



Seminole County  
Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts  
Stephen Koontz, Purchasing and Contracts Manager  
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

---

**EVALUATION TABULATION**

RFP-604828-24/MHH

Risk Management Information System

RESPONSE DEADLINE: July 31, 2024, at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Wednesday, July 31, 2024

Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Response 5
American Technical Services, Inc. 2134 Palm Harbor Blvd, Suite A Palm Harbor, FL 34683 Craig Zivolich <a href="mailto:sales@atsrmis.com">sales@atsrmis.com</a> Phone: (727) 431-0135	EPIC Engineering & Consulting Group, LLC 1049 Willa Springs Drive, Suite 1001 Winter Springs, FL 32708 Prasad Chittaluru <a href="mailto:sales@epicgroupllc.com">sales@epicgroupllc.com</a>	Klear.ai* 5252 Orange Ave, Suite 208 Cypress, CA 90630	Origami Risk LLC 222 N LaSalle St, Suite 2100 Chicago, IL 60601 Michael Fix <a href="mailto:mfix@origamirisk.com">mfix@origamirisk.com</a>	Riskconnect, Inc. 380 Interstate North Parkway SE, Suite 400 Atlanta, GA 30339 Federico Decia <a href="mailto:rfp@riskconnect.com">rfp@riskconnect.com</a>

**\*Non-responsive: Failed to comply with Section 3.12 "Licenses".**

Tabulated by Michael Hall, Senior Procurement Analyst on Wednesday, July 31, 2024, at 2:00 pm.

Recommendation/Intent to Award: Origami Risk LLC

Tentative BCC Meeting: 06/10/2025

Committee Member	Title	Signature
Alicia Castillo	Risk Management Claims Manager	<i>Alicia Castillo</i>
Amy Jinright	Assistant Fire Chief	<i>Amy Jinright</i> Amy Jinright (Dec 9, 2024 06:51 EST)
Makwinder Kaur-McNeil	Project Manager II - IT	<i>M. K</i> Makwinder Kaur-McNeil (Dec 9, 2024 07:55 EST)
Raymond Kelly	Project Manager II - Fleet	<i>Raymond Kelly</i>
David Stough	Senior Team Leader – Roads/Stormwater	<i>DS</i> David Stough (Dec 9, 2024 07:59 EST)
William Telkamp	Risk Management Manager	<i>Bill Telkamp</i> Bill Telkamp (Dec 10, 2024 11:47 EST)



Seminole County  
Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts  
Stephen Koontz, Purchasing and Contracts Manager  
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

---

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP-604828-24/MHH  
Risk Management Information System  
RESPONSE DEADLINE: July 31, 2024 at 2:00 pm  
Report Generated: Wednesday, December 4, 2024

PHASE 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Organization	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Experience: Assess the vendor's RMIS industry experience, track record, and reputation in delivering similar solutions to similar organizations (municipal/county governments).

Knowledge and Expertise: Ensure the vendor has in-depth knowledge of RMIS-specific regulations, challenges, and operational needs.

Alignment: Determine whether the vendor's solution and overall business approach align with your organization's long-term strategic goals and values.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Incident, Claims and Litigation Management	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Incident Management: How effectively does the system handle incident management and escalation procedures?

Claims Management: Do the capabilities for managing claims align with Seminole County's needs?

Litigation Management: Does the system offer comprehensive tools for managing all aspects of litigation cases, including documentation, timelines, and associated tasks.

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP-604828-24/MHH  
Risk Management Information System

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Automation and Workflow Management	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Automation Features: How well does the system automate routine processes such as notifications, approvals, and reminders?

Workflow Customization: Can workflows be easily configured to meet the unique needs of different departments within Seminole County?

Paperless Transition: How effectively does the system support a transition from paper-based processes to fully digital workflows?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Safety	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Safety Audits: Does the system facilitate scheduling, conducting, and tracking of safety audits and inspections.

Training and Certification: Does the system provide tools for managing employee safety training, certifications, and renewals.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Reporting	Points Based	15 (15% of Total)

Description:

Real-Time Reporting: Does the system offer advanced reporting tools for real-time monitoring of incidents, cost tracking, and trend analysis?

Customizability of Reports: Are reports customizable to meet specific departmental or organizational needs?

Dashboards: Does the dashboard offer customizable views that present data clearly through intuitive visualizations that allow users to quickly interpret information. How easy is it to change or customize dashboard views to individual preference?

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP-604828-24/MHH  
Risk Management Information System

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
System Usability	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Ease of Use: How intuitive and user-friendly is the system for different user levels (novices to experts)?

Mobile Accessibility: How well does the system support access and functionality via mobile devices or remote locations?

Interface Design: Is the interface clean, organized, and easy to navigate? Are the workflows logical and simple?

Customization: Can the system be easily customized to meet Seminole County's unique needs now and in the future?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Implementation, Training and Support	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)

Description:

Implementation Plan: Does the vendor's plan present a clear, detailed, and realistic implementation plan. Is it customizable/flexible?

Training Resources: What level of training and onboarding does the vendor provide for new users?

Ongoing Support: How robust is the vendor's customer support, including response times, availability, and issue resolution?

Documentation and Help: Are there detailed help guides, tutorials, or user manuals available?

### AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Alicia Castillo	Amy Jinright	Makwinder Kaur-McNeil	Raymond Kelly	David Stough	William Telkamp	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Origami Risk	100 (1)	91 (1)	93 (1)	85 (1)	90 (1)	100 (1)	<b>93.17</b>	<b>1</b>
Riskconnect, Inc.	98 (2)	72 (2)	84 (2)	77 (2)	77 (2)	88 (2)	<b>82.67</b>	<b>2</b>
EPIC	7 (3)	8 (3)	52 (3)	68 (3)	59 (3)	37 (3)	<b>38.5</b>	<b>3</b>

### VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Organization Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Incident, Claims and Litigation Management Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Automation and Workflow Management Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Safety Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Reporting Points Based 15 Points (15%)	System Usability Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Implementation, Training and Support Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Origami Risk	9.2	23.5	9.2	9.3	13.8	9.3	18.8	<b>93.17</b>
Riskconnect, Inc.	8.2	21	8	8.3	12	7.7	17.5	<b>82.67</b>
EPIC	2.8	9.5	4.2	4.3	6	4.5	7.2	<b>38.5</b>

## INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

EPIC	
Organization   Points Based   10 Points (10%)	
Alicia Castillo: 0	Lacks RMIS industry experience and understanding. Does not meet criteria.
Amy Jinright: 1	They did not seem to have any experience with RMIS
Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 4	System is more general and customization but not a industry established RMIS system. There is no expertise in RMIS within the organization.
Raymond Kelly: 5	Vendor is new to this area and is looking to expand
David Stough: 5	Epic was my 1st choice before the demonstrations. After which i believe Origami would be the best vendor to suite our needs and service the RMIS system
William Telkamp: 2	Little to no experience in risk management information systems.
Incident, Claims and Litigation Management   Points Based   25 Points (25%)	
Alicia Castillo: 2	EPIC does not have a RMIS system, their demonstration was on the fly. They would not be able to handle the complexity of RMIS. Does not meet criteria.
Amy Jinright: 2	They did not seem to have experience with this

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 12

While screen were shown in the demo, the proposal was misleading.

Raymond Kelly: 16

The system would meet the needs of Seminole County

David Stough: 15

While I believe Epic would provide a functional system to suite our needs, Origami's has an established program with many users and a track record of success in the RMIS field.

William Telkamp: 10

It appears the product could be configured for claims management and litigation management, but it seems more a backend looking for a frontend to configure.

#### Automation and Workflow Management | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 2

Configurable. Does not meet criteria.

Amy Jinright: 1

Did not seem user friendly

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 6

The RMIS automation does not exist for any processes shown in the demo.

Raymond Kelly: 6

System is customizable for a fee

David Stough: 5

This vendor's workflow appears to be built specifically for the demonstration.

William Telkamp: 5

Appears to be capable of being configured for RMIS-type automation and workflow but currently is not a robust RMIS product.



**Safety | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 0

Does not meet criteria.

Amy Jinright: 1

Did not seem to have much experience with this

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 8

There were so nice features presented and there is FAA feature in place now.

Raymond Kelly: 7

There is a scheduling system that pulls in information but limited out to other systems

David Stough: 5

With no existing RMIS customers, they would growing their knowledge of our RMIS system with us. I feel that taking on a vendor like Origami that has an existing platform would be in the best interest of the County.

William Telkamp: 5

Likely could be configured to meet our safety needs, based on presentation of airport safety features.

**Reporting | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Alicia Castillo: 2

Customizable however, Does not meet criteria.

Amy Jinright: 1

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 7

reports can be built in the future but not currently present.

Raymond Kelly: 11

System offers customization and reports

David Stough: 10

Their system appears to have fine reporting capabilities. I believe we're looking for an established system that will help our Risk department get better. Epic's system would be built to our specific needs, not allowing us to grow into a better system.

William Telkamp: 5

Customizable, but it is unclear how robust it would be for RMIS-type reporting features out of the box.

#### System Usability | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 1

Mobile Access, customizable however, does not meet criteria.

Amy Jinright: 2

Was not end user friendly

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 5

while system highly customizable, it is not currently in use as a RMIS solution.

Raymond Kelly: 8

It was fairly easy to follow the demonstration on use

David Stough: 6

Again, the Epic RMIS system appears to have been built for the demonstration. The County would be better suited to partner with a more established program that will help our Risk Department grow into a better department.

William Telkamp: 5

Likely customizable but without robust RMIS features to demonstrate, it is unclear how easy to use the product would be once fully designed as a RMIS.

#### Implementation, Training and Support | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Alicia Castillo: 0

Does not meet criteria.

Amy Jinright: 0

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 10

The system would need to be built for implementation.

Raymond Kelly: 15

The vendor has a plan for implementation but still needs to be fully developed

David Stough: 13

Epic is local, this is always a plus. But Origami showed in the demonstrations that their established system would suit the County's needs better.

William Telkamp: 5

Vendor offered to bring in a RMIS subject matter expert during implementation at no extra cost, but this demonstrates how unprepared the product currently is to function as a robust RMIS.

### Origami Risk

#### Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 10

Vast experience and knowledge of RMIS; developed in-house; 10+ yrs in the industry; over 200 gov't entities as clients.

Amy Jinright: 9

Seemed to have great experience with RMIS

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

10+ years in the business for RMIS, EHS, and GRC, developed in house. 15% profits go into R&D investments. 99% customer retention and have 180+ won from direct competitors.

Raymond Kelly: 8

The company demonstrated experience among the industry

David Stough: 9

Based on the demonstration provided by Origami, I believe this vendor would be the best pick for the County's RMIS system.

William Telkamp: 10

An industry leader with clients similar to Seminole County in size and product use.

#### Incident, Claims and Litigation Management | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Alicia Castillo: 25

Ability to access mobile app; configurable; ability to customize dashboard; dashboard easily downloadable to run reports

Amy Jinright: 23

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 24

incident - body part map; easy to send to TPA, mail merge, standard forms. tasks, review - setup assign to user, notification, notes, diaries. easy to convert claim to litigation (related fields) - tie to ODG risk score; OSHA

Raymond Kelly: 21

The procedures seem to flow easily and align with the needs of Seminole County

David Stough: 23

The capabilities of this system align with Seminole County's needs.

William Telkamp: 25

Product can do everything we specified, and more. Very flexible configuration options. The screens presented seemed the most intuitive and least cluttered of the three vendor products demonstrated.

#### Automation and Workflow Management | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 10

workflows available; upload files received via Outlook; receive alerts as "banner"; templates available;

Amy Jinright: 9

Workflow looked easy to follow

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

forms have options to build specific fields that's specific to the business. autofill employee info.

Raymond Kelly: 8

Notifications were customizable as needed and workflow can be developed to meet needs

David Stough: 9

The workflow of this system seemed to be the easiest to maneuver of the 3 systems we reviewed.

William Telkamp: 10

Robust automation features and workflow customization. Meets all of our needs. Seems the most user-friendly of the three vendor products.

#### Safety | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 10

Configurable for certificates, checklists available; upload work orders, photo, maintenance logs

Amy Jinright: 9

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

risk and safety leader.

Raymond Kelly: 9

System is capable of scheduling and works with the email Seminole County currently uses

David Stough: 9

The tools shown for training shown in the demonstration appeared to be the better of the 3 we reviewed.

William Telkamp: 10

Meets all of our safety requirements.

**Reporting | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Alicia Castillo: 15

Customizable for reports and dashboards

Amy Jinright: 13

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 14

personalized dashboard, any data point can be pushed to dashboard, multiple dashboards. can export data to pdf. and run reports specific time or ad-hoc

Raymond Kelly: 13

Vendor demonstrated a customized report for a client's needs and can be adjusted as needed

David Stough: 13

The dashboards and reporting capabilities shown in the demonstration appeared to be the better of the 3 we reviewed.

William Telkamp: 15

Dashboards customizable and intuitive. Robust real-time reporting. Screens seemed the least cluttered.

**System Usability | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 10

User-friendly; easy to navigate; mobile accessibility; easily customizable.

Amy Jinright: 10

The areas for field users to submit incident reports were very user friendly and easy to follow

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

easy to navigate, can export data to pdf. mobile interface to submit incidents and mobile accessibility.

Raymond Kelly: 8

As a new user watching the demonstration the system seemed very intuitive.

David Stough: 9

This vendor demonstrated that their system would be the most user friendly of the 3 we reviewed.

William Telkamp: 10

Seemed the most intuitive and user-friendly of the three products demonstrated. Easily customized to our needs. Great mobile access.

#### Implementation, Training and Support | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Alicia Castillo: 20

Vendor provided clear plan; skilled product experts

Amy Jinright: 18

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 19

Direct training - implementation and post, help center, learning center, service case management portal; account manager/professional services/ client success - support post implementation. industry knowledge team members. user conference (18 month) and focus group meeting monthly

Raymond Kelly: 18

The vendor has a well laid out plan for roll out and support

David Stough: 18

This vendors plan was clear and detailed.

William Telkamp: 20

Implementation, training, and ongoing support plan and tools are well-honed, detailed, and realistic.

### Riskconnect, Inc.

#### Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 10

Market leader; significant expertise; comprehensive solutions and aligned to meet our needs.

Amy Jinright: 7

Seemed to have sufficient experience with RMIS

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

2400 customers over 45 countries, 1100 risk professionals, strong processes, customer focus, built on salesforce.com - one of largest - largest CRM, power and innovation, - easy to use, ease of administration, lower total cost of ownership 97% retention rate, 70% customers expanded business with riskconnect 50% employees customer facing

Raymond Kelly: 6

Vendor has existing clients but would not share much information

David Stough: 7

Riskconnect came in 2nd from the demonstrations. Their system would work fine for the County, Origami seemed to offer a more in depth and user friendly system

William Telkamp: 10

An industry leader with clients similar to Seminole County in size and product use.

#### Incident, Claims and Litigation Management | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Alicia Castillo: 25

Ability to handle and align with our needs. Dashboard customizable.

Amy Jinright: 20

N/A



Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 22

central rmis - dashboard tailor to user/security, reports, tasks (by views0, build out workflows and approvals - financials, ability to chat, update within the chatter feature.

Raymond Kelly: 19

System offers procedures to process claims with customization

David Stough: 20

The capabilities of this services would work fine for Seminole County's needs.

William Telkamp: 20

Product can do everything we specified, and more. Very flexible configuration options.

#### Automation and Workflow Management | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 10

Ability to set up email workflow to assign a task; streamline operations.

Amy Jinright: 7

Workflow seemed average and fairly easy to follow

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

action items with notifications. drill down into financials - summarize, coplit

Raymond Kelly: 7

System can be customized

David Stough: 7

This vendor's workflow would work fine to suite our needs.

William Telkamp: 8

Robust automation features and workflow customization. Meets all of our needs.

**Safety | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 10

Investigation checklist; questionnaire templates; generate corrective actions.

Amy Jinright: 7

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 8

health and safety - separate module - dashboard osha forms, track and manage safety

Raymond Kelly: 8

Audits can be customized and adjusted to needs

David Stough: 7

This system offers an acceptable level of training options.

William Telkamp: 10

Meets all of our safety requirements.

**Reporting | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Alicia Castillo: 14

customizable.

Amy Jinright: 9

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 13

dashboard - report incident, contract review request, report request, property update request, bond request, osha log request, other. Misc request, check request status, outbound certificate request, subpoena request, safety data sheet

Raymond Kelly: 12

Reports can be created, and dashboards can be customized

David Stough: 12

The reporting capabilities of this system would work fine for our needs.

William Telkamp: 12

Dashboards customizable and intuitive. Robust real-time reporting.

#### System Usability | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 10

User-friendly; Customizable; Ability to pull data from external sources

Amy Jinright: 7

Seemed user friendly for the end user

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 6

User interface is styled to be dated in a format of a database.

Raymond Kelly: 8

System looked like it was easy to navigate

David Stough: 7

The usability of this system with their mobile accessibility would work fine for our needs. Origami's system appears to fit better in my opinion.

William Telkamp: 8

Easily customized to our needs. Great mobile access.

#### Implementation, Training and Support | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Alicia Castillo: 19

There may be items not included in the scope of work.

Amy Jinright: 15

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 17

ongoing training - both virtual - training library - knowledge videos, training upfront on the system, team - support team - account executive (business), success manager - day to day - customer success, bring technical team build interactive 6-8 month process, building function, testing, deploying, upfront define priorities

Raymond Kelly: 17

The vendor demonstrated a detailed plan for implementation and training

David Stough: 17

This vendor offered suitable amount of training and support.

William Telkamp: 20

Implementation, training, and ongoing support plan and tools are well-honed, detailed, and realistic.

## PHASE 1

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Qualifications and Experience	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Functionality	Points Based	40 (40% of Total)

Description: N/A.

EVALUATION TABULATION  
RFP-604828-24/MHH  
Risk Management Information System

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Technical Requirements	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description: N/A.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Approach	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description: N/A.

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

Description: N/A.

### AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Alicia Castillo	Amy Jinright	Makwinder Kaur-McNeil	Raymond Kelly	David Stough	William Telkamp	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
EPIC	89 (1)	89 (1)	88 (1)	94 (1)	89 (1)	83 (3)	<b>88.67</b>	<b>1.33</b>
Origami Risk	88.5 (2)	80.5 (4)	75.5 (3)	88.5 (3)	43.5 (3)	88.5 (2)	<b>77.46</b>	<b>2.83</b>
Riskconnect, Inc.	80.2 (3)	82.2 (3)	68.2 (4)	91.2 (2)	40.2 (4)	89.2 (1)	<b>75.17</b>	<b>2.83</b>
American Technical Services, Inc.	52.4 (4)	82.4 (2)	78.4 (2)	85.4 (4)	68.4 (2)	68.4 (4)	<b>72.59</b>	<b>3</b>

### VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Qualifications and Experience Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Functionality Points Based 40 Points (40%)	Technical Requirements Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Project Approach Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Cost Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
EPIC	17.5	33.7	8.5	9	20	<b>88.67</b>
Origami Risk	17.5	34.7	8.5	8.3	8.5	<b>77.46</b>
Riskconnect, Inc.	15.8	32.8	8	7.3	11.2	<b>75.17</b>
American Technical Services, Inc.	14.2	31.5	6.8	7.7	12.4	<b>72.59</b>

## INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

American Technical Services, Inc.	
Qualifications and Experience   Points Based   20 Points (20%)	
Alicia Castillo: 5	
Weaknesses: Information not provided in the RFP. Lacks Risk Management and Insurance industry knowledge.	
Amy Jinright: 18	
N/A	
Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 18	
years of experience in business	
Raymond Kelly: 20	
The company has been doing business for a long time and retains clients.	
David Stough: 14	
ATS appears to be qualified to supply the County with our RMIS needs.	
William Telkamp: 10	
Response is not clear on firm's experience and qualifications.	
Functionality   Points Based   40 Points (40%)	
Alicia Castillo: 25	
Weaknesses: lacks Risk Management and Insurance industry knowledge.	
Amy Jinright: 35	
N/A	
Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 34	
additional cost of api and other general functionality	

Raymond Kelly: 35

A handful of functions requested will be required to be done through a 3rd party and some items will need to be customized to work as desired.

David Stough: 30

The proposed system appears to provide the County with the flexibility, ease of use and data tracking we're looking for.

William Telkamp: 30

No built-in training tracking or safety meeting support tools. Litigation Management description section is blank.

#### Technical Requirements | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 5

Strengths: Most meets requirements - standard functionality Weaknesses: a number of requirements , Vendor Customization at an Additional cost.

Amy Jinright: 9

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 5

missing answers to security section and others

Raymond Kelly: 8

Requires many items to be customized to meet our needs with the addition of programs from 3rd parties.

David Stough: 6

Although all items were not bid on, it appears that all needs would be met with the proposed system.

William Telkamp: 8

Only partially met the search across all modules question.



**Project Approach | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 5

Weaknesses: does not identify ATS team assigned to the project.

Amy Jinright: 8

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

Project plan with timeline

Raymond Kelly: 10

The submitted plan will provide the needed training for transition.

David Stough: 6

The proposed approach appears to be sufficient to our needs.

William Telkamp: 8

Confusing project plan. Schedule speaks to Stages while detailed information speaks to Phases.

**Cost | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)**

Alicia Castillo: 12.4

2nd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Amy Jinright: 12.4

2nd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 12.4

2nd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Raymond Kelly: 12.4

2nd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

David Stough: 12.4

2nd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

William Telkamp: 12.4

2nd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

## EPIC

### Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Alicia Castillo: 18

Strengths: strong technical experience; office locally; based on reference owner is hands on and responsive, excel in customer service.  
Weaknesses: may lack risk management and insurance industry experience.

Amy Jinright: 19

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 15

based on years of business in risk area as mentioned in proposal

Raymond Kelly: 20

They have Mutiple local government municipalities that they currently serve.

David Stough: 18

EPIC appears to be qualified to supply the County with our RMIS needs. Their location and working knowledge with the County makes them my top pick.

William Telkamp: 15

Does not appear to have a RMIS focus. Project references do not appear to be RMIS projects, while some appear to be safety-related.

### Functionality | Points Based | 40 Points (40%)

Alicia Castillo: 35

Strengths: completed a project for environmental services; positive feedback. Weaknesses: may lack risk management and insurance experience however, it should not prevent them from the functionality based on their strong technical experience.

Amy Jinright: 32

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 35

functionality screenshots clear

Raymond Kelly: 35

The standard functionality of the program will require customization to meet our needs.

David Stough: 35

The proposed system would provide the County with the flexibility, ease of use and data tracking we're looking for. As a field supervisor, being able to complete entries using a tablet would make the data entry step on our end much more efficient.

William Telkamp: 30

Highly customized configurations could potentially impact system performance; customization may impact integration with third-party systems or future upgrades, necessitating careful planning and testing.

#### Technical Requirements | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Alicia Castillo: 8

Strengths: "Meets Requirements - Standard Functionality"; "Meets Requirements - Configurable Functionality".

Amy Jinright: 9

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

answered thoroughly explained.

Raymond Kelly: 9

Some of the requested features will need customization beyond the companies' standard offerings

David Stough: 8

All items being bid on ensures me that our technical needs would be met.

William Telkamp: 8

It's unclear they have experience applying their data management product to risk management needs. Ad-hoc reporting requires power-user level skillset on SQL.

**Project Approach | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 8

Strengths: Familiar with Seminole County; strong customer service Weaknesses: may lack risk management and insurance experience however, they have the ability to build the module based on our needs; can change project approach.

Amy Jinright: 9

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 9

timeline clear with goals and objectives to meet deliverables.

Raymond Kelly: 10

The plan provided looks like a good plan.

David Stough: 8

The proposed approach appears to be sufficient to our needs.

William Telkamp: 10

Proposed 18 weeks to go live

**Cost | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)**

Alicia Castillo: 20

Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Amy Jinright: 20

Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 20

Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Raymond Kelly: 20

Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

David Stough: 20

Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

William Telkamp: 20

Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

### Origami Risk

#### Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Alicia Castillo: 20

Strengths: Leading provider of integrated solutions for risk and insurance industry. Industry experts, well-versed in the risk management technology needs.

Amy Jinright: 19

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 18

# of years in RMIS business

Raymond Kelly: 20

There are many reviews and references available which vouch for their experience and qualifications.

David Stough: 8

Origami Rick seems to have the qualifications but, not all items were bid on. Additionally, I question if the rate of growth they are experiencing would hinder their response to our needs.

William Telkamp: 20

Listed references are RMIS users at the county government level. Personnel listed as examples of team members for the project well-experienced.

#### Functionality | Points Based | 40 Points (40%)

Alicia Castillo: 40

Strengths: mobile capabilities fully supported. Elective modules part of comprehensive Origami offering.

Amy Jinright: 36  
N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 33  
based on information submitted in proposal

Raymond Kelly: 40  
The reviews online are very good for the product offered.

David Stough: 19  
The proposed system appears as though it would be functional to our basic needs but I believe other options would be flexible to have more ease of use.

William Telkamp: 40  
Feature-rich functionality.

**Technical Requirements | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 10  
Strengths: Mainly #1 - "Meets Requirements - Standard Functionality"

Amy Jinright: 9  
N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 8  
based on information provided

Raymond Kelly: 10  
The proposal submitted says it will meet all requirements requested.

David Stough: 4  
Its unclear if the technical requirements would be what the County is looking for as all items were not bid on.

William Telkamp: 10  
Seems to meet all the technical requirements.

**Project Approach | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 10

Strengths: system offers a comprehensive library; identified project team with industry experience; outlined the inception process including training

Amy Jinright: 8

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 8

based on information submitted in proposal

Raymond Kelly: 10

The submitted plan is through and well planned.

David Stough: 4

The proposed approach appears to meet our basic needs.

William Telkamp: 10

Project approach easy to follow but may take up to a year or more for complete implementation.

**Cost | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)**

Alicia Castillo: 8.5

Highest Cost over 5 year term.

Amy Jinright: 8.5

Highest Cost over 5 year term.

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 8.5

Highest Cost over 5 year term.

Raymond Kelly: 8.5

Highest Cost over 5 year term.

David Stough: 8.5

Highest Cost over 5 year term.

William Telkamp: 8.5

Highest Cost over 5 year term.

### Riskconnect, Inc.

#### Qualifications and Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Alicia Castillo: 18

Strengths: industry experts; versed in the risk management industry technology needs Weaknesses: Did not provide Similar Project Experience/client references

Amy Jinright: 18

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 15

questions not answered

Raymond Kelly: 20

Reviews from customers and employees rate this company very good.

David Stough: 6

Riskconnect seems to have the qualifications but, not all items were bid on and, no references were provided.

William Telkamp: 18

Does not provide references until selected as a finalist but is a global provider of RMIS services.

#### Functionality | Points Based | 40 Points (40%)

Alicia Castillo: 35

Strengths: Configurable solution based on our needs; single domain enabling all modules to be interconnected.



Amy Jinright: 35  
N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 30  
questions not answered

Raymond Kelly: 40  
Based off information and reviews the program is easy to use with little training required.

David Stough: 17  
The proposed system appears as though it would meet our basic needs.

William Telkamp: 40  
Feature-rich product

**Technical Requirements | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 10  
Meets Requirement - "Standard Functionality"

Amy Jinright: 9  
N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 6  
missing answers to questions

Raymond Kelly: 10  
Based on the information provided this program will meet the required needs.

David Stough: 3  
Its unclear if the technical requirements would be what the County desires as all items were not bid on.

William Telkamp: 10  
Seems to meet all the technical requirements.

**Project Approach | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Alicia Castillo: 6

Weaknesses: Did not identify their team assigned to the project including their qualifications. Vendor operates a global team of support through a portal; may lack customer service support. Vendor would provided an implementation plan upon contract award provided a sample plan instead.

Amy Jinright: 9

N/A

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 6

generic info from template; no timeframe estimate

Raymond Kelly: 10

The plan provided for implementation looks like a simple yet effective plan.

David Stough: 3

The proposed approach appears to meet our basic needs.

William Telkamp: 10

Project approach was clear and easy to follow.

**Cost | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)**

Alicia Castillo: 11.2

3rd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Amy Jinright: 11.2

3rd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Makwinder Kaur-McNeil: 11.2

3rd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

Raymond Kelly: 11.2

3rd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

David Stough: 11.2

3rd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.

William Telkamp: 11.2

3rd Lowest Cost over 5 year term.