EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP-604747-24/MHH

Website Redesign

RESPONSE DEADLINE: April 3, 2024, at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Wednesday, April 3, 2024

Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Response 5
American Technology Consulting, LLC 6600 Westown Parkway, Suite 255 West Des Moines, IA 50266 Nick Reddin nick@american-technology.net Phone: (515) 770-9977	Exygy, Inc.* 548 Market Street, Suite 59930 San Francisco, CA 94104	Granicus LLC 408 Saint Peter Street, Suite 600 Saint Paul, MN 55102 rfp@granicus.com	Mobikasa LLC* 135 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor New York, NY 10016	NUB8, LLC 1111 Brickell Avenue, 10th Floor, Suite 43 Miami, FL 33131 Federico Decia sales@nub8.net Phone: (781) 708-1200
$359,000.00	N/A	$850,255.00	N/A	$430,389.16

Response 6	Response 7	Response 8	Response 9
Planeteria Media LLC+ 100 Stony Point Road, Suite 240 Santa Rosa, CA 95401 Tyler Coffin tyler@planeteria.com	SGS Technologie, LLC 6817 Southpoint Parkway, Suite 2104 Jacksonville, FL 32216 Anand Venkatesan bids@sgstechnologies.net Phone: (904) 332-4534 Ext: 347	SpaceMade LLC dba Solodev 360 Central Avenue, Suite 1360 Saint Petersburg, FL 33701 Dasha Moore dm@solodev.com	Technology International, Inc. 1331 South International Parkway, Suite 2251 Lake Mary, FL 32746 Rifat Habib tii@tii-usa.com
N/A	$396,840.00	$1,222,329.20	$183,160.00

*Non-responsive: Failed to comply with Section 4.12 "Licenses".

+Non-responsive: Failed to comply with Section 3.23 "Pricing".

Tabulated by Michael Hall, Senior Procurement Analyst on Wednesday, April 3, 2024, at 2:00 pm.

Recommendation/Intent to Award: SGS Technologie, LLC

Committee Member	Title	Signature
Douglas Baker	IT Program Manager II	
Natalie Guerra	IT Senior Programmer	
Chris Patton	Director of Communications	
Carlos Vazquez	IT Team Lead - Solutions Delivery Group	
Timothy Williams	IT Senior Programmer (Webmaster)	
Andrea Wontor	Public Information Division Manager	
Howard Xi	IT Senior Programmer	

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP-604747-24/MHH

Website Redesign

RESPONSE DEADLINE: April 3, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Monday, August 26, 2024

PHASE 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Technical Expertise and Innovation	Points Based	25 *(25% of Total)*

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Overall Presentation	Points Based	20 *(20% of Total)*

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Previous Work and References	Points Based	10 *(10% of Total)*

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Management and Execution	Points Based	10 *(10% of Total)*

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Support and Maintenance	Points Based	15 *(15% of Total)*

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability to Answer Questions Provided	Points Based	20 *(20% of Total)*

Description: N/A.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Douglas Baker	Natalie Guerra	Chris Patton	Carlos Vazquez	Timothy Williams	Andrea Wontor	Howard Xi	Total Score (Max Score 100)
SGS Technologie	91	89	94	98	93	96	96	**93.86**
Technology International, Inc.	83	86	83	70	74	77	95	**81.14**

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Technical Expertise and Innovation Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Overall Presentation Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Previous Work and References Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Project Management and Execution Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Support and Maintenance Points Based 15 Points (15%)	Ability to Answer Questions Provided Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
SGS Technologie	23.3	18.6	9.4	9.1	14	19.4	**93.86**
Technology International, Inc.	20.1	16.1	8	7.3	12.4	17.1	**81.14**

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

SGS Technologie

Technical Expertise and Innovation | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 22

CMS: Sitefinity, workflow functionality , form creation, widgets, Admin functionality to allow only comm to publish.

Natalie Guerra: 23

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 23

A strong knowledge of a variety of questions posed by the evaluation team. The ability for the presented CMS system to perform most of the actions needed is a plus in my eyes as we do not have to rely on third-party applications perform critical website functions.

Carlos Vazquez: 24

Seems knowledgeable and innovated

Timothy Williams: 23

Understands the technology used and needed for integrational opportunities

Andrea Wontor: 25

Website looks easy on the backend! Appreciate the simplicity of updating and adding pages

Howard Xi: 23

They are experienced in what they do. Form and workflow is a slight weakness in my opinion.

Overall Presentation | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 18

The CMS is a good option to use. Has all the functionality required.

Natalie Guerra: 19

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 19

I appreciate how the demo website wasn't a carbon copy of the current website. The team took chances and it paid off. I was impressed with seeing our content presented in a different way. Font choices were odd.

Carlos Vazquez: 19

nice presentation. would it love to see pages they have build

Timothy Williams: 18

well prepared for demo

Andrea Wontor: 19

Enjoyed presentation and manner of the team during initial and demo; knowledgeable and great attention to detail

Howard Xi: 18

Was not able to see some more advanced capabilities of the forms because they require additional configuration. Also did not get to see the actual SQL connection management. The flow was good.

Previous Work and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 9

The vendor has good experience managing a CMS.

Natalie Guerra: 8

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 9

SGS has a host of work references that are similar to our needs.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

22 plus years of experience with other govt. agencies

Timothy Williams: 10

Has worked and currently work with other Govt's

Andrea Wontor: 10

Past government experience bodes well for us and an understanding of Seminole's needs

Howard Xi: 10

A lot of experience with County level governments.

Project Management and Execution | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 9

6 months to implement. Sound process to complete the project.

Natalie Guerra: 8

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 9

I appreciate the formal presentations. The team didn't speak over another. The project manager controlled the presentation and helped manage the Q&A period.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

company mentioned that always hit timelines. 6 month project

Timothy Williams: 9

- able to migrate current system

Andrea Wontor: 9

Strong timeline and eagerness to move forward

Howard Xi: 10

Don't see an issue based on the presentation.

Support and Maintenance | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Douglas Baker: 13

The vendor ensured they would partner with our team and be responsive especially in times of emergency.

Natalie Guerra: 13

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 14

The team uses BaseCamp for project management. The county implementation team is familiar with this tool as it was used by our last website vendor.

Carlos Vazquez: 15

different methods of submissions and SLA

Timothy Williams: 14

meets sla requirements

Andrea Wontor: 14

Appreciated comments that they are always available for site work and do updates visually every few years

Howard Xi: 15

Don't see an issue based on the presentation

Ability to Answer Questions Provided | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 20

All questions were answered.

Natalie Guerra: 18

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 20

As mentioned previously, I appreciated the professional presentation. Answers didn't

Carlos Vazquez: 20

answered all questions

Timothy Williams: 19

answered all our questions provided

Andrea Wontor: 19

Seemed easy to work with and knew how to respond to questions ranging from cyber security to look and ease of site usage and design

Howard Xi: 20

Answered the provided written questions.

Technology International, Inc.

Technical Expertise and Innovation | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 20

CMS: Word Press web and app development cyber security priority encrypted data Analytics: Monster Insight Media Asset Mgm Work flow 65% of sites use WordPress MySQL DB Can be AWS or different DC

Natalie Guerra: 22

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 20

Excellent demonstration of the capabilities of a WordPress backend. Third-party widgets pose challenges for operational continuity, as well as cost control.

Carlos Vazquez: 16

Seem to know the technical aspects, didn't see innovations on the presentation

Timothy Williams: 20

was ok. seem fairly comfortable with WP systems

Andrea Wontor: 20

Dislike how the backend looks difficult to navigate with similar vibe to Solodev; dislike how different widgets all seem to be a different method to learn

Howard Xi: 23

The technology is great, my concern is too many plugins to maintain.

Overall Presentation | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 15

CMS is widely used but it relies on unsupported addons to perform many functions.

Natalie Guerra: 17

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 18

Demonstration website was well thought out. I particularly liked how the team took advantage of T.S. Debbie to show how the new website could accommodate emergency preparedness information.

Carlos Vazquez: 15

good but spend too much time on the presentation instead of going directly to the point. Seems to be that they were not prepare and had one person remote.

Timothy Williams: 15

not as detailed, viewing the CMS backend as requested/ director spoke commandeered most of the meeting

Andrea Wontor: 15

First presentation did not go well, with little demo or true explanation of site

Howard Xi: 18

The flow was not as smooth with many interrruptions.

Previous Work and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 9

500 Public sector clients. Has good experience managing a CMS.

Natalie Guerra: 8

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 8

Previous work experience shines through as the team were talking about solutions to transfer data from the existing website.

Carlos Vazquez: 8

Since 1992

Timothy Williams: 7

not much govt related sites

Andrea Wontor: 7

Past work shown, like that they are local to Seminole County

Howard Xi: 9

Looks good but maybe not as much experience with County level governments.

Project Management and Execution | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 8

Sound process to complete the project.

Natalie Guerra: 8

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 8

The team functioned well in presenting the material and working through the questions.

Carlos Vazquez: 5

didn't go into details

Timothy Williams: 6

not up front and clear how they will manage upper tiers of modules/plugins

Andrea Wontor: 6

Attention to detail in presentation was lacking with typos, bad punctuation, old logo being used. Does not bode well.

Howard Xi: 10

Saw no issues within the presentation.

Support and Maintenance | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Douglas Baker: 13

The vendors support options were acceptable.

Natalie Guerra: 13

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 13

The team confirmed how it would communicate with the County. The team has a unique advantage due to its location.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

didn't go into details

Timothy Williams: 10

not up front and clear how they will manage upper tiers of modules/plugins

Andrea Wontor: 13

Like that they are local to work with team on support and maintenance moving forward

Howard Xi: 15

Saw no issues within the presentation.

Ability to Answer Questions Provided | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 18

All questions were answered.

Natalie Guerra: 18

Met Expectations

Chris Patton: 16

I appreciate the team's work. It was evident throughout the presentation. I did not like how the solutions to several posed questions were third-party apps.

Carlos Vazquez: 16

answered some of the questions but high level and too long answers

Timothy Williams: 16

answers were a bit vague to some of the detailed inquires

Andrea Wontor: 16
Initial in person meeting had no true demo experience
Howard Xi: 20
The provided written questions were answered.

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Firm Experience, Qualifications and References	Points Based	10 *(10% of Total)*

Description:
● Business Organization – the type of business the vendor is registered as (i.e., sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, and Limited Liability Company).
● Length of time in business – include the date the business started and any name changes, mergers and acquisitions that have taken place since inception.
● Locations – list headquarters & location information including number of employees at each location.
● Customer base – the total number governmental or local government customers to date and the number currently active on open projects broken down by state and jurisdiction.
● Experience – include 3-5 case studies for similar projects for government entities.
● Subject matter expertise – a description of the vendor's subject matter expertise.
● Qualifications - Description of how the vendor meets the preferred qualifications listed in Section 4.1.
● Capacity and Stability of Firm - a description of the Consulting Firm's capacity to meet the requirement including but not limited to the financial capacity of the firm, size of relevant technical staff, and the ability to meet the timelines outlined in this document.
● Vendor shall include at least three (3) different references of county organizations of the same size and complexity of Seminole County that have worked with the Firm in a professional capacity with a scope similar to the one described in Section 3.
● The references provided shall all be from engagements that took place in their entirety within the last five (5) calendar years.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Personnel and Dedicated Staffing	Points Based	20 *(20% of Total)*

Description:
● Include profiles, bios, and resumes for any and all personnel who will be working on the project should the vendor be awarded. Projected amount of time all personnel will dedicate to the project (full-time and part-time).
● Include the projected amount of time the vendor will be spending at Seminole County facilities throughout the various stages of the project, including staffing for ongoing support. Statement on how the Firm staff plan to communicate and engage throughout the project (i.e., web conferencing hosted by vendor, Skype, etc.).

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Management Approach and Execution	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:
● Project Timeline Assurance
○ Vendor shall include a projected timeline with milestones based on Section 3.
○ This section shall include specifics on number of staff needed and time to complete each phase. If the vendor chooses to include additional services such as implementation and training support post-award, then those projected timelines shall also be included in the response.
● Ability to meet Project Goals
●Executive Summary - Vendor shall include a description of the highlights, features and distinguishing points of the response. Within this summary a list of individuals and contact information for the response shall be included.
○ Vendor shall describe how they will meet the goals detailed in Section 2.
● Include the resources, staff, and expectations required of Seminole County to ensure this project is a success.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Technical Knowledge	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)

Description:
● Response to Scope
○ This section shall include a response to each item of the scope of services laid out in Section 3 and Attachment B. If the vendor is hoping to only go after one phase (either redesign, CMS implementation, or Ongoing Support) they can respond to that given scope of work.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost Proposal	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:
A not-to-exceed amount that would be contained in a potential agreement with Seminole County shall be included.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Douglas Baker	Natalie Guerra	Chris Patton	Carlos Vazquez	Timothy Williams	Andrea Wontor	Howard Xi	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Technology International, Inc.	87	95	82	83	96	58	79	**82.86**
SGS Technologie	80	82	82	84	82	57	81	**78.25**
Granicus	67.4	69.4	74.4	79.4	56.4	62.4	71.4	**68.68**
ATC	77.7	78.7	70.7	81.7	45.7	52.7	65.7	**67.6**
Solodev	59.8	74.8	55.8	60.8	31.8	50.8	71.8	**57.89**
nub 8	66.6	77.6	58.6	48.6	25.6	47.6	70.6	**56.5**

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Firm Experience, Qualifications and References Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Personnel and Dedicated Staffing Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Project Management Approach and Execution Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Technical Knowledge Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Cost Proposal Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Technology International, Inc.	7.4	15.6	20.6	14.3	25	**82.86**
SGS Technologie	9.6	17.7	22.1	17.9	11	**78.25**
Granicus	9.3	16.3	20.9	16.9	5.4	**68.68**
ATC	5.6	14.6	19	15.7	12.7	**67.6**
Solodev	8	14	18.1	14	3.8	**57.89**
nub 8	5.4	12.6	15.4	12.4	10.6	**56.5**

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

ATC
Firm Experience, Qualifications and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 7

Over 15 years experience. 85 US employees. 185 total. All Case studies from Iowa. Customers: Amazon and John Deere. Did not list any local govt customers.

Natalie Guerra: 7

Case Studies not Government

Chris Patton: 5

Missing key information regarding location information, including headquarters location, total number of governmental or local customers to date, and similar projects for governmental entities were not listed.

Carlos Vazquez: 8

Length of business is a somewhat concern

Timothy Williams: 5

- Long time in business - references doesn't exemplify the complexity typically encountered when supporting a government organization

Andrea Wontor: 5

No county experience listed and all examples were of organizations that were not similar. Location and customer base questions also not addressed.

Howard Xi: 2

The examples provided by the vendor are of business es co-owned by the vendor's principle. The references provided are also relatively simple in design. No clear governmental experience.

Personnel and Dedicated Staffing | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 18

Staff are experienced in performing this type of projects.

Natalie Guerra: 18

met requirements

Chris Patton: 15

Information on the resumes was lacking, and the communication plan was underdeveloped. Agile Scrum was not mentioned in Communication Plan, though it was highlighted in detail in the firm's qualifications.

Carlos Vazquez: 18

Personnel staff seems to be knowledgeable

Timothy Williams: 10

- reasonably equipped staff

Andrea Wontor: 8

No response to amount of time vendor will spend at Seminole County facilities, or specifics on communication. Charts lack ease of readability

Howard Xi: 15

Did not say where they were based or how we would communicate. Did not list ongoing support staff bio.

Project Management Approach and Execution | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 22

39 - 46 weeks to implement. Provided a comprehensive approach addressing all required items. I did not ID any deficiencies.

Natalie Guerra: 23

met requirements

Chris Patton: 22

Project timeline and project goals were very strong. Well written and easy to follow. I was discouraged by the lack of direction in the executive summary. In my opinion, it was a missed opportunity to highlight how the new Seminole County website will stand out from the competition.

Carlos Vazquez: 24

PM approach is in line with what we are looking for.

Timothy Williams: 8

- there needs to be more of a focus on integration to existing API's and shortcode

Andrea Wontor: 14

Timeline lacked specifics on number of staff needed and time to complete phases. List of individuals and contact for response missing? Solid answer on Seminole County staff expectations

Howard Xi: 20

Relatively broad and generic, lack specifics and detail.

Technical Knowledge | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 18

CMS would be Wordpress. Will be ADA compliant. 24x7 support. Agile delivery.

Natalie Guerra: 18

equirements

Chris Patton: 16

Over reliance on Wordpress widgets to meet functional requirements.

Carlos Vazquez: 19

Technical knowledge in on par for what we are looking for

Timothy Williams: 10

- good coverage of pdf accessibility

Andrea Wontor: 13
Long technical knowledge answer with dictionary of terms. Good emphasis on brand standards.
Howard Xi: 16
The examples provided showed no clear advantage of technical knowledge.

Cost Proposal	Points Based	25 Points (25%)
Douglas Baker: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost
Natalie Guerra: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost
Chris Patton: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost
Carlos Vazquez: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost
Timothy Williams: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost
Andrea Wontor: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost
Howard Xi: 12.7
2nd Lowest Cost

Granicus

Firm Experience, Qualifications and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 9

Over 25 years experience. SAAS solution built for govt. 98% customer retention rate. Other local govt customers: City or Orlando/ Osceola County/ Hartford, CT/ San Antonio TX/ Denver, CO/ 6500+ govt customers

Natalie Guerra: 9

Met Requirements

Chris Patton: 10

All elements of "Firm Experience, Qualifications, and References" are present.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

Company has vast years of experience specially in the public sector.

Timothy Williams: 8

- has actual gov't references

Andrea Wontor: 9

Only missed number of currently active projects, broken down by state and jurisdiction.

Howard Xi: 10

Lots of experience with government sites and similar government entities.

Personnel and Dedicated Staffing | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 19

Staff are experienced in performing this type of projects.

Natalie Guerra: 17

Did not see projected time in this section

Chris Patton: 17

Missing information includes projected amount of time all personnel will dedicate to the project.

Carlos Vazquez: 20

Detailed description of personnel and clear information about project timeline.

Timothy Williams: 13

- have the expertise, but uncertain if it will be properly leveraged to support our organization with the current proposal

Andrea Wontor: 13

Missing projected amount of time all personnel will dedicate. Soft statement on remote connectivity. Readability of sections a plus though.

Howard Xi: 15

The amount of time dedicated to the project seems low.

Project Management Approach and Execution | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 24

Tentative 9-12 month implementation. Thorough details of the project plan.

Natalie Guerra: 20

more details

Chris Patton: 22

Lacking detail on project timeline

Carlos Vazquez: 24

Excellent Project Management approach

Timothy Williams: 15

- not to enthused about utilizing a cloud based system

Andrea Wontor: 19

Detailed on needs from Seminole County and understanding of leadership team meetings etc. for good communication. Soft response on timeline. Strong executive summary.

Howard Xi: 22

The process seems drawn out.

Technical Knowledge | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 10

Granicus built-for-government CMS, Will be ADA compliant. Unknown if this is relevant but it does not integrate with Elavon CC payments. Hosted in Microsoft Azure Government. 24/7/365 telephone support for Severity 1. Granicus provides a 99.9% uptime guarantee. CAN NOT --Meet CMS – Infographic Builder requirement. --CMS does not currently offer individual help text for each field --Direct access to the site databases and source code is restricted for site administrators --direct retrieval of DB backups by administrators is not a standard feature --CMS does not provide native geocoding of addresses --only certain file types are allowed. Attachment C discusses 3rd party integrations including iframes. Pg 43 says What's not in scope? • Anything within an iframe or embedded HTML content

Natalie Guerra: 18

met requirements

Chris Patton: 20

Great response to the scope. Extremely detailed.

Carlos Vazquez: 20

Proven company with lots of experience years

Timothy Williams: 15

- well versed staff knowledge needed to bridge the gap with regards to integration

Andrea Wontor: 16

Understands need for ease of content updates, architecture, mobile friendly, mention of dashboards and branding

Howard Xi: 19

Lots of experience with similar institutions.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)
Douglas Baker: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost
Natalie Guerra: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost
Chris Patton: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost
Carlos Vazquez: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost
Timothy Williams: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost
Andrea Wontor: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost
Howard Xi: 5.4
5th Lowest Cost

nub 8

Firm Experience, Qualifications and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 5

Founded in 2018. 30 employees, only 1 local govt customer,

Natalie Guerra: 8

1 government entity

Chris Patton: 6

Location information missing. Some case studies submitted are not government-type clients, or similar size to RFP project.

Carlos Vazquez: 6

Lack of business experience

Timothy Williams: 2

- poor experience

Andrea Wontor: 5

Equivalent experience is severely lacking, with nothing similar to county government.

Howard Xi: 6

Relatively lack of experience working with US governmental entities.

Personnel and Dedicated Staffing | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 15

Most of the team is new to this company.

Natalie Guerra: 18

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 12

Communication plan is severely lacking detail. Resumes don't list names.

Carlos Vazquez: 12

Lack of experience

Timothy Williams: 5

- inadequate local support/staffing

Andrea Wontor: 9

No names given in bios? Weird. Soft answer on communication and projected time.

Howard Xi: 17

Fair, nothing really stands out.

Project Management Approach and Execution | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 20

Agile approach with Sprints. Total estimated project duration of 7 months for the Website Redesign (phase 1) and CMS Implementation (phase 2), and 5 months of ongoing support (phase 3) in year one.

Natalie Guerra: 23

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 15

Timeline is confusing. Overlapping phases in the timeline seems less than ideal. For example, the visual design and branding is ongoing when the sprint to complete BCC pages begins.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

Average Project Management approach

Timothy Williams: 5

- not confident that they will be able to support this projects needs

Andrea Wontor: 13

Scrum methodology? Full timeline given, answer on expectations from Seminole County staff. Communication between two entities?

Howard Xi: 22

Relatively quicker timeframe.

Technical Knowledge | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 16

AWS. Uses WordPress and Elementor,. Will be ADA compliant.

Natalie Guerra: 18

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 15

Technical knowledge is evident. Many solutions appear to relay on third-party WordPress widgets but there is no description of how these are to be maintained.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

Responses didn't have enough details.

Timothy Williams: 3

-poor technology to support the organizational needs

Andrea Wontor: 10

General response

Howard Xi: 15

Limited hours and years of support. Locked into AWS architecture. Lacked clarity on emergency requests.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

Natalie Guerra: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

Chris Patton: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

Carlos Vazquez: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

Timothy Williams: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

Andrea Wontor: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

Howard Xi: 10.6

4th Lowest Cost

SGS Technologie

Firm Experience, Qualifications and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 10

21 years experience . FL govt customers include: Brevard County, Collier County Metropolitan Planning Organization, Jacksonville Electric Authority, Florida Housing Finance Corporation, Marion County TPO, the City of Miami, CSC Broward County, Florida Office of Attorney General, Northwest Florida Water Management District, City of Laredo - Planning & Zoning Department, Laredo & Webb County MPO,

Natalie Guerra: 9

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 10

All items are accounted for in firm experience, qualifications, and references.

Carlos Vazquez: 10

Company has a vast amount of experience specially in government sites.

Timothy Williams: 10

- other gov't references

Andrea Wontor: 9

Solid answers and case study experience, actually worked in sizeable local government before, Answered with a note from bank even for financial stability.

Howard Xi: 9

Long histroy with government customers and local. Only lacks county level references.

Personnel and Dedicated Staffing | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 18

Staff are experienced in performing this type of projects.

Natalie Guerra: 18

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 18

Information provided in the resumes was top of class. A full-time team was also top of class. Preferred to see more emphasis on the firm's staff plan to communicate and engage throughout the project.

Carlos Vazquez: 19

Company provided the necessary information about personnel and project timeline

Timothy Williams: 19

- good staffing

Andrea Wontor: 13

Good bios and actually showed their roles on past projects but missed mention on communication with Seminole County?

Howard Xi: 19

Team dedicated full time.

Project Management Approach and Execution	Points Based	25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 23

8-9 month implementation,

Natalie Guerra: 25

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 23

The project timeline was well detailed; however, a missing key detail was the number of staff needed to complete each phase of the project.

Carlos Vazquez: 24

Responses have the information requested

Timothy Williams: 23

- detailed timeline

Andrea Wontor: 15

Descriptive timeline and executive summary. Some mention of Seminole County staff needs.

Howard Xi: 22

Some review and approval timeline may need to be adjusted.

Technical Knowledge | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 18

Sitefinity CMS on AWS. Using AWS, SGS can guarantee an uptime of 99.9%Answered Yes o all tech questions. Will be ADA compliant.

Natalie Guerra: 19

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 20

Technical knowledge was thorough, and solutions were detailed for each item in the scope of services.

Carlos Vazquez: 20

Company has the technical knowledge required

Timothy Williams: 19

- reasonably can met most of our requirements

Andrea Wontor: 9

Very general technical knowledge displayed or effort invested into this segment

Howard Xi: 20

Looks good.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)
Douglas Baker: 11
3rd Lowest Cost
Natalie Guerra: 11
3rd Lowest Cost
Chris Patton: 11
3rd Lowest Cost
Carlos Vazquez: 11
3rd Lowest Cost
Timothy Williams: 11
3rd Lowest Cost
Andrea Wontor: 11
3rd Lowest Cost
Howard Xi: 11
3rd Lowest Cost

Solodev

Firm Experience, Qualifications and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 8

20+ full-time employees, with approximately 10+ full-time contractors, Miami Beach Visitor and Convention Authority (VCA), Florida Department of Education, Volusia County, Central Florida Regional Transit Authority (LYNX), Seminole County Public Schools,

Natalie Guerra: 9

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 7

Answered questions regarding company size, customer base, and relevant experience were general without specific details. References were excellent.

Carlos Vazquez: 8

Company has experience with other local government

Timothy Williams: 8

- ideal references

Andrea Wontor: 8

Accurately provided information on firm experience and origin story; community impact highlighted well

Howard Xi: 8

Lots of experience with county level governmental sites. Some clear simple mistakes on the submitted file.

Personnel and Dedicated Staffing | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 16

Staff are experienced in performing this type of projects.

Natalie Guerra: 18

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 12

Resumes were lacking detail. Provided org chart for the proposed team was confusing. I'm unsure who or what is PSTA in the org chart. I did not see a projected amount time each team member would dedicate to the project.

Carlos Vazquez: 16

Company seems well established

Timothy Williams: 4

- poor support

Andrea Wontor: 15

All bios on staff listed out, with organizational chart and plans for communication

Howard Xi: 17

Did not specify if the team is working on this project full-time or part-time.

Project Management Approach and Execution | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 20

8-9 month to implement. Provided high level information of the project implementation. Could have gone into greater detail.

Natalie Guerra: 25

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 18

Project timeline is far too aggressive. The beta website is delivered in week 30 and by week 33 the project is over. Major reservations about the time given to client review cycles.

Carlos Vazquez: 18

Project timeline was clear.

Timothy Williams: 8

- lot of coverage details omitted from rfp

Andrea Wontor: 14

Solid timeline with expanded case study highlighting overcoming challenges. Emphasis on design mentioned -- but if so, how did we get the website we have now?? No mention of needs from Seminole County

Howard Xi: 24

Relatively shorter timeframe, given their familarity with our current site.

Technical Knowledge	Points Based	20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 12

Will be ADA compliant. Solodev CMS on AWS, Support 24x7. Several Items require customization: Email functionality - Seamless Email Integration Email functionality - SMS Search Engine Optimization (SEO) – Sitemap Search Engine Optimization (SEO) – Image Optimization Search Engine Optimization (SEO) – Structured Data/Content Site Search – Cross-platform Search Capabilities Administrative Controls and Interface – Data Visualization: Internal Dashboard Administrative Controls and Interface – Native Reporting Tools Administrative Controls and Interface – Database Access (REST API Integration) Forms – Payments Digital Asset & Media Management – Embed Livestream Training – Google Analytics Training – Content Editing Best Practices CMS – Cross-platform publishing Forms – Surveys (third party)

Natalie Guerra: 19

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 15

Responses to the scope often lacked details. Is "custom setup required" a yes or no?

Carlos Vazquez: 15

Lots of Custom add on

Timothy Williams: 8

- some CMS integration requirement not met

Andrea Wontor: 10

General information and response

Howard Xi: 19

Should be very familiar with our current site and what needs to be done.

Cost Proposal	Points Based	25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 3.8

Highest Cost

Natalie Guerra: 3.8

Highest Cost

Chris Patton: 3.8

Highest Cost

Carlos Vazquez: 3.8

Highest Cost

Timothy Williams: 3.8

Highest Cost

Andrea Wontor: 3.8

Highest Cost

Howard Xi: 3.8

Highest Cost

Technology International, Inc.

Firm Experience, Qualifications and References | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Douglas Baker: 9

In business for 32 years, 1200+ projects completed, 300+ public sector clients, City of Pembroke Pines, FL

Natalie Guerra: 8

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 7

Business organization information is listed. Case studies are not similar size projects or government entities.

Carlos Vazquez: 7

Company has government sites experience

Timothy Williams: 10

- Good Experience - great client list

Andrea Wontor: 5

Basics were answered but references were not of equivalent size and complexity, nor determined to be from within last 5 years. Total number of customers to date and open projects were not broken down

Howard Xi: 6

Did not give example of governmental sites in case study. The examples given were relatively simple in complexity.

Personnel and Dedicated Staffing | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 20

Communication and correspondence will be in person as HQ is in Lake Mary. Staff are experienced in performing this type of projects.

Natalie Guerra: 18

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 14

Resumes are missing beyond two team members.

Carlos Vazquez: 14
Would've love for company to provide more staff bios and profiles that could potentially be assigned to the project

Timothy Williams: 19
- staff credentials are good w8ith current technologies covered

Andrea Wontor: 9
Two bios given only as full time employees; advised work would be in person as local, but did not specify amount of time

Howard Xi: 15
Did not include all personnel bio, nor their time dedicated to the project.

Project Management Approach and Execution	Points Based	25 Points (25%)
Douglas Baker: 23
TII follows the agile methodology of 'Scrum' to create the new website.7 month implementation. Sound methodology.

Natalie Guerra: 25
meet requirements

Chris Patton: 19
Overlapping phases creates concern for client review cycles. Timeline is extremely aggressive.

Carlos Vazquez: 22
Project approach seems to be within our scope

Timothy Williams: 22
- great; although an aggressive timeline

Andrea Wontor: 11
Mention of needs from staff, strong timeline response. Executive summary is soft.

Howard Xi: 22
Fast timeline.

Technical Knowledge | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Douglas Baker: 10

Uses WordPress as the CMS, 24 hour access to online support portal, ADA compliant, 99.9% Uptime Did not provide direct answers to Attachment B – Functional Requirements and Attachment C - Third-Party Integrations. Page 31 does address Attachment C but not real details.

Natalie Guerra: 19

meet requirements

Chris Patton: 17

Scope is well detailed.

Carlos Vazquez: 15

Scope responses were general in terms

Timothy Williams: 20

- WP will be a great tool to manage our needs

Andrea Wontor: 8

Little to no mention of design of website, understanding of architecture, readability etc.

Howard Xi: 11

Lacked clear repsonse to scope or functonal requirements.

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Douglas Baker: 25

Lowest Cost

Natalie Guerra: 25

Lowest Cost

Chris Patton: 25

Lowest Cost

Carlos Vazquez: 25
Lowest Cost

Timothy Williams: 25
Lowest Cost

Andrea Wontor: 25
Lowest Cost

Howard Xi: 25
Lowest Cost