## Background Information for RFP 3792

- The District currently has 38 leased devices from various manufacturers and dealers.
- The District currently owns 21 Océ units, which the manufacturer will no longer support. These machines are over six years old and need to be removed from the fleet as soon as possible.
- Lease expirations are non-coterminous and on different billing cycles.
- Multiple cooperative contracts were used to obtain current copiers and there are varying terms and conditions on each copier making it difficult to keep up with requirements on each.
- Wanted the lease agreements to coincide with the fiscal year.
- Due to the growth of the District, the District's fleet of copiers needed to be right sized to ensure that department needs were being met.


## Process for Creating a Solution

- A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued to hire an independent third party consultant that specializes in assisting agencies with determining efficiency improvements and assisting with the RFP process for copier fleet management services.
- ProBuyers LLC was awarded the contract to assist with the RFP process for a fee of \$24,000.
- ProBuyers LLC met with key District personnel, including Information Technology staff, and conducted an on-site walk through and assessment of the current environment.
- ProBuyers LLC provided recommendations for right sizing the District's copier fleet.
- ProBuyers LLC provided specifications for the RFP to be reviewed by District key personnel.
- Revisions were made to the specifications and the RFP was issued.
- A total of eight (8) vendors responded to the RFP.
- ProBuyers LLC provided an initial evaluation based on the following criteria and weights as set forth in the RFP: Technical Requirements (15), Support and Service Specifications (15), Corporate Experience and References (10), Assessment/Implementation Plan (5), Exceptions to District Terms of Contract (10), Value-Added Services (10) and Pricing (35).
- Based upon of the initial evaluation, three companies were invited to provide presentations to the evaluation committee. Those companies were Denitech Corporation, NovaCopy, Inc., and Toshiba Business Solutions, Inc.
- After the presentations, the evaluation committee met and picked two finalists, which were Denitech Corporation and NovaCopy, Inc.
- The two finalists were asked to provide a showcase of their proposed equipment and District staff were invited to the showcase to see demonstrations of the equipment and provide an evaluation of both company's equipment.
- References were contacted for the two finalists and asked to rate them on the following: Service Level Received, Quality of Units, Billing Accuracy, Billing Timeliness, Responsiveness to Requests and the Number of Complaints Received .
- Each member of the evaluation committee completed an evaluation form, which rated the proposals based on the same evaluation criteria and weights as stated in the RFP.


## Recommendation

- Based on the evaluations completed by the evaluation committee, the recommendation to the Board is to award the contract to NovaCopy, Inc. References played a key role in the evaluation.

0 NovaCopy's references were from Weatherford College, Texas Wesleyan University, Collin County, City of McKinney, Allen ISD and City of Arlington. All of their references were very favorable.
0 Denitech's references were from Tarrant County College, Texas Christian University, Plano ISD and the City of Allen. Several of the references rated Denitech extremely low in the area of billing accuracy and billing timeliness.

- According to our Information Technology staff that participated in the evaluation, NovaCopy's model is a better fit with our current IT environment.


## Determination of Pricing and Future Requests

- The included spreadsheet entitled Financial Summary is based on our current needs today, plus the addition of multifunctional devices at the new Health Sciences Center and Conference Center at Central Park Campus. This is the cost that is identified on the Board Agenda and will be the initial cost of installing the new fleet of multifunctional devices, plus a $10 \%$ allowance for new equipment as needed during the 62 month contract term.
- Additional multifunctional devices will be added during the 62 month contract term as the District continues to grow and as upgrades to higher segment devices are needed to increase speed, add color or other approved functionality.
- Any requests for additional multifunctional devices, upgrades or additional features will go through an internal approval process before being allowed and will require written justification.
- Monthly pricing for the various devices that could be added at any time during the 62 month contract term have been established as part of the RFP and are identified in the attached Schedule D. Monthly rates are identified for adding the various devices during each month of the contract. Any machines added in the first two years of the contract will be new and any machines added during the last three years of the contract will be remanufactured to keep costs down.
- Purchasing will increase the contract amount based on pricing in Schedule $D$ as new devices are approved and added.


## FINANCIAL SUMMARY

## CATEGORY DESCRIPTION

Copier/mfd equipment, software, professional services, miscellaneous fees \& buyout dollars over five years

Copier/mfd monochrome proposed cpi (service and supplies only)
Estimated copier/mfd monochrome volume ( 62 months)
Estimated copier/mfd monochrome 62-month proposed cost

Copier/mfd color proposed cpi (service and supplies only)
Estimated copier/mfd color volume (62 months)
Estimated copier/mfd color 62-month proposed cost

Grand total copier/mfd device-related fleet costs for 62 months (excluding contributions)--all segments

Total contribution to the district
Approx Cost - Additional Copier/MFDs - New Health Sciences Building
Grand total copier/mfd device-related fleet costs for 62 months (including contributions)--all segments

Approx. 10\% allowance for futre additions, upgrades and added functionality during the contract term

Buyout of current copier leases with various vendors

## Total Contract Amount

Current 62-month copier/mfd total cost
Total 62-month savings for copier/mfd fleet

Denitech
NovaCopy
\$ 482,453 \$ 521,951

| $\$$ | 0.0055 | $\$$ | 0.0039 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $50,000,000$ |  |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 7 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5 , 0 0 0}$ |


| $\$$ | 0.0490 | $\$$ | 0.0590 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | $2,450,000$ | $2,450,000$ |  |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}, \mathbf{0 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 4 , 5 5 0}$ |


| $\$$ | 877,503 | $\$$ | 861,501 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | $(50,000)$ | $\$$ | - |
| $\$$ | 27,000 | $\$$ | 27,000 |
| $\$$ | 854,503 | $\$$ | 888,501 |


| $\$$ | 85,450 | $\$$ | 88,850 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | 88,000 | $\$$ | 88,000 |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$$ | $1,027,953$ | $\$$ | $1,065,351$ |

Total Lease Term Difference Between Vendors
Total Monthly Difference Between Vendors
\$
37,398
\$
603

The District will spend approximately $\$ 88,000$ to buyout current copier leases with multiple vendors.

PRICING SCHEDULE D
PRICING SCHEDULE FOR ADDING COPIER/MFDS DURING CONTRACT TERM


PRICING SCHEDULE D
PRICING SCHEDULE FOR ADDING COPIER/MFDS DURING CONTRACT TERM

|  | Segment 4 Color | Segment 5 Monochrome | Segment 5 Color |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years 1-2 New Equipment | Konica Minolta bizhub C654e | Konica Minolta Pro 951 | Konica Minolta PRESS C1085 |
| Lease Cost Basis Amount: | 10,284.00 | 11,853.00 | 59,972.00 |


| Month/Year | Lease Rate Factor |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7/15 | 0.01817 | \$ | 186.82 | 215.32 | 1,089.45 |
| 8/15 | 0.01843 | \$ | 189.53 | 218.45 | 1,105.26 |
| 9/15 | 0.01870 | \$ | 192.33 | 221.68 | \$ 1,121.61 |
| 10/15 | 0.01898 | \$ | 195.23 | 225.02 | 1,138.51 |
| 11/15 | 0.01928 | \$ | 198.23 | 228.47 | \$ 1,155.99 |
| 12/15 | 0.01958 | \$ | 201.33 | \$ 232.05 | \$ 1,174.09 |
| 1/16 | 0.01989 | \$ | 204.55 | \$ 235.76 | \$ 1,192.84 |
| 2/16 | 0.02021 | \$ | 207.88 | 239.60 | \$ $1,212.28$ |
| 3/16 | 0.02055 | \$ | 211.34 | 243.58 | \$ $1,232.44$ |
| 4/16 | 0.02090 | \$ | 214.93 | 247.72 | 1,253.36 |
| 5/16 | 0.02126 | \$ | 218.65 | \$ 252.01 | 1,275.09 |
| 6/16 | 0.02164 | \$ | 222.52 | 256.47 | 1,297.67 |
| 7/16 | 0.02203 | \$ | 226.55 | 261.12 | 1,321.16 |
| 8/16 | 0.02244 | \$ | 230.75 | \$ 265.95 | \$ $1,345.61$ |
| 9/16 | 0.02286 | \$ | 235.11 | \$ 270.98 | \$ $\quad 1,371.08$ |
| 10/16 | 0.02330 | \$ | 239.67 | \$ 276.23 | \$ 1,397.64 |
| 11/16 | 0.02377 | \$ | 244.42 | \$ 281.71 | \$ 1,425.36 |
| 12/16 | 0.02425 | \$ | 249.39 | \$ 287.43 | \$ 1,454.32 |
| 1/17 | 0.02475 | \$ | 254.58 | \$ 293.42 | \$ $\quad 1,484.59$ |
| 2/17 | 0.02528 | \$ | 260.01 | \$ 299.68 | \$ $1,516.27$ |
| 3/17 | 0.02584 | \$ | 265.70 | \$ 306.24 | \$ 1,549.47 |
| 4/17 | 0.02642 | \$ | 271.67 | \$ 313.12 | \$ $1,584.29$ |
| 5/17 | 0.02703 | \$ | 277.94 | \$ 320.35 | 1,620.86 |
| 6/17 | 0.02767 | \$ | 284.54 | \$ 327.95 | 1,659.30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Segment 4 Color | Segment 5 Monochrome | Segment 5 Color |
| Years 3-5 New, Used, Reconditioned or Remanufactured Equipment (Please indicate build status type being proposed next to model number) |  | Equal or equivalent to Konica Minolta bizhub C654e Remanufactured |  | Equal or equivalent to Konica Minolta bizhub Pro 951 Remanufactured | Equal or equivalent to Konica Minolta bizhub PRESS C1085 Remanufactured |
| Lease Cost Basis Amount: |  | \$ | 10,284.00 | 11,853.00 | 59,972.00 |

SUMMARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS--
ALL SEGMENTS SHOWING
ACTUAL MONTHLY MINIMUM
BILLING AND ESTIMATED
SERVICE COSTS


| Grand total estimated <br> copierlmfd fleet monthly <br> cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Vendor scores for <br> copier/mfd pricing | 19.26 | 33.11 | 29.12 | 24.20 | 33.59 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SUMMARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS--
ALL SEGMENTS SHOWING
ACTUAL MONTHLY MINIMUM
BILLING AND ESTIMATED
SERVICE COSTS

| Category description | NovaCopy (Startup Alt) |  | Toshiba |  | Toshiba (Startup Alt) |  | Zeno Imaging |  | Zeno Imaging (Canon Alt) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Copier/mfd equipment, software, professional services \& miscellaneous fees over five years | \$ | 651,503.44 | \$ | 508,410.29 | \$ | 546,340.90 | \$ | 700,972.00 | \$ | 907,246.00 |
| Copier/mfd monochrome proposed cpi (service and supplies only) | \$ | 0.0039 | \$ | 0.00470 | \$ | 0.0047000 | \$ | 0.0059000 | \$ | 0.0059000 |
| Estimated copier/mfd monochrome volume ( 62 months) |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |
| Estimated copier/mfd monochrome 62-month proposed cost | \$ | 195,000.00 | \$ | 235,000.00 | \$ | 235,000.00 | \$ | 295,000.00 | \$ | 295,000.00 |
| Copier/mfd color proposed cpi (service and supplies only) | \$ | 0.0590 | \$ | 0.0350 | \$ | 0.0350 | \$ | 0.0485 | \$ | 0.0485 |
| Estimated copier/mfd color volume (62 months) |  | 2,450,000 |  | 2,450,000 |  | 2,450,000 |  | 2,450,000 |  | 2,450,000 |
| Estimated copier/mfd color 62-month proposed cost | \$ | 144,550.00 | \$ | 85,750.00 | \$ | 85,750.00 | \$ | 118,825.00 | \$ | 118,825.00 |
| Grand total copier/mfd device-related fleet costs for 62 months--all segments | \$ | 991,053.44 |  | 829,160.29 | \$ | 867,090.90 | \$ | 1,114,797.00 | \$ | 1,321,071.00 |


| Grand total estimated <br> copier/mfd fleet monthly <br> cost         <br> Vendor scores for <br> copier/mfd pricing $\$$ 15,985 $\$$ 13,374 $\$$ 13,985 $\$$ 17,981 |
| :--- |


| Rating Scale for each criterion 1-5, with 1 the lowest score and 5 the highest score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (Weight $=15 \%$ )-REFER TO SECTION 5.1 OF PROPOSAL. A. Number and severity of proposed model specification deviations. B. Network compatibility, data encryption and network security. C. Environmental sustainability. D. Secure printing. | PDF Encryption and LDAP support are at an additional cost. | 4.5 | 0.68 |  | 5.0 | 0.75 | Segment 2 and Segment 5C devices are slower than required specifications. No single pass duplex scanning. No USB port included. |
| SUPPORT AND SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS (Weight=15\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.2 OF PROPOSAL. A. Number and severity of contract deviations. B. Will proactive PMs be performed? C. Warehouse proximity. D. Billing and service reporting samples. | Numerous deviations including: No PMs will be provided; 98\% fleet-wide average (not per-unit) up-time; Loaners will not be provided unless there is a written request. | 2.0 | 0.30 | No PMs will be provided. | 4.5 | 0.68 | No PMs will be provided. |
| COMPANY EXPERIENCE \& REFERENCES (Weight = 10\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.3 OF PROPOSAL. A. <br> Completeness of reference detail. B. Number of likesized customers listed. C. Completeness of manufacturer letter. D. Description of roles and responsibilities. E. Founding date and legal trade status. | 31 technicians and 5,700 units. | 5.0 | 0.50 | 33 technicians and 5,900 units. | 5.0 | 0.50 | 13 technicians and 7,100 units. |
| ASSESSMENT/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (Weight -5\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.4 OF PROPOSAL. A. Detailed work plan with proposed dates included for this project. B. Staffing information. C. Back-up personnel plan. D. IT support plan. | No dates provided for the defined steps. | 2.0 | 0.10 | 3 teams of 2 on assessment. | 4.0 | 0.20 | 2 teams of 2 on assessment. Some more detail needed |
| EXCEPTIONS TO SECTION 2.0 DISTRICT TERMS AND CONDITIONS (Weight 10\%) | Numerous deviations taken. | 2.0 | 0.20 |  | 5.0 | 0.50 |  |
| OTHER VALUE-ADDED SERVICES AND ALTERNATE PROPOSALS (Weight = 10\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.5 OF PROPOSAL. A. Was $\$ 115,000$ in start-up funds provided? B. Are there any other alternate proposals provided? C. Are any other value-added elements included? | $5 \%$ of devices can be upgraded, downgraded or canceled. Onsite CSR included. Follow-me Print and Behavior Modification included. In-house Financing. | 4.0 | 0.40 | Follow-me Print and Behavior Mondification included. \$120,000 provided under alternate proposal. | 4.0 | 0.40 | Follow-me Printing and Behavior Modification included. No Start-up support funds. |
| TOTAL COST (Weight $=35 \%$ )--REFER TO SECTION 5.6 AND PRICING SCHEDULES A-E OF PROPOSAL. <br> A. Completeness of pricing Schedules A-E. B. Is pricing firm? C. Are there any extra costs not included in the pricing schedules? D. On pricing Schedule B item (a) monochrome price comparisons on pricing Schedules should carry the majority of the weight in this category. Item (b) color pricing should carry less weight since only about $10 \%$ of the volume is color. | Professional services fees may increase after year 2. | 2.8 | 0.96 | Incomplete Schedule D. | 4.7 | 1.66 |  |
| TOTAL WEIGHTING (5 = PERFECT SCORE). This will be automatically calculated. |  |  | 3.14 |  |  | 4.68 |  |
| PERCENTILE SCORE. This will be automatically calculated. The closer to $100 \%$ the better overall value the proposal represents. |  |  | 63\% |  |  | 94\% |  |
| OVERALL RANKING. The highest percentile score should receive the number 1 ranking, and so forth for the remaining proposals. |  |  | 5 |  |  | 1 |  |


|  |  |  |  | Digital Campus Convenience Copiers |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rating Scale for each criterion 1-5, with 1 the lowest score and 5 the highest score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (Weight = 15\%)-REFER TO SECTION 5.1 OF PROPOSAL. A. Number and severity of proposed model specification deviations. B. Network compatibility, data encryption and network security. C. Environmental sustainability. D. Secure printing. | 4.5 | 0.68 | In NovaCopy's alternate proposal, Segment 5 and 5C devices are slower than required specifications | 5.0 | 0.75 | Segment 5 C is slower than required specifications. No single pass duplex scanning. | 4.8 | 0.72 |
| (Weight=15\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.2 OF PROPOSAL. A. Number and severity of contract deviations. B. Will proactive PMs be performed? C. Warehouse proximity. D. Billing and service reporting samples. | 4.5 | 0.68 |  | 5.0 | 0.75 | Cap on downtime credits. Removal of hard drives is not included. 5 free equipment moves per year included. | 4.0 | 0.60 |
| COMPANY EXPERIENCE \& REFERENCES (Weight = 10\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.3 OF PROPOSAL. A. <br> Completeness of reference detail. B. Number of likesized customers listed. C. Completeness of manufacturer letter. D. Description of roles and responsibilities. E. Founding date and legal trade status. | 4.0 | 0.40 | 37 technicians and 2,900 units. | 5.0 | 0.50 | No information regarding number of technicians or devices within 50 mile radius. 5.3.6 more clarification needed. | 2.0 | 0.20 |
| ASSESSMENT/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (Weight -5\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.4 OF PROPOSAL. A. Detailed work plan with proposed dates included for this project. B. Staffing information. C. Back-up personnel plan. D. IT support plan. | 4.0 | 0.20 | 1 team of 5 people on assessment. Some more detail needed. | 4.0 | 0.20 | Generic plan provided with no dates. | 3.0 | 0.15 |
| EXCEPTIONS TO SECTION 2.0 DISTRICT TERMS AND CONDITIONS (Weight 10\%) |  | 0.00 |  | 5.0 | 0.50 | Minor Deviations. | 4.5 | 0.45 |
| OTHER VALUE-ADDED SERVICES AND ALTERNATE PROPOSALS (Weight = 10\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.5 OF PROPOSAL. A. Was $\$ 115,000$ in start-up funds provided? B. Are there any other alternate proposals provided? C. Are any other value-added elements included? | 2.0 | 0.20 | The District is financing the $\$ 115,000$. In-house Financing. | 2.5 | 0.25 | Offering \$115,000. | 2.0 | 0.20 |
| TOTAL COST (Weight = 35\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.6 AND PRICING SCHEDULES A-E OF PROPOSAL. <br> A. Completeness of pricing Schedules A-E. B. Is pricing firm? C. Are there any extra costs not included in the pricing schedules? D. On pricing Schedule B item (a) monochrome price comparisons on pricing Schedules should carry the majority of the weight in this category. Item (b) color pricing should carry less weight since only about $10 \%$ of the volume is color. | 3.5 | 1.21 |  | 4.8 | 1.68 |  | 5.0 | 1.75 |
| TOTAL WEIGHTING (5 = PERFECT SCORE). This will be automatically calculated. |  | 3.36 |  |  | 4.63 |  |  | 4.07 |
| PERCENTILE SCORE. This will be automatically calculated. The closer to $100 \%$ the better overall value the proposal represents. |  | 67\% |  |  | 93\% |  |  | 81\% |
| OVERALL RANKING. The highest percentile score should receive the number 1 ranking, and so forth for the remaining proposals. |  | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |


| Rating Scale for each criterion 1-5, with 1 the lowest score and 5 the highest score |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (Weight $=15 \%$ )-REFER TO SECTION 5.1 OF PROPOSAL. A. Number and severity of proposed model specification deviations. B. Network compatibility, data encryption and network security. C. Environmental sustainability. D. Secure printing. | In the Ricoh proposal, Segment 5C unit is slower than required specifications. No Single pass duplex scanning. | 4.5 | 0.68 |
| SUPPORT AND SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS (Weight=15\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.2 OF PROPOSAL. A. Number and severity of contract deviations. B. Will proactive PMs be performed? C. Warehouse proximity. D. Billing and service reporting samples. | Zeno is proposing a Reservation of Rights document that reserves the right to negotiate all RFP terms and conditions. | 2.0 | 0.30 |
| COMPANY EXPERIENCE \& REFERENCES (Weight = 10\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.3 OF PROPOSAL. A. <br> Completeness of reference detail. B. Number of likesized customers listed. C. Completeness of manufacturer letter. D. Description of roles and responsibilities. E. Founding date and legal trade status. | 15 techincians and 4,000 units. In Section 5.3.6 more clarification is needed. | 3.0 | 0.30 |
| ASSESSMENT/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (Weight -5\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.4 OF PROPOSAL. A. Detailed work plan with proposed dates included for this project. B. Staffing information. C. Back-up personnel plan. D. IT support plan. | More detail and additional dates needed. | 4.0 | 0.20 |
| EXCEPTIONS TO SECTION 2.0 DISTRICT TERMS AND CONDITIONS (Weight 10\%) | Reservation of Rights document allows Zeno to negotiate all terms and conditions. | 2.0 | 0.20 |
| OTHER VALUE-ADDED SERVICES AND ALTERNATE PROPOSALS (Weight = 10\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.5 OF PROPOSAL. A. Was $\$ 115,000$ in start-up funds provided? B. Are there any other alternate proposals provided? C. Are any other value-added elements included? | Offering $\$ 115,000$. No Response to Section 5.5. | 1.0 | 0.10 |
| TOTAL COST (Weight = 35\%)--REFER TO SECTION 5.6 AND PRICING SCHEDULES A-E OF PROPOSAL. <br> A. Completeness of pricing Schedules A-E. B. Is pricing firm? C. Are there any extra costs not included in the pricing schedules? D. On pricing Schedule B item (a) monochrome price comparisons on pricing Schedules should carry the majority of the weight in this category. Item (b) color pricing should carry less weight since only about $10 \%$ of the volume is color. | No response to Section 5.6. Schedule B is incomplete. Sechedule D was not completed. | 3.7 | 1.30 |
| TOTAL WEIGHTING (5 = PERFECT SCORE). This will be automatically calculated. |  |  | 3.08 |
| PERCENTILE SCORE. This will be automatically calculated. The closer to 100\% the better overall value the proposal represents. |  |  | 62\% |
| OVERALL RANKING. The highest percentile score should receive the number 1 ranking, and so forth for the remaining proposals. |  |  | 6 |

