

AWARD SUMMARY

SUBJECT: Award Summary of RFP K456 – Seed to Sale Inventory Tracking System

TO: Randy Simmons and Other Interested Parties

FROM: John Farley and Katie Cunningham

PURPOSE OF PAPER: To summarize and provide recommendations for the award of RFP K456 – Seed to Sale Inventory Tracking System

BACKGROUND: Request for Proposals (RFP) K456 – Seed to Sale Inventory Tracking System was posted to WEBS on August 2, 2013 under the Commodity Codes listed below. A total of 785 vendors were notified of the solicitation, seven (7) of which were minority and woman owned, fourteen (14) of which were minority owned, eleven (11) of which were veteran owned, seven (7) of which were woman owned, and 91 of which were Washington small businesses.

<u>Commodity Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
209-56	Inventory Management
920-03	Application Service Provider (ASP) (Web Based Hosted)
209-59	Logistics and Supply Chain Software

The purpose of RFP K456 was to establish a Contract for a COTS or MOTS web-based Seed to Sale Inventory Tracking System to assist the WSLCB with tracking and monitoring all Marijuana growth, processing, testing, and retail transaction data by Marijuana Licensees through the supply chain to help prevent diversion, promote public safety, and collect tax revenue.

An optional Pre-Proposal Conference was held on August 13, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. at the WSLCB Headquarters Building. A total of twenty-three (23) vendors were in attendance.

- The official Pre-Proposal Conference Sign-In Sheet was posted to WEBS on August 15, 2013.

Proposals were due August 23, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. (PT). A total 122 vendors downloaded the RFP document from WEBS prior to the due date and time.

Prior to the proposal due date and time, one (1) amendment to the solicitation was posted to WEBS.

- Amendment 1 was posted to WEBS on August 15, 2013 to answer vendor questions and make changes to the RFP.

A total of twenty-two (22) vendors submitted Proposals in response to RFP K456:

1. Agrisoft Development Group
2. Barcodes West
3. BioTrackTHC
4. Cairnstack Software
5. Cloupid
6. Cran Share Holding (dba OrderCore)
7. Dataskill
8. Dispense Labs
9. Franwell
10. Green Sentry Solutions
11. MASS Group
12. MJ Freeway
13. MJ Solutions
14. Pacteria Technology International
15. Proteus Business Solutions
16. Quantum 9
17. ScanMyList, Inc. (dba Synch)
18. State Software Services, Inc.
19. Strategic Consulting Services
20. Tilted Logistics Solutions
21. Viridian Sciences
22. Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.

Of the twenty-two (22) responses received, all but one (1) were received in the lcbids@liq.wa.gov inbox. Dataskill submitted an on-time response to K456@liq.wa.gov. A late response from Dataskill was also submitted to lcbids@liq.wa.gov. The WSLCB accepted and evaluated the response from Dataskill which was submitted to K456@liq.wa.gov on time.

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

Responsiveness Review:

Following the Proposal due date and time, the proposals were checked for responsiveness. The items included in the responsiveness check were:

- Proposal submitted on or before August 23, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. (PT)
- Proposer completed the Submittal Document
 - Signed copy of the Proposer’s Authorized Offer (Certifications and Assurances)
 - Proposer Information
 - Subcontractor Information
 - Letter of Submittal
 - Non-Cost Proposal
 - Cost Proposal

Findings and Rejections:

Cloupid Inc. failed to submit their Proposal by the RFP K456 response deadline and their response was thus deemed non-responsive and rejected from further participation in the RFP. A rejection letter was sent to Cloupid Inc. on August 25, 2013.

Green Sentry Solutions submitted a vague cost proposal. The WSLCB requested clarification of Green Sentry Solutions’ cost proposal on September 3, 2012 and received Green Sentry Solutions’ clarification response on September 4, 2013. The cost proposal and subsequent clarification submitted by Green Sentry Solutions remained vague and failed to identify all costs in a manner consistent with the RFP instructions and the WSLCB was unable to evaluate the firm’s cost proposal. Green Sentry Solutions was deemed non-responsive and rejected from further participation in the RFP. A rejection letter was sent to Green Sentry Solutions on September 9, 2013.

Quantum 9 Inc.’s proposal included a former WSLCB employee who directly participated in the traceability model development related to Initiative 502 implementation at the WSLCB within the past two (2) years. Therefore, the proposal submitted by Quantum 9 Inc. failed to comply with RCW 42.52.040(1) and (3), and RCW 42.52.080(5). Quantum 9 Inc. was disqualified from participation in RFP K456 and a rejection letter was sent to the firm on September 10, 2013.

Evaluation Overview:

In accordance with RFP K456, Section 4.1, Overview:

“The Proposer who meets all of the RFP requirements and receives the highest number of total points as described in this section, will be declared the Successful Proposer and enter into contract negotiations with the WSLCB.”

In accordance with RFP K456, Section 4.2, Allocation of Points:

“The scores for each Proposal will be assigned a relative importance for each scored section. The relative importance for each section is as follows:

PHASE 1 EVALUATION

<i>Phase 1 Requirements</i>	<i>Available Points</i>
<i>Non-Cost Proposal:</i>	<i>1000 points</i>
<i>Cost Proposal:</i>	<i>100 points</i>
<i>Total Possible Phase 1 Points:</i>	<i>1100 points</i>

PHASE 2 EVALUATION (OPTIONAL)

<i>Phase 2 Requirements</i>	<i>Available Points</i>
<i>Oral Presentation (optional):</i>	<i>100 points</i>
<i>Total Possible Phase 2 Points</i>	<i>100 points</i>

If it is deemed to be in the best interest of the WSLCB to only complete the Phase 1 Evaluation, there are a maximum of 1100 points available. If it is deemed to be in the best interest of the WSLCB to complete both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Evaluations, there are a maximum of 1200 points available.”

Phase 1 Evaluation

Non-Cost Evaluations:

According to RFP K456, Section 4.3, Evaluation Process:

“...*Non-Cost Scoring:*

The Non-Cost Submittal is comprised of two (2) sections: Management Proposal and Technical Proposal. Evaluators will score each Management Proposal element of the Non-Cost Submittal. The Procurement Coordinator will score each Technical Proposal element of the Non-Cost Submittal. The Procurement Coordinator will tabulate evaluators’ scoring. A statistical calculation will be performed to establish a single score for the Non-Cost section of each Proposal. There are a maximum of 1000 points available in the Non-Cost Submittal, broken down per section as detailed in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Non-Cost Point Summary

Non-Cost Submittal	Available Non-Cost Points
<i>Management Proposal</i>	320
<i>Technical Proposal</i>	680
Total	1000

Technical Proposal Clarifications:

The Technical Proposal section of the RFP K456 Submittal Document states in part, “*Proposer is instructed to complete the table below for their Proposed Seed to Sale Inventory Tracking System by marking an “X” in the appropriate column for each listed requirement...*” The intent of this section is to instruct the Proposer to enter one (1) “X” in response to each requirement. The Non-Cost Technical Proposals submitted by MJ Freeway, Pactera Technology International, State Software Services Inc., and Viridian Sciences contained two (2) “X’s” for one (1) or more requirement. The WSLCB obtained clarification of which “X” for each requirement was accurate for evaluation.

Non-Cost Evaluation Findings:

Management Proposal: A total of 320 Management Proposal Non-Cost points were available. Management Proposal scores were determined by a team of five (5) evaluators. The table below represents the Management Proposal Non-Cost scoring for each responsive Proposer:

Vendor	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Management Proposal Score
<i>Max Points</i>	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	320.0
BioTrackTHC	37.6	37.0	35.0	37.0	34.6	37.0	37.0	36.0	291.2
MJ Freeway	38.0	37.0	33.0	34.0	36.6	34.0	32.0	34.6	279.2
Franwell	36.6	36.0	32.0	34.0	31.0	33.0	35.0	28.0	265.6
Cairnstack Software	31.0	24.6	30.0	33.0	33.6	32.6	37.0	35.6	257.4
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	32.6	26.0	29.0	35.0	27.6	34.0	32.0	31.0	247.2
Viridian Sciences	30.0	25.0	31.6	30.0	28.0	30.0	32.0	30.2	236.8
Dispense Labs	33.0	24.0	23.0	33.6	29.0	28.0	31.0	27.6	229.2
Proteus Business Solutions	31.6	32.0	28.0	22.4	29.0	29.0	26.0	27.0	225.0
State Software Services, Inc.	28.2	26.6	30.6	31.6	24.6	23.4	24.0	25.6	214.6
ScanMyList, Inc. (dba Synch)	24.0	25.0	27.0	27.6	27.0	27.0	28.6	26.6	212.8
MASS Group	28.0	27.0	26.0	29.0	26.0	16.0	25.6	26.0	203.6
MJ Solutions	28.6	30.0	24.0	20.0	19.0	23.0	23.0	28.0	195.6
Agrisoft Development Group	20.6	30.0	22.0	26.0	25.0	22.0	27.0	20.6	193.2
Pactera Technology International	24.6	27.0	23.0	18.0	21.0	26.0	22.0	18.0	179.6
Strategic Consulting Services	18.0	19.0	18.0	18.2	20.0	20.0	20.6	22.0	155.8
Barcodes West	21.0	21.0	17.0	21.0	21.0	12.0	11.0	13.0	137.0
Tilted Logistics Solutions	20.6	18.0	18.6	17.0	12.0	12.0	18.0	14.6	130.8
Dataskill	23.6	22.0	12.0	17.0	2.0	16.0	22.0	1.0	115.6
Cran Share Holding (dba OrderCore)	17.0	13.0	10.0	12.0	11.0	12.0	15.0	10.0	100.0

The formula used for calculating the Management Proposal Non-Cost Score is as follows:

$$MPS = (Q1 + Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5 + Q6 + Q7 + Q8)$$

Where;

Q# = Represents the Question Score

MPS = Management Proposal Score

Each Question Score was determined by calculating the average evaluator score for that question.

Technical Proposal: A total of 680 Technical Proposal Non-Cost points were available. Technical Proposal scores were calculated by the Procurement Coordinator. The table below represents the Technical Proposal Non-Cost scoring for each responsive Proposer:

Vendor	Technical Proposal Score
MJ Solutions	680.0
BioTrackTHC	664.0
Franwell	656.0
State Software Services, Inc.	648.0
MASS Group	632.0
Cairnstack Software	625.0
Dataskill	608.0
Proteus Business Solutions	560.0
MJ Freeway	544.0
Cran Share Holding (dba OrderCore)	541.0
ScanMyList, Inc. (dba Synch)	522.0
Dispense Labs	508.0
Agrisoft Development Group	504.0
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	496.0
Viridian Sciences	480.0
Strategic Consulting Services	462.0
Barcodes West	454.0
Pactera Technology International	254.0
Tilted Logistics Solutions	77.0

Proposer was instructed to respond to a total of 67 technical proposal requirements with one (1) of the following options:

- Out of the Box (OOB): The Proposed System completely meets the requirement without customization or configuration.
- Configuration (CFG): The Proposed System must be configured to meet the requirement but changes to software code are not required.
- Custom Solution (CSL): The requirement can be met by implementing a custom solution.
- Subcontractor (SUB): The requirement can be met by implementing a custom solution provided by Subcontractor.

Where;

OOB = 100% of the possible points for that requirement

CFG = 60% of the possible points for that requirement

CSL = 20% of the possible points for that requirement

SUB = 10% of the possible points for that requirement

Each Proposer's technical proposal score was calculated by summing the points received for all 67 technical proposal requirements.

Total Non-Cost Score: A total of 1000 Non-Cost points were available. Total Non-Cost Scores were calculated by summing the Management Proposal and Technical Proposal scores for each responsive Proposer. The table below represents the total Non-Cost score for each responsive Proposer:

Vendor	Management Proposal Score <i>(320 max pts)</i>	Technical Proposal Score <i>(680 max pts)</i>	Total Non-Cost Score <i>(1000 max pts)</i>
BioTrackTHC	291.2	664.0	955.2
Franwell	265.6	656.0	921.6
Cairnstack Software	257.4	625.0	882.4
MJ Solutions	195.6	680.0	875.6
State Software Services, Inc.	214.6	648.0	862.6
MASS Group	203.6	632.0	835.6
MJ Freeway	279.2	544.0	823.2
Proteus Business Solutions	225.0	560.0	785.0
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	247.2	496.0	743.2
Dispense Labs	229.2	508.0	737.2
ScanMyList, Inc. (dba Synch)	212.8	522.0	734.8
Dataskill	115.6	608.0	723.6
Viridian Sciences	236.8	480.0	716.8
Agrisoft Development Group	193.2	504.0	697.2
Cran Share Holding (dba OrderCore)	100.0	541.0	641.0
Strategic Consulting Services	155.8	462.0	617.8
Barcodes West	137.0	454.0	591.0
Pactera Technology International	179.6	254.0	433.6
Tilted Logistics Solutions	130.8	77.0	207.8

The formula used for calculating the Total Non-Cost Score is as follows:
 $NCS = (MPS + TPS)$

Where;

MPS = Management Proposal Score

TPS = Technical Proposal Score

NCS = Total Non-Cost Score

Cost Evaluation:

Cost was evaluated for responsive Proposers only. According to RFP K456, Section 4.3, Evaluation Process:

“... Cost Proposal Evaluation:

*The Procurement Coordinator will calculate the Cost score for the Cost Proposal section of the Response using Proposer’s Cost submittal. The total available points for the Cost Proposal section are **100 points**. Cost scoring will be calculated by combining elements of the Cost Proposal to determine the overall cost to the WSLCB.*

The Proposer’s Cost Proposal shall be scored in relation of the other Cost Proposals received.”

Cost Evaluation Findings:

A total of 100 Cost points were available. Cost scores were calculated by the Procurement Coordinator. The table below represents cost scoring:

Vendor	Inventory Tracking System Low Bid	Inventory Tracking System Pricing	Inventory Tracking System Cost Score (70 max pts)	Annual Maintenance & Support Low Bid	Annual Maintenance & Support Pricing	Annual Maintenance & Support Cost Score (30 max pts)	Total Cost Score (100 max pts)
MJ Solutions	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	70.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	30.00	100.00
Tilted Logistics Solutions		\$170,000.00	30.88		\$50,000.00	15.00	45.88
MASS Group		\$190,000.00	27.63		\$60,000.00	12.50	40.13
Dispense Labs		\$195,375.00	26.87		\$300,000.00	2.50	29.37
MJ Freeway		\$249,000.00	21.08		\$289,000.00	2.60	23.68
Cran Share Holding (dba OrderCore)		\$295,000.00	17.80		\$175,000.00	4.29	22.08
Proteus Business Solutions		\$350,000.00	15.00		\$220,000.00	3.41	18.41
Dataskill		\$370,633.00	14.16		\$217,175.00	3.45	17.62
Barcodes West		\$600,000.00	8.75		\$100,000.00	7.50	16.25
Franwell		\$650,000.00	8.08		\$130,000.00	5.77	13.85
Pactera Technology International		\$700,260.00	7.50		\$118,800.00	6.31	13.81
ScanMyList, Inc. (dba Synch)		\$726,800.00	7.22		\$249,600.00	3.00	10.23
BioTrackTHC		\$782,000.00	6.71		\$296,000.00	2.53	9.25
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.		\$875,000.00	6.00		\$420,000.00	1.79	7.79
Agrisoft Development Group		\$875,000.00	6.00		\$425,000.00	1.76	7.76
Strategic Consulting Services		\$927,000.00	5.66		\$399,900.00	1.88	7.54
State Software Services, Inc.		\$1,650,000.00	3.18		\$600,000.00	1.25	4.43
Viridian Sciences		\$3,163,000.00	1.66		\$2,199,000.00	0.34	2.00
Cairnstack Software		\$3,546,000.00	1.48		\$1,596,000.00	0.47	1.95

The formulas used for calculating the Cost Score are as follows:

ITSCS = (LB/CB)*70

Where;

LB = Low Bid

CB = Current Bid Being Evaluated

ITSCS = Inventory Tracking System Cost Score

AMSCS = (LB/CB)*30

Where;

LB = Low Bid

CB = Current Bid Being Evaluated

AMSCS = Annual Maintenance & Support Cost Score

CS = ITSCS + AMSCS

Where;

ITSCS = Inventory Tracking System Cost Score

AMSCS = Annual Maintenance & Support Cost Score

CS = Total Cost Score

Cost Proposal Clarifications:

The WSLCB sought clarification via email of the Cost Proposal submitted by Cairnstack Software. The Cost Proposal submitted by this vendor stated various costs, including percentages. Cairnstack Software clarified their response by submitting clarification of the percentages.

The WSLCB sought clarification via email of the Cost Proposal submitted by State Software Services Inc. The Cost Proposal submitted by this vendor was unclear due to the fact that the vendor modified the original language of the WSLCB's submittal document. State Software Services clarified their response by confirming the total proposed cost.

Proposer Total Phase 1 Score:

Per Section 4.3 of RFP K456, Evaluation Process:

“...Proposer Total Score:

Proposers’ Total Scores will be calculated by summing Cost and Non-Cost factor points (maximum of 1100 points) to determine the Proposer’s total Phase 1 score.”

Total Phase 1 Score: There were a total of 1100 Cost and Non-Cost points possible. The table below represents the Proposers’ Total Phase 1 Scores:

Vendor	Non-Cost Score (1000 max pts)	Cost Score (100 max pts)	Total Phase 1 Score (1100 max pts)
MJ Solutions	875.60	100.00	975.60
BioTrackTHC	955.20	9.25	964.45
Franwell	921.60	13.85	935.45
Cairnstack Software	882.40	1.95	884.35
MASS Group	835.60	40.13	875.73
State Software Services, Inc.	862.60	4.43	867.03
MJ Freeway	823.20	23.68	846.88
Proteus Business Solutions	785.00	18.41	803.41
Dispense Labs	737.20	29.37	766.57
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	743.20	7.79	750.99
ScanMyList, Inc. (dba Synch)	734.80	10.23	745.03
Dataskill	723.60	17.62	741.22
Viridian Sciences	716.80	2.00	718.80
Agrisoft Development Group	697.20	7.76	704.96
Cran Share Holding (dba OrderCore)	641.00	22.08	663.08
Strategic Consulting Services	617.80	7.54	625.34
Barcodes West	591.00	16.25	607.25
Pactera Technology International	433.60	13.81	447.41
Tilted Logistics Solutions	207.80	45.88	253.68

The formula used for calculating the Total Score is:

$NCS + CS = TS$

Where;

NCS = Non-Cost Score

CS = Cost Score

TS = Total Score

Phase 2 Evaluation

Oral Presentations:

Per Section 4.3 of RFP K456 Evaluation Process:

“...Phase 2 Evaluation - Oral Presentation (scored) (Optional)

The WSLCB reserves the right to schedule Oral Presentations if determined to be in the best interest of the WSLCB. In the event Oral Presentations are required, the WSLCB will contact the top-scoring Proposer(s) to schedule a presentation date, time, and location. A score of up to 100 additional points may be awarded for the Oral Presentation. The Proposer’s score for the Oral Presentation may be added to the Proposer’s total score described in Step 2 above.

Commitments made by the Proposer during the Oral Presentation, if any, will be considered binding.”

The WSLCB determined that the Oral Presentations are in the best interest of the Agency. As a result of the Phase 1 portion of the RFP evaluation process, the WSLCB determined the following three (3) firms as the top-scoring proposers and scheduled Oral Presentations with these firms:

1. BioTrack THC
2. Franwell
3. MJ Solutions

Oral Presentation Findings:

A total of 100 Oral Presentation points were available. Each top-scoring proposer was given a total of one (1) hour and 30 minutes to complete their presentation. Oral Presentation scores were determined by a team of five (5) evaluators. The table below represents the Oral Presentation scoring for each top-scoring Proposer:

Vendor	Oral Presentation – Phase 2 Score (100 Max Pts)
Franwell	88.40
BioTrackTHC	77.20
MJ Solutions	61.60

Each Oral Presentation Score was determined by calculating the average evaluator score for each Proposer’s presentation.

Proposer Total Evaluated Score (Phase 1 & Phase 2):

There were a maximum of 1200 points available. The table below represents the Proposers’ total evaluated scores:

Vendor	Total Phase 1 Score (1100 Max Pts)	Total Phase 2 Score (100 Max Pts)	Total Evaluated Score (1200 Max Pts)
BioTrackTHC	964.45	77.20	1041.65
MJ Solutions	975.60	61.60	1037.20
Franwell	935.45	88.40	1023.85

The formula used for calculating the Total Evaluated Score is:

TES = TP1S + TP2S

Where;

TES = Total Evaluated Score

TP1S = Total Phase 1 Score

TP2S = Total Phase 2 Score

AWARD SUMMARY:

In accordance with RFP K456, it is the intent of the WSLCB to enter into a single Contract with to the responsive responsible Proposer with the highest total score.

As established through the above evaluation process, **BioTrack THC** is the responsive proposer with the highest total score. BioTrack THC scored **1041.65** points out of 1200 possible points. The next highest scoring Proposer scored a total of 1037.20 points.

References:

Per Section 4.3 of RFP K456 Evaluation Process:

“...References (pass/fail)

The WSLCB reserves the right to request and check references after Proposal submittal, to assist in determining the overall responsibility of the Proposer...”

In order to verify the Proposer’s overall responsibility, the WSLCB determined that it was in the best interest of the State to verify the references of BioTrack THC. The WSLCB completed a reference check with a total of three (3) references. The table below represents the results of the reference check to BioTrack THC:

Question	R1	R2	R3
1 On a scale of 0-3, please rate BioTrack THC’s inventory tracking system.	3	2	3
2 On a scale of 0-3, please rate BioTrack THC’s efficiency and training during system installation and setup.	3	3	3
3 On a scale of 0-3, please rate BioTrack THC’s customer service, responsiveness, and overall support.	3	3	3

Question		R1	R2	R3
4	On a scale of 0-3, please rate BioTrack THC's problem resolution process.	3	2	3
5	On a scale of 0-3, please rate BioTrack THC's overall responsibility and quality of work.	3	3	3
Average Score		3	2.6	3

BioTrack THC received an average performance level of two (2) or greater from contacted references. The reference check helped confirm that BioTrack THC is a responsible vendor.

Determination of Proposer Responsibility:

Per RFP K456, Section 4.3, Evaluation Process, "Determination of Proposer Responsibility":

"After Proposal submittal, the WSLCB reserves the right to make reasonable inquiry and/or requests for additional information, to assist in determining the overall responsibility of any Proposer. Requests may include, but are not limited to, educational degrees, business licenses, financial statements, credit ratings, references, record of past performance, criminal background check, clarification of Proposer's offer, access to the Proposed System, and on-site inspection of Proposer's or Proposer's subcontractor's facilities. Failure to respond to said request(s) may result in the Proposer being deemed non-responsive and thus disqualified."

In order to determine Proposer's overall responsibility, the WSLCB determined that the proposer with the highest total score met responsibility factors through the following:

- Signature of the Proposer's Authorized Offer acknowledging compliance with all terms, conditions and requirements of RFP K456 and the resulting Contract
- Information presented in the proposer's Non-Cost response to RFP K456
- Verification of the Proposer's company license via the Department of Licensing's website
- Verification via the Department of Revenue's website that the Proposer is registered with the Department of Revenue and that the firm's account is open
- Verification that the Proposer meets the technical requirements as stated in their response to RFP K456 through use of their test site
- An average performance level score of two (2) or greater from contacted references

AWARD RECOMMENDATION:

It is the Procurement Coordinator's recommendation that **BioTrack THC** be announced as the Apparent Successful Proposer and enter into contract negotiations with the WSLCB for RFP K456 – Seed to Sale Inventory Tracking System.

I concur with the above Award Recommendation:

Randy Simmons
Deputy Director

Date