Pro/ Lifeline	Granicus
Electronic Voting	6	6	4
Request to Speak Microphone Control	7	7	4
Video Support Control	4	4	1
Optional Features	2	6	3
Overall Score (of 24 possible)*	19	23	12

**It should be noted that of the 24 written specifications, 17 were considered to be required specifications and 7 were considered optional. Both Roll Call Pro / Lifeline and AVI met all 17 of the required specifications.*

To evaluate the usability, and better assess the actual functionality and specification compliance of the systems, each system vendor provided a live demonstration of the proposed system to a group of County Board Supervisors and staff. Each in attendance were asked to score each demo based upon their impression of the system by filling out a score sheet. The scores were divided into three functional categories for each system, with each functional area evaluated for ease of use, functionality and flexibility. These scores were combined and averaged for each system, and are summarized in the table below.

Demo Scores			
Functions	System Vendor		
	AVI	Roll Call Pro/ Lifeline	Granicus
Electronic Voting	4.2	4.9	2.7
Request to Speak Microphone Control	4.0	4.9	2.9
Video Support Control	4.4	4.8	NA
Overall	4.2	4.8	2.8

MIS Proposal Evaluation Summary

County Board Voting System

5/28/19

Cost Proposal Evaluation

The system cost evaluation must consider not only the vendor's cost proposal, but also the costs for audio system features required to ensure the desired functionality, once installed, as well as any additional hardware required. The table below summarizes the purchase price for each system as proposed, and the corresponding cost estimate for the audio system components and other hardware necessary to achieve the desired functionality.

Complete System Costs (System + A/V Requirements)				
Vendor / System	Cost as Proposed	Estimated A/V System Costs	Additional Hardware	Total Cost
Roll Call Pro / Lifeline	65,168	16,208	10,000*	91,376
AVI w/o optional cameras	172,533	33,476	None	206,009
AVI w/ optional cameras	184,670	16,208	None	200,878
Granicus	7,375	86,175	None	93,550

* Roll Call Pro requires the purchase of additional wireless mobile devices to be used as voting stations.

Annual Support Costs and Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)

The RFP requested that each vendor provide an annual support and maintenance quote. This amount is to be fixed for five years. The support quotes are listed in the table below. One vendor proposed a discount for up front payment, this is also reflected in the table below.

System Support Costs			
Vendor	Annual cost	Total cost / 5 yrs	5 yr cost prepaid.
AVI	17,535	87,675	NA
Roll Call	6,011	30,055	24,055
Granicus	3,875	19,375	NA

Using the amounts in the tables above, a five year total cost of ownership (TCO) has been calculated for each system. This is shown in the table below. These figures include the upfront

MIS Proposal Evaluation Summary

County Board Voting System

5/28/19

system costs, five years of support (paid annually) and the estimated cost of the A/V system components and other hardware required to achieve the desired functionality.

Five Year TCO					
System	Purchase Cost	A/V Costs	Additional Hardware	Annual Support	5 yr TCO
AVI w/o opt cameras	172,533	33,476	N/A	17,535	293,684
Roll Call Pro/ Lifeline	65,168	16,208	10,000	6,011	115,376
Granicus	7,375	86,175	N/A	3,875	112,925

System Proposal Ranking

In accordance with the parameters set forth in the RFP, system selection is to be made based primarily upon compliance with the specifications. Utilizing the overall functional compliance and demo scores from above, a ranking of system functionality, based on specification compliance, was developed for each of the proposals. This is shown in the table below, along with the corresponding five year TCO.

System Specification Compliance Ranking				
Rank	System Vendor	Functional Score	Demo Score	5 Year TCO
1	Roll Call Pro / Lifeline	23	4.8	\$115,376
2	AVI	19	4.2	\$293,684
3	Granicus	12	2.8	\$112,925

Additional considerations set forth in the RFP for system selection are: cost, continuing vendor support, and vendor reputation and past performance. The RFP also reserves the County's ability to establish alternate evaluation criteria, deemed to be in its best interest. The evaluation and award sections from the RFP document read as follows:

After determining that a proposal satisfies the mandatory requirements stated in this Request for Proposal, a comparative assessment of the relative benefits and deficiencies of the proposal in relationship to the published evaluation criteria shall be made using subjective judgment. The award of a contract resulting from this Request for Proposal shall be based on the proposal Sauk County deems to be the best proposal received in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated below:

MIS Proposal Evaluation Summary

County Board Voting System

5/28/19

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Cost | 15% |
| • System Compliance with Specifications | 50% |
| • Continuing Vendor Support | 20% |
| • Vendor Reputation and Past Performance | 15% |

Sauk County will award to the Contractor who submits a proposal that is determined to be most advantageous to the County. In determining the most advantageous proposal, Sauk County reserves the right to consider criteria such as, but not limited to, quality of workmanship, design features, compatibility with existing technology, standardization, past experience, delivery schedule, installation schedule, vendors past performance with the County and/or service reputation and service capability. The County may opt to establish alternate selection criteria to protect its best interest or meet performance or operational standards.

Additional information and copies of the proposals are available from the MIS Department upon request.