

Consultants Input

| | Complete RFP Response | Potential for hidden charges | Pricing provided in requested format | Legal Considerations | Customer base similar to Dallas County |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Supplier 1 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Supplier 2 | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Supplier 3 | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Supplier 4 | ✓ | | | | ✓ |
| Supplier 5 | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ |

Based on a review and evaluation of the responses submitted to the Dallas County RFP 2002-011-1007 for Information Technology Outsourcing Services we provide the following point of consideration:

- Supplier 1 has provided a response that was found to be incomplete, that indicated possible hidden charges throughout the potential relationship, pricing that was not related to any documented levels of service, and a proposed approach to due diligence that lead us to conclude that the proposed services are not indicative of an experienced and sophisticated outsourcer. The preliminary RFP evaluation scoring indicated the largest gap exists between this Bidder and all others.
- Supplier 2 has provided a complete and robust response that identified their expertise and experience in providing global network services for other customers, however their response indicated a lack of experience for all other in-scope services, and led the evaluator to speculate that Dallas County might be the first customer in a new local government market segment for the stated scope of services. The proposed charges for due diligence lead us to conclude that the proposed services are not indicative of an experienced outsourcer.
- Supplier 3 has provided the strongest and most relevant documentation concerning their established customer base. The customer base and references indicate relationships that are similar in scope to the services described in the RFP (2002-011-1007) by Public sector customers similar to Dallas County. It appears that this Bidder's service offerings are targeted to state, local, and federal customers. The preliminary RFP evaluation has identified this Bidder as receiving the most points.
- Supplier 4 has provided a response that, while complete and comprehensive, may be difficult to reach agreement on. The structure of the response and the content appeared to indicate the County would need to conform to the service offering rather than the service offering conforming to the County's unique needs. The preliminary RFP evaluation has indicated that this Bidder's score is relatively close to Supplier 3 and Supplier 5.

- Supplier 5 has provided a complete response to the RFP that addresses several different delivery models and associated pricing, all of which address the stated requirements. In addition, Supplier 5 has taken the opportunity to identify additional services that may be of interest to the County in general. The preliminary RFP evaluation has indicated that this Bidder's score is relatively close to Supplier 3 and Supplier 4.