

**Award Justification Statement**  
**Statewide Solicitation #MG20-81**  
**Contract Name: Online Marketplace**  
*Awarded: 03/12/2020*

**I. Summary**

The evaluation committee determined that the proposals submitted by the following vendors (in alphabetical order) met the required point thresholds and provide the best value for Online Marketplaces:

Amazon.com Services LLC, CDW Government LLC, Office Depot Inc, The Chariot Group LLC, W.W. Grainger Inc.

**II. Evaluation Process**

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Part 7 of the Utah Procurement Code by an Evaluation Committee comprised of representatives from the Utah Division of Purchasing, the City of West Jordan, the City of Murray, and Utah County. Solicitation number #MG20-81 was assigned to this solicitation. A representative from State Purchasing attended the evaluation committee meetings to ensure that the process outlined in the Procurement Code was followed, but was not a voting member of the evaluation committee.

A Best Value (BV) solicitation was issued by the State to enter into a State Cooperative contract with vendors to provide Office and School Supplies Marketplace to any eligible user defined in the BV, and any other State affiliated agencies, Cities, Counties, etc. The main goals of this solicitation are to procure Office and School Supplies through an online marketplace outlined above. Under Utah Code 63G-6a-702(2), the BV process was used because criteria other than costs 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.

Following an evaluation of the mandatory minimum requirements (Stage I of the evaluation) identified in the BV, 9 vendors were deemed eligible to proceed to Stage 2: Technical Proposal Evaluation. Of these 9 vendors, 5 vendors met or exceeded the minimum technical score thresholds. These 5 vendors were eligible to proceed to the Stage 3: Cost Proposal Evaluation. The following section describes Stage 2 and Stage 3 of the evaluation process. Vendors A, B, C, and D did not meet the technical score threshold and were deemed non-responsive in order to move on to the cost stage.

**III. Stage 2 and 3 – Technical Criteria and Cost Evaluation**

In Stage 2, proposals were evaluated against 3 criteria that were picked to show the vendors expertise within the criteria desired in this solicitation. These criteria asked Offerors to provide or were evaluated on the following: Level of Expertise (Criteria 1), Risk Assessment Plan (Criteria 2), Value Added Services (Criteria 3), and Marketing Plan (Criteria 4).

The Evaluation Committee subjectively assigned points for each criteria based on the vendors' responses. Only the Technical criteria was assigned a weight threshold. A Total Technical Points threshold was established and set at 425 points. Offerors needed to match or exceed the threshold in order move on to the Stage 3 cost evaluation.

In Stage 3 of the evaluation, Offerors were asked to provide cost based on a list of items within the solicitation. The Offeror with the lowest Cost Point Ratio set the baseline ratio to be awarded a contract. Any Offeror whose Cost Point Ratio was within 300% of the lowest Cost Point Ratio was also awarded.

Total Cost was computed by adding up the proposed cost for all the items in the Items section of the solicitation. The formula to compute the Cost Point Ratio is: Total Cost/Technical Points = Cost Point Ratio.

**IV. Stages 2 and 3 Points and Awards**

**Stage 2: Technical Evaluation**

Weight	Technical Scores	Amazon	Vendor A	Vendor B	CDW	Vendor C	Office Depot	Vendor D	Chariot Group	Grainger
45.0	Criteria #1 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 225)									
25.0	Criteria #2 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 125)									
15.0	Criteria #3 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 75)									
15.0	Criteria #4 - Total Points (Total Possible Points = 75)									
	Total Technical Points (Total Possible Points = 500) Minimum Threshold = 425									

**Stage 3: Cost Evaluation and Grand Total Points**

Total Cost Points	Cost Scores - Education	Amazon	Vendor A	Vendor B	CDW	Vendor C	Office Depot	Vendor D	Chariot Group	Grainger
	Cost									
	Cost Points Ratio									
Total Cost Points	Cost Scores - IT									
	Cost									
	Cost Points Ratio									
Total Cost Points	Cost Scores - MRO									
	Cost									
	Cost Points Ratio									
Total Cost Points	Cost Scores - Office									
	Cost									
	Cost Points Ratio									

**Total Technical Points threshold = 425**

5 of the 9 vendors acquired the required points in the evaluation process to be awarded a contract. Factoring in both technical criteria and cost proposals, these vendors demonstrated that they are able to provide the best value within these categories.

**V. Conclusion**

Based upon the scores and process described above, it is the opinion of the Evaluation Committee and the State of Utah, that the proposals which exceeded the Technical Points threshold provide the best value (See Section I for list of awarded vendors). The proposals provided by those vendors meet or exceed each of the minimum requirements outlined in the RFP and are in the best interest of the procurement unit.