

RFP 2001-01: Jury Management System Software and Services

PUBLICATION OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The Court received proposals from four vendors on proposal due date February 19, 2020. The four proposers were:

1. Tyler Technologies, Inc.
2. Jury Systems Incorporated
3. ICON Hold Co
4. Pioneer Technology Group

Court's three member Evaluation Committee evaluated the proposals to identify responsible proposers who submitted responsive proposals, also called qualified proposers. Proposals of qualified proposers were further evaluated for technical aspects and points were assigned by the Evaluation Committee. Evaluation of the proposals is presented below:

1. Consolidated Eval Sheet for RFP 2001-01 3 12 2020
2. Technical Eval Table RFP 2001-01 3 12 2020 (Technical evaluation of proposals received from qualified proposers)

Public opening of Cost Bids of qualified proposers will be done at 2:00 pm on March 16, 2020 in conference room # 34, at the following address:

Superior Court of California
County of Contra Costa
725 Court Street, 4th Floor
Martinez 94553

CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION SHEET RFP 2001-01 JURY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SOFTWARE AND SERVICES

I CRITERIA FOR RESPONSIBLE PROPOSER

| ID | REQUESTED DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF QUALIFICATION CRITERIA | MEMBER OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS (Submitted and found OK / Submitted but not OK / Not Submitted) | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | TYLER TECHNOLOGIES | JURY SYSTEMS INCORPORATED | ICON | PIONEER TECHNOLOGY GROUP |
| | | Evaluation Criteria | | | |
| 1 | The proposer should possess a minimum of 5 years of experience of providing jury management system and services to at least two courts for each of the 5 years. Such services should be the same or substantially similar to those described in the attached Scope of Work. Proposer shall provide a list of courts in the given table format. | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 2 | The proposer must make a statement that it is not currently be under suspension or other disciplinary review by any local, state, or federal government agency. (Attach General Certifications Form) | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 3 | The proposer must make a statement that it is not tax delinquent with the State of California or Federal Government. (Attach General Certifications Form) | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 4 | Proposer should be a financially stable organization for the three previous consecutive years (i.e. 2018, 2017 and 2016). (Provide abridged financial statements) | Provided; consistent profit making | Provided. JSI incurred net loss in 2016, significant net profit in 2017 and broke-even in 2018. JSI believes losses are due to employee payments. As JSI is improving its financial performance it is considered financially stable. | Provided; consistent profit making | Provided; consistent profit making |
| 5 | The proposer must provide five references of similar work they have performed for private or government organizations, and state that he or she agrees to the Court contacting those organizations. (Format provided in Bidder – Proposer Information Questionnaire). | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 6 | Proof that Proposer is qualified to do business and is in good standing in CA or in its home jurisdiction. | CA Corporate # C2722711 Status: Active | CA Corporate # 1798622 Status: Active | Certi. Of Good Standing from Delaware state (20201517704)and Cert. of existence from Georgis state (#18666474) Status: Active | State of Florida, Dept of State Document # L05000105236 Status: Active |

II CRITERIA FOR RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

| ID | REQUESTED DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF QUALIFICATION CRITERIA | MEMBER OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS (Submitted and found OK / Submitted but not OK / Not Submitted) | | | |
|----|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | TYLER TECHNOLOGIES | JURY SYSTEMS INCORPORATED | ICON | PIONEER TECHNOLOGY GROUP |
| 1 | Bidder Proposer Information Questionnaire | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 2 | Certification of Acceptance of Standard Agreement with its Terms and Conditions | Proposer has taken exception to the entire standard agreement. | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Proposer has taken exception to some clauses in the standard agreement (See note 1) |
| 3 | General Certifications Form | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 4 | Certification of Insurance | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 5 | Certification of Acceptance | Proposer has taken specific exceptions to solicitation document. | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Proposer has taken exception to solicitation document but have not submitted the exceptions (See note 2) |
| 6 | Payee Data Record Form | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 7 | Darfur Contracting Act Certification | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |
| 8 | Small Business Declaration | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 9 | DVBE Bidder Declaration | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 10 | DVBE Declaration | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 11 | Unruh Civil Rights Act & CA Fair Employment and Housing Act Certification | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok | Submitted and found ok |

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| III | COST BID RECEIVED | Cost Bid received before 5.00 pm 2/19/2020 | Cost Bid received before 5.00 pm 2/19/2020 | Cost Bid received before 5.00 pm 2/19/2020 | Cost Bid received before 5.00 pm 2/19/2020 |
|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|

IV RESPONSIBLE PROPOSER SUBMITTED RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL (QUALIFIED PROPOSERS)

| | | MEMBER OBSERVATIONS (YES / NO) | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------|-----------------------------|
| | | TYLER TECHNOLOGIES | JURY SYSTEMS INCORPORATED | ICON | PIONEER TECHNOLOGY GROUP |
| 1 | Responsible proposer submitted responsive proposal | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Note 1: As per court's assessment none of them are material.

Note 2: No specific exceptions provided

DECISION: *The committee decided to open the cost bids of qualified proposers.*

Evaluation Committee:

(Sign and Date)

Dated and signed

Dated and signed

Dated and signed

Dated and countersigned

Member 1

Member 2

Member 3

Procurement Unit, FSD

TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSALS RECEIVED FOR RFP 2001-01 JURY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND SERVICES

| CRITERION | MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS | JURY SYSTEMS INCORPORATED | | | | ICON | | | | PIONEER TECHNOLOGY GROUP | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------|----------|---------|----------------|--------|----------|---------|--------------------------|--------|----------|---------|
| | | David | Shelly | Marouane | Average | David | Shelly | Marouane | Average | David | Shelly | Marouane | Average |
| Evaluation Committee Member>>> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TECHNICAL PROPOSAL Depth of the Proposal: Proposal to include functionality, implementation support, on-going support, customer care, integration, reliability, ease of use, scalability, expandability and adaptability to new processes, applications and technologies. Should include response to expectations indicated in the Exhibit 1 Scope of Work and Exhibit 2 RFP Technical Evaluation and those indicated at 9.2A Technical Proposal. | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
| Demonstrated ability to execute and support jury management system and services: In form of number of CA courts of comparable or bigger size as compared to the Court where the proposer has implemented and has provided jury management system and services. Demonstrate a well-planned, integrated transition from any existing system(s), will ensure that service disruptions are minimized, Court staff (users) are well trained and supported, and operational inconveniences are minimized. Demonstrate ability to upload DMV and Voter registration files, ability to send SMS/text notifications, IVR capabilities to integrate with Court's phone system, web interface /client functionality. Good to have: Excellent working relationship with Judicial Council, CA DMV, and County Registrar of Voters. References of other CA courts of comparable or bigger size as compared to the Court | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 12 |
| COST PROPOSAL: The Cost Proposal will be evaluated on the overall reasonableness of the prices submitted. | 40 | Cost bid points will be assigned after opening of cost proposals | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Acceptance of the Contract Terms and Conditions | 5 | | | | 5 | | | | 5 | | | | 3 |
| DVBE Incentive (if applicable) | 5 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| TOTAL (Refer Note below) | 100 | | | | 55 | | | | 33 | | | | 31 |
| Small Business Incentive (if applicable) | | Not Applicable | | | | Not Applicable | | | | Not Applicable | | | |
| FINAL TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTE: If a Proposer receives Small Business Incentive, the score assigned to its proposal will be increased by an amount equal to 5% of the points assigned to the highest scored proposal.

DECISION: Final evaluation to be completed after opening of cost bids.

Evaluation Committee:

(Sign and Date)

Dated and Signed
Member 1

Dated and Signed
Member 2

Dated and Signed
Member 3

Documents attached: Evaluation Sheets of all members for all the proposers

Dated and Countersigned
Procurement Unit, FSD