

From: John Price
To: kathy_nealy@msn.com
Sent: 11/5/2007 4:12:51 PM
Subject: Fwd: Unisys Letter Dated 10/31/2007

>>> Shannon Brown 11/05/2007 1:07:00 PM >>>
 Commissioner Price,

Bob and I have had a chance to discuss the letter from Unisys on 10/31/2007 disputing the information provided to Commissioners Court for the review of the Desktop Support RFP. Below is a response for each of her points:

On-site support - Unisys was specifically asked in the clarification meeting on Wednesday, October 24 to provide a number of on-site support personnel included in their proposal. The first answer was 10-12, the second answer was 8-10 and then when requested that they stated 8-10. CyberDyne was asked to verify that same information. They provided a list of the number assigned to certain buildings as follows: 1 - Admin, 3 - Records, 1 - Frank Crowley, 2 - Lew Sterrett, 4 - George Allen, 2 - HHS, 1 - Henry Wade, 1 - JJAEP, and 3 - Other/floater plus 3 for asset management, plus 3 for administration. That is the figure used in the comparison. This was an important clarification for the IT staff to understand how each firm planned to deploy their resources. I agree there was no minimum requirement in the RFP, but the purpose of the comparison was to show the differences.

Daily Coverage - The purpose of the comparison was again to show a difference. CyberDyne proposed coverage hours that were above the requirements of the RFP. Unisys had that chance with their proposal, but elected not to do it until they learned of the issue.

Transition Time - The cost impact for extending the ATOS agreement was listed to ensure that Commissioners Court had a full cost accounting of the two proposals. I know when I spoke to Commissioners Mayfield, Dickey, Cantrell, and Judge Foster that I made it clear that was not a cost proposed by Unisys. But that their proposed timeline did make that cost real to the County. We don't believe that Unisys can state that CyberDyne's short timeline is risky - it just doesn't match theirs.

Inventory Management - Again, they were asked in the clarification meeting to state what would happen if the inventory management system did not produce a report that Dallas County trusted - Unisys said Dallas County would have to pay for another inventory. CyberDyne said an additional inventory after the initial one would be their cost. Both vendors indicated their asset management system would be robust enough to not require an annual inventory. The clarification question made it clear that CyberDyne intended to back that up with paying for another inventory if Dallas county wasn't satisfied. Unisys did not.

MWBE Participation - Leffie has provided this information to you.

Cost Comparison - Unisys states that the hourly rate is \$65 - that is not what they stated to Linda when she requested clarification on their letter. They stated that the 3,000 hours would be based on a blended rate of \$85. I have an email from Unisys stating this amount.

Unisys' proposal to include 3,000 hours in the contract for projects in lieu of paying for the \$150,000 for the interface. Dallas County lowered this number to 1,000 based on actual usage in 2007 and used that figure to calculate the estimated cost. Using Unisys' 3,000 hours, and stated blended rate of \$85, the additional annual cost is \$255,000 for each year of the contract. At that level, Unisys is much higher than CyberDyne, even without counting the additional ATOS contract time.

Commissioner, I did speak to Kate Connolly on Wednesday morning, October 31, 2007 at about 11 am. I made it clear to her that I could not discuss specifics of the negotiations but that I wanted her to have an opportunity to ask questions and that I would answer those I could. I also wanted to let her know the next steps in the process. She was clearly still angry and stated that she believed she wasn't treated fairly in the last three RFPs she participated in with Dallas County (HelpDesk, Inmate Phones, Desktop Support). Obviously, I hate hearing that people feel as if they weren't treated fairly. However, she at no time mentioned that she had already sent this letter to you earlier in the day.

The committee looked at the information provided in the clarification

**GOVERNMENT
 EXHIBIT NO.
 339**

discussions with both vendors and determined that the costs between the two were essentially the same (after Dallas County reduced the number of hours to 1,000 for Unisys' proposal) but that the potential risks for Unisys were more pronounced, especially as they related to the interface, inventory, and contract negotiations. The intent of the comparison was to show Commissioners Court the factors considered. I believe Ms. Connolly's responses to those comparisons do not change the fact that Unisys cannot be ready to go live until after the first of the year and that there are still significant contractual issues that would need to be resolved to even get a signed contract.

I have also provided the financial information to all of the court members. This is court order #26 on tomorrow's agenda.

Please call me if you wish to discuss further.

Shannon