

Award Justification Statement
Solicitation # SK18001
Contract Name: State of Utah - NASPO ValuePoint
Data Communications Products and Services
Awarded: April 12, 2019

Project Summary

A request for proposals was issued by the State of Utah on behalf of NASPO ValuePoint, participating states, and their eligible end users for the following scope of work:

- Unified Communications
- Networking
- Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking
- Wireless
- Facility Management, Monitoring and Control

Evaluation Process

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Part 7 of the Utah Procurement Code by an Evaluation Committee comprised of representatives from the State of Utah, Michigan, Washington, Alaska, Florida, Louisiana, and Minnesota. A representative from the Utah Division of Purchasing attended the evaluation committee meetings to ensure that the process outlined in the Procurement Code was followed but was not a voting member on the evaluation committee. Under Utah Code 63G-6a-702(2), the RFP process was used because criteria other than cost were considered important in determining which proposal provides the best value to the State. These other factors (other than cost) were highly significant in determining which vendor's proposal provided the best value to the State. The following paragraphs describe each scoring category and explain and compare the scores assigned to each proposal by the State's evaluation committee.

Twenty-Nine proposals were received on September 11, 2018 through the State of Utah's eProcurement system. The preliminary evaluation stage was conducted by the State of Utah to ensure compliance with the RFP's minimum qualifications.

1. Minimum Qualifications.

The RFP requested that an awarded Contractor provide the following pass/fail criteria as minimum mandatory information:

<u>Mandatory Minimum Requirements</u>	<u>RFP Section</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>
Acknowledgement of Amendments	SciQuest	Pass/Fail
RFP Development	4.1.1	Pass/Fail
Evaluation of Proposals	4.1.2	Pass/Fail
Proposed Categories	4.1.3	Pass/Fail
Delivery	4.1.4	Pass/Fail
Credit Rating	4.1.5	Pass/Fail
OEMs Only	4.1.6	Pass/Fail

Upon preliminary review of the mandatory pass/fail RFP criteria, 0 proposals were rejected and determined non-response for failing to conform to the mandatory minimum. 29 proposals were submitted to the evaluation committee for technical scoring.

2. Technical OEM Evaluated Qualifications.

In this stage proposals were evaluated against the following 6 criterion:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>RFP Section</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>
Company Profile and References	4.2.1	50.0
Ability to Supply NASPO ValuePoint Member States	4.2.2	50.0
Ability to Provide Technical Support to End Users	4.2.3	50.0
Qualifications and Technical Ability	4.2.4	25.0
Security	4.2.5	50.0
Environmental	4.2.6	25.0

As outlined in the SK18001 RFP, in order to be eligible to proceed onto Stage 3: Category Qualification Evaluation proposals were required to score a minimum of 162.5 points within the Stage 2 evaluation. A total of 250.0 points were available in this stage of the evaluation. Proposals that did not receive the required minimum score threshold were disqualified and eliminated from further consideration.

As outlined in the SK18001 RFP, during the technical evaluation phase the evaluation committee determined that the proposals that received an average score of 3.25 (equivalent of 65%) or higher per criterion provided sufficient information to the evaluation committee to demonstrate their proposal exceeded the addressed requirements for the category. Individual criterion were scored on a scale of 1 to 5, as outlined in the RFP. Overall, the evaluation committee determined that these proposals would allow Participating Entities an opportunity to make a best value determination based on the proposals provided by the offerors.

The evaluation committee determined that proposals that received an average score of less than 3.25 (equivalent of 65%) did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate to the evaluation committee that their proposals met the outlined requirements.

Following this stage 2 evaluation, 20 proposals received technical scores that met or exceeded the minimum technical point requirements outlined in the RFP and proceeded onto stage 3 category qualification evaluation. Refer to Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation for the distribution of scores given.

9 proposals were rejected for failing to meet the required minimum technical scoring thresholds outlined in the RFP. The rejected proposals did not adequately demonstrate that their offered solutions met the minimum threshold to proceed onto the stage 3 evaluation. The evaluation

committee determined that these proposals did not substantively address the topics/criterion identified in SK18001 RFP. Refer to Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation for the distribution of scores given.

3. Technical Category Evaluation (Per Category).

In this stage proposals were evaluated against the following 5 criterion, per category the proposal sought an award in:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>RFP Section</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>
Ability to meet Requirements of Selected Category	4.3.1	100.0
Consumption Models	4.3.2	25.0
Category Specific Security	4.3.3	50.0
Open Standards and Interoperability	4.3.4	50.0
Value Added Services	4.3.5	25.0
<i>Total Stage 3 Points Per Category</i>		<i>250.0 points</i>

The total possible points and the minimum score threshold that proposals were required to receive were as follows:

Award Categories	Total Points Possible	Stage 3: Minimum Threshold
Unified Communications	250.0	175.0
Networking	250.0	175.0
Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking	250.0	175.0
Wireless	250.0	175.0
Facility Management, Monitoring, and Control	250.0	175.0

Proposals that did not receive the required minimum score threshold were disqualified and eliminated from further consideration.

As outlined in the SK18001 RFP, during the technical evaluation phase the evaluation committee determined that the proposals that received an average score of 3.5 (equivalent of 70%) or higher per criterion provided sufficient information to the evaluation committee to demonstrate their proposal exceeded the addressed requirements for the category. Individual criterion were scored on a scale of 1 to 5, as outlined in the RFP. Overall, the evaluation committee determined that these proposals would allow Participating Entities an opportunity to make a best value determination based on the proposals provided by the offerors.

The evaluation committee determined that proposals that received an average score of less than 3.5 (equivalent of 70%) did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate to the evaluation committee that their proposals met the outlined requirements.

Following this stage 3 evaluation, 14 proposals received technical scores that met or exceeded the minimum technical point requirements outlined in the RFP and proceeded onto stage 4 cost evaluation. Refer to Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation for the distribution of scores given.

6 proposals were fully rejected for failing to meet the required minimum technical scoring thresholds outlined in the RFP. 2 proposals were partially rejected for failing to meet the required minimum technical scoring thresholds for some of the award categories applied for. The rejected proposals did not adequately demonstrate that their offered solutions met the minimum threshold to proceed onto the stage 3 evaluation. The evaluation committee determined that these proposals did not substantively address the topics/criterion identified in SK18001 RFP. Refer to Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation for the distribution of scores given.

4. Cost Proposal Evaluation.

The 14 offerors that met the minimum 70% score threshold, had their Cost Proposals evaluated as outlined in the SK18001 RFP. Offerors offering no minimum discount (or 0%) off MSRP for a given category were deemed non-responsive to that category.

Proposals then separated into the following groups:

- Group 1: those Offerors whose proposal qualifies for all Award Categories.
- Group 2: those Offerors whose proposal qualifies one or more Award Categories, but not all Award Categories.

A total of 166.7 cost points were available per Category. The Offeror with the highest proposed Average Minimum Discount % off List within the Category received the 166.7 cost points. All other proposals received a portion of the cost points based on how much lower their proposed Average Minimum Discount % was from the highest. The formula to compute cost points is: $(\text{Proposed Average Discount \%} / \text{Highest Average Minimum Discount \%}) * \text{Total Cost Points Available}$. As provided in the Attachment E Cost Proposal the Average Minimum Discount % for a given category was calculated by averaging:

- Hardware and Software (on premise)
- Cloud Services
- Service Packages (i.e., Maintenance, etc.)

As provided in the SK18001 RFP, the Average Minimum Discount % off within Group 1 proposals were compared against the Group 1 proposals. The Average Minimum Discount % off within Group 2 proposals were compared against the Group 2 proposals. Applying this cost formula as outlined in the SK18001 RFP, cost points were assigned as represented in Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation.

As outlined in the SK18001 RFP, awards were made to responsive and responsible offerors whose proposal received the minimum technical point threshold, provided a Cost Proposal as described in the RFP, and achieved a minimum total combined points (technical points + cost points) of:

- 466.69 total points for Unified Communications
- 466.69 total points for Networking
- 466.69 total points for Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking
- 466.69 total points for Wireless
- 466.69 total points for Facility Management, Monitoring, and Control

Vendors seeking an award in categories only received an award in the respective category if their total combined points meet the award threshold for the category (i.e, 466.69 points for Networking). Provided below are the awarded vendors and their accompanying awarded categories:

	Unified Communications	Networking	Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking	Wireless	Facility Management, Monitoring, and Control
AT&T	X				
ATOS	X				
Cisco	X	X	X	X	X
Cradlepoint		X	X	X	
Extreme Networks		X	X	X	
Hewlett Packard Enterprise		X	X	X	
Juniper Networks		X	X		
NEC	X				
Palo Alto Networks			X		

Conclusion

Based on the justifications outlined above, and pursuant to the SK18001 RFP, the 9 offerors identified above provide the best value to the State and other participating entities. Subject to successful negotiations of the terms and conditions, each has been awarded a contract.

Data Communications Products & Services
Solicitation # SK18001
Master Summary Evaluation

Total Proposals:	29
# Awarded:	9
# Rejected:	20

Stage 2 Threshold: 162.5 points Stage 3 Threshold: 175 points Award Threshold: 466.69

Vendors	Stage 1: Mandatory Minimums	Stage 2: DEM Evaluated	Stage 3: Category Qualification Evaluation					Stage 4: Cost Proposal Evaluation										Total Combined Scores					Award Status
			1. Unified Communications	2. Networking	3. Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking	4. Wireless	5. Facility Management, Monitoring and Control	1. Unified Communications		2. Networking		Switches, Security, and Storage Networking		4. Wireless		5. Facility Management, Monitoring and Control		1. Unified Communications	2. Networking	3. Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking	4. Wireless	5. Facility Management, Monitoring and Control	
								%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points						
Group 1: Those Offerors whose proposal qualifies for all Award Categories.																							
Cisco	Pass	179.4	191.9	191.9	191.9	190.0	18.00%	166.70	18.00%	166.70	18.00%	166.70	18.00%	166.70	18.00%	166.70	537.95	537.95	537.95	536.08	536.08	Awarded	
Group 2: Those Offerors whose proposal qualifies one or more Award Categories, but not all Award Categories																							
AT&T	Pass	170.6	182.5	136.3	149.4	158.1	25.00%	138.92									492.04	306.88	320.00	-	328.75	Awarded	
ATOS	Pass	209.4	208.8				24.00%	133.36									551.49	-	-	-	-	Awarded	
Cradlepoint	Pass	188.8		190.0	191.3	188.8			25.00%	151.55	25.00%	151.55	25.00%	166.70				530.30	531.55	544.20	-	Awarded	
Extreme Networks	Pass	186.9		190.6	196.9	195.0			18.67%	113.17	18.67%	113.17	18.67%	124.49				490.67	496.92	506.37	-	Awarded	
Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Pass	181.9		188.1	188.1	193.1			25.00%	151.55	25.00%	151.55	25.00%	166.70				521.55	521.55	541.70	-	Awarded	
Juniper Networks	Pass	183.1		180.0	186.3				27.50%	166.70	27.50%	166.70						529.83	536.08	-	-	Awarded	
NEC	Pass	175.0	190.6				30.00%	166.70									532.33	-	-	-	-	Awarded	
Palo Alto Networks	Pass	186.3			198.1						15.00%	90.93						-	-	475.30	-	Awarded	
Vendor 3	Pass	193.8	196.9				8.33%	46.29									436.91	-	-	-	-	No Award	
Vendor 6	Pass	185.0		183.8	196.9	166.9			7.87%	47.71	9.08%	55.04						416.46	436.92	-	-	No Award	
Vendor 7	Pass	180.0		193.1	189.4				4.00%	24.25	4.00%	24.25						397.37	393.62	-	-	No Award	
Vendor 9	Pass	178.8			186.9						7.67%	46.49						-	412.12	-	-	No Award	
Vendor 13	Pass	181.3	195.0				10.00%	55.57									431.82	-	-	-	-	No Award	
Vendor 2	Pass	182.5	118.8		111.9	110.6																	
Vendor 10	Pass	181.9	160.0																				
Vendor 11	Pass	179.4	165.6																				
Vendor 15	Pass	189.4		156.9	166.3	165.6																	
Vendor 16	Pass	183.1			170.0	170.0																	
Vendor 18	Pass	168.1	173.8			169.4																	
Vendor 1	Pass	141.9																					
Vendor 4	Pass	129.4																					
Vendor 5	Pass	145.6																					
Vendor 8	Pass	135.6																					
Vendor 12	Pass	128.8																					
Vendor 14	Pass	138.8																					
Vendor 17	Pass	152.5																					
Vendor 19	Pass	158.8																					
Vendor 20	Pass	150.0																					

Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation

Weight	Stage 3: Category Qualification Evaluation	Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18	
	Evaluator 5		4.0			5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0										4.0
	Evaluator 6		2.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 7		3.0			4.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 8		3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Total Average Score		3.0			4.0	4.1	3.8	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1										3.1
20.0	Criteria #1 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 100.0)		60.0			80.0	82.5	75.0	82.5	85.0	80.0	82.5										62.5
	Criteria #2 - Consumption Models																					
	Evaluator 1		3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 3		2.0			3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0										2.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 5		4.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 6		2.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0										4.0
	Evaluator 7		3.0			4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 8		4.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0										3.0
	Total Average Score		3.0			4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.3										3.0
5.0	Criteria #2 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)		15.0			20.0	17.5	20.0	20.0	18.1	17.5	16.3										15.0
	Criteria #3 - Category Specific Security																					
	Evaluator 1		3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0										4.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 3		3.0			4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.0										3.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0										4.0
	Evaluator 5		4.0			5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0										4.0
	Evaluator 6		2.0			4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	2.0										3.0
	Evaluator 7		3.0			4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0										2.0
	Evaluator 8		2.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0										4.0
	Total Average Score		2.9			4.1	3.9	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.6	2.9										3.4
10.0	Criteria #3 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)		28.8			41.3	38.8	36.3	35.0	40.0	36.3	28.8										33.8
	Criteria #4 - Open Standards and Interoperability																					
	Evaluator 1		3.0			4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 2		2.0			3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 3		2.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0										3.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 5		2.0			4.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 6		1.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0										3.0
	Evaluator 7		1.0			2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0										2.0
	Evaluator 8		2.0			4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Total Average Score		2.0			3.3	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.4										2.9
10.0	Criteria #4 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)		20.0			32.5	32.5	35.0	33.8	33.8	36.3	33.8										28.8
	Criteria #5 - Value Added Services																					
	Evaluator 1		3.0			3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 3		3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0										4.0
	Evaluator 5		3.0			5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0										4.0
	Evaluator 6		1.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0										4.0
	Evaluator 7		2.0			4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0										3.0
	Evaluator 8		2.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0										3.0
	Total Average Score		2.5			3.6	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.3	3.6	3.8										3.4
5.0	Criteria #5 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)		12.5			18.1	18.8	17.5	19.4	16.3	18.1	18.8										16.9
	Total Technical Points (Total Possible Points = 250.0) Minimum Threshold = 175.0		136.3			191.9	190.0	183.8	190.6	193.1	188.1	180.0										156.9

Category 3: Routers, Switches, Security, and Storage Networking																					
Weight	Criteria #1 - Ability to Meet Requirements for Selected Category	Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18
	Evaluator 1		2.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 2		1.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 3		2.0	3.0		3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 5		3.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Evaluator 6		2.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 7		1.0	2.0		4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 8		3.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Total Average Score		2.1	3.3		4.0	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9								
20.0	Criteria #1 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 100.0)		42.5	65.0		80.0	82.5	82.5	85.0	82.5	80.0	82.5	77.5								
	Criteria #2 - Consumption Models																				
	Evaluator 1		2.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Evaluator 2		1.0	3.0		4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Evaluator 3		2.0	2.0		3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation

Weight	Stage 3: Category Qualification Evaluation	Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18
	Evaluator 4	3.0	3.0			5.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0				3.0		3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 5	3.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 6	3.0	1.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	3.0	2.0			4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0				5.0		3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0				3.0		3.0	3.0	
	Total Average Score	2.5	2.5			4.0	3.5	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.8				3.5		3.1	3.4	
5.0	Criteria #2 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)	12.5	12.5			20.0	17.5	20.6	20.0	18.1	17.5	16.3	18.8				17.5		15.6	16.9	
	Criteria #3 - Category Specific Security																				
	Evaluator 1	3.0	4.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 2	2.0	3.0			3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0				4.0		3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 3	2.0	3.0			4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0				4.0		3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	3.0	4.0			5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 5	2.0	4.0			5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0				5.0		3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 6	2.0	2.0			4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0				4.0		3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	2.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0				5.0		2.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	4.0	
	Total Average Score	2.4	3.3			4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.3	3.5				4.3		3.3	3.4	
10.0	Criteria #3 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)	23.8	32.5			41.3	40.0	38.8	40.0	40.0	36.3	32.5	35.0				42.5		32.5	33.8	
	Criteria #4 - Open Standards and Interoperability																				
	Evaluator 1	3.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 2	2.0	3.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0				3.0		3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 3	1.0	2.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0				3.0		3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	2.0	3.0			3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 5	2.0	3.0			4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				5.0		4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 6	2.0	1.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				3.0		4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	2.0	1.0			2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0				5.0		3.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0	2.0			4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	3.0	
	Total Average Score	2.1	2.3			3.3	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.9				3.9		3.6	3.3	
10.0	Criteria #4 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)	21.3	22.5			32.5	32.5	36.3	32.5	32.5	36.3	36.3	38.8				38.8		36.3	32.5	
	Criteria #5 - Value Added Services																				
	Evaluator 1	3.0	4.0			3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0				3.0		3.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 2	1.0	3.0			3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0				3.0		3.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 3	2.0	4.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				3.0		3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	3.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0				4.0		4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 5	3.0	4.0			5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 6	2.0	2.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0				3.0		4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 7	2.0	3.0			4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0				4.0		3.0	1.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0	4.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0				3.0		3.0	2.0	
	Total Average Score	2.4	3.4			3.6	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.4				3.4		3.4	2.4	
5.0	Criteria #5 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)	11.9	16.9			18.1	18.8	18.8	19.4	16.3	18.1	18.8	16.9				16.9		16.9	11.9	
		Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18
	Total Technical Points (Total Possible Points = 250.0)																				
	Minimum Threshold = 175.0	111.9	149.4			191.9	191.3	196.9	196.9	189.4	188.1	186.3	186.9				198.1		166.3	170.0	

Category 4: Wireless																					
	Criteria #1 - Ability to Meet Requirements for Selected Category																				
	Evaluator 1	2.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 2	1.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 3	2.0				3.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 4	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 5	3.0				5.0	5.0		5.0		4.0								4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 6	2.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	1.0				4.0	4.0		5.0		5.0								3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								3.0	4.0	
	Total Average Score	2.1				4.0	4.1		4.3		4.1								3.3	3.8	
20.0	Criteria #1 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 100.0)	42.5				80.0	82.5		85.0		82.5								65.0	75.0	
	Criteria #2 - Consumption Models																				
	Evaluator 1	2.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		3.0								3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 2	1.0				4.0	3.0		3.0		3.0								3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 3	2.0				3.0	3.0		4.0		3.0								2.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	3.0				5.0	3.0		4.0		3.0								3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 5	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 6	3.0				4.0	3.0		4.0		4.0								4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	3.0				4.0	3.0		5.0		4.0								3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								3.0	3.0	
	Total Average Score	2.5				4.0	3.4		4.0		3.5								3.1	3.4	
5.0	Criteria #2 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)	12.5				20.0	16.9		20.0		17.5								15.6	16.9	
	Criteria #3 - Category Specific Security																				
	Evaluator 1	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0								4.0	4.0	

Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation

Weight	Stage 3: Category Qualification Evaluation	Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18	
	Evaluator 2	1.0				3.0	3.0		3.0		3.0									3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 3	1.0				4.0	3.0		3.0		3.0									3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	3.0				5.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 5	2.0				5.0	5.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 6	3.0				3.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	2.0				4.0	4.0		3.0		4.0									2.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	4.0	
	Total Average Score	2.3				4.0	3.9		3.6		3.8									3.4	3.3	
10.0	Criteria #3 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)	22.5				40.0	38.8		36.3		37.5									33.8	32.5	
	Criteria #4 - Open Standards and Interoperability																					
	Evaluator 1	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 2	2.0				3.0	3.0		3.0		3.0									3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 3	1.0				3.0	3.0		3.0		3.0									3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	2.0				3.0	4.0		3.0		4.0									4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 5	2.0				4.0	2.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 6	2.0				3.0	3.0		4.0		4.0									3.0	4.0	
	Evaluator 7	2.0				2.0	4.0		3.0		3.0									3.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0				4.0	3.0		3.0		4.0									4.0	3.0	
	Total Average Score	2.1				3.3	3.3		3.4		3.6									3.5	3.4	
10.0	Criteria #4 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)	21.3				32.5	32.5		33.8		36.3									35.0	33.8	
	Criteria #5 - Value Added Services																					
	Evaluator 1	3.0				3.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									3.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 2	1.0				3.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									3.0	2.0	
	Evaluator 3	2.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 4	3.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 5	3.0				4.0	3.0		5.0		4.0									3.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 6	2.0				3.0	3.0		4.0		4.0									4.0	3.0	
	Evaluator 7	2.0				4.0	4.0		4.0		3.0									3.0	1.0	
	Evaluator 8	3.0				3.0	3.0		3.0		4.0									3.0	2.0	
	Total Average Score	2.4				3.5	3.6		4.0		3.9									3.3	2.4	
5.0	Criteria #5 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)	11.9				17.5	18.1		20.0		19.4									16.3	11.9	
	Total Technical Points (Total Possible Points = 250.0) Minimum Threshold = 175.0	110.6				190.0	188.8		195.0		193.1									165.6	170.0	

Category 5: Facility Management, Monitoring, and Control																					
Weight	Criteria	Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18
	Criteria #1 - Ability to Meet Requirements for Selected Category																				
	Evaluator 1		4.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											3.0
	Evaluator 3		4.0			3.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											3.0
	Evaluator 5		4.0			5.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 6		3.0			4.0		3.0		3.0											2.0
	Evaluator 7		2.0			4.0		2.0		2.0											2.0
	Evaluator 8		4.0			4.0		2.0		2.0											3.0
	Total Average Score		3.4			4.0		3.4		3.4											3.1
20.0	Criteria #1 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 100.0)		67.5			80.0		67.5		67.5											62.5
	Criteria #2 - Consumption Models																				
	Evaluator 1		3.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											3.0
	Evaluator 3		3.0			3.0		4.0		4.0											3.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			5.0		4.0		4.0											3.0
	Evaluator 5		4.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 6		4.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 7		2.0			4.0		3.0		3.0											4.0
	Evaluator 8		4.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Total Average Score		3.3			4.0		3.9		3.9											3.5
5.0	Criteria #2 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)		16.3			20.0		19.4		19.4											17.5
	Criteria #3 - Category Specific Security																				
	Evaluator 1		4.0			4.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			3.0		3.0		3.0											3.0
	Evaluator 3		3.0			4.0		3.0		3.0											4.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			5.0		3.0		3.0											4.0
	Evaluator 5		3.0			5.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 6		3.0			3.0		4.0		4.0											4.0
	Evaluator 7		2.0			4.0		2.0		2.0											4.0
	Evaluator 8		3.0			4.0		3.0		3.0											4.0
	Total Average Score		3.0			4.0		3.3		3.3											3.9
10.0	Criteria #3 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)		30.0			40.0		32.5		32.5											38.8

Exhibit 1: Master Summary Evaluation

Weight	Stage 3: Category Qualification Evaluation	Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18	
	Criteria #4 - Open Standards and Interoperability																					
	Evaluator 1		4.0			4.0		3.0														4.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			3.0		3.0														3.0
	Evaluator 3		3.0			3.0		3.0														3.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			3.0		3.0														4.0
	Evaluator 5		3.0			4.0		4.0														3.0
	Evaluator 6		3.0			3.0		3.0														4.0
	Evaluator 7		2.0			2.0		2.0														3.0
	Evaluator 8		4.0			4.0		3.0														3.0
	Total Average Score		3.1			3.3		3.0														3.4
10.0	Criteria #4 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 50.0)		31.3			32.5		30.0														33.8
	Criteria #5 - Value Added Services																					
	Evaluator 1		3.0			3.0		4.0														3.0
	Evaluator 2		3.0			3.0		4.0														3.0
	Evaluator 3		3.0			4.0		4.0														3.0
	Evaluator 4		3.0			4.0		4.0														4.0
	Evaluator 5		3.0			4.0		3.0														4.0
	Evaluator 6		2.0			3.0		3.0														4.0
	Evaluator 7		1.0			4.0		3.0														3.0
	Evaluator 8		3.0			3.0		3.0														3.0
	Total Average Score		2.6			3.5		3.5														3.4
5.0	Criteria #5 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 25.0)		13.1			17.5		17.5														16.9
		Vendor 2	AT&T	ATOS	Vendor 3	Cisco	Cradlepoint	Vendor 6	Extreme Networks	Vendor 7	Hewlett Packard Enterprise	Juniper Networks	Vendor 9	Vendor 10	Vendor 11	NEC	Palo Alto Networks	Vendor 13	Vendor 15	Vendor 16	Vendor 18	
	Total Technical Points (Total Possible Points = 250.0) Minimum Threshold = 175.0		158.1			190.0		166.9														169.4