

**RFQ#945598 E-Filing and Document Management Systems  
Evaluation Team Score Sheet**

**Round 1**

Offeror	Granicus	ImageSoft, Inc.	Xerox Government Systems, LLC
Qualifications and Experience (30 Points)	11.00	20.00	28.00
Proposed Solutions (55 Points)	20.00	40.00	48.00
Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation (15 Points)	2.00	8.00	11.00
<b>Round 1 Evaluation Scores</b>	<b>33.00</b>	<b>68.00</b>	<b>87.00</b>

**Round 2**

Offeror	Granicus	ImageSoft, Inc.	Xerox Government Systems, LLC
Demonstrations of Proposed Solutions (65 Points)	Did not qualify for Round 2	40.00	60.00
Cost (35 Points)		28.00	23.83
<b>Round 2 Evaluation Scores</b>		<b>68.00</b>	<b>83.83</b>
<b>TOTAL EVALUATION SCORES</b>		<b>136.00</b>	<b>170.83</b>

## Evaluation Comments

### Granicus

#### Strengths

**Qualifications and Experience:**

**Proposed Solution:**

**Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation:**

**Demonstration of Proposed Solution:** N/A. Did not advance to Round 2.

#### Weaknesses

**Qualifications and Experience:** No references included; qualifications and experience lacking with only 8 years experience; no pre-certification presented; generic proposal that appeared to be copied and pasted.

**Proposed Solution:** Document Management System offered had to be hosted and was offered through a subcontractor.

**Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation:** Implementation plan does not appear to adhere to Metro's requested scope of work. Phase-in presented appeared unrealistic.

**Demonstration of Proposed Solution:** N/A. Did not advance to Round 2.

## ImageSoft, Inc.

### Strengths

**Qualifications and Experience:** Experienced in court solutions.

**Proposed Solution:** Multiple add-ons available.

**Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation:** Detailed risks.

**Demonstrations of Proposed Solutions:** Their proposed DMS was great.

### Weaknesses

**Qualifications and Experience:** No county court experience in Tennessee; no pre-certification presented; references weren't strong.

**Proposed Solution:** Workflow necessary to accommodate all 3 clerk offices does not exist in the proposed E-Filing system. E-filing system is not database agnostic.

**Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation:** Project schedule not determined.

**Demonstrations of Proposed Solutions:** Their proposed solution had very blurred lines between DMS and E-filing and was very heavy on DMS. Demonstration did not appear to be well-prepared; did not do a good job on answering questions that were brought up during the demonstration meeting. Their presentation was very generic on separate systems vs together systems. The evaluation team felt as though the presentation pushed evaluation team toward doing one system instead of three separate systems. Metro would not own the code. They are not currently certified by AOC. On base was very broad. No experience in implementing with State Trial Courts in TN. They proposed a very aggressive implementation schedule that lacked a detailed plan on who would do what in the implementation process. The demonstration made it appear to be a very complicated system. Log in for law firms was generic and provided no separation, so all users can see everything. The demonstration made evaluation team unsure on how administration would work if it was one system and not three. They don't have a customer that is currently hosting on their own. They are not database agnostic.

## Xerox Government Systems, LLC

### Strengths

**Qualifications and Experience:** Well qualified.

**Proposed Solution:** Workflow does accommodate all 3 clerk offices; multiple training options available; database agnostic systems; detailed user guides with scenarios similar to Metro's needs.

**Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation:** Detailed breakdown of project schedule and potential risks involved.

**Demonstration of Proposed Solution:** Demonstration of Proposed Solution provided a better explanation on how their interface would work and how it would interface with current and future case management. They discussed their plan for implementation and the different phases. They are AOC certified. They have experience with State Trial Courts in TN. The presenter understood and spoke clerk lingo. Presentation seemed more like collaboration than a sales pitch. Metro would be able to own the code and they provided a great solution for owning the code. They stated that they can provide the requested three separate systems. They were much more complete with regards to Metro's current processes and provide a very easily customizable system. They represented having a working knowledge of the TN court processes. They were very upfront about their timeline. They are database agnostic.

### Weaknesses

**Qualifications and Experience:** Only implemented E-filing in 4 jurisdictions. No implementation in juvenile court.

**Proposed Solution:** Response times and resolution times.

**Project Schedule, Risk, and Risk Mitigation:** Dates within project schedule are concerning.

**Demonstration of Proposed Solution:** DMS is small.

Solicitation Title & Number			RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
E-Filing and Document Management Systems, RFQ #945598			28	7	35
Offeror's Name	Total Bid Amount	SBE/SDV Participation Amount	RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
ImageSoft, Inc.	\$1,213,940.00	\$0.00	28.00	0.00	28.00
Xerox Government Systems, LLC	\$1,426,184.00	\$0.00	23.83	0.00	23.83