

Solicitation No.: 7-EC2-0125 (OHIO)

Solicitation Title: E-Rate CAT2 Form 470 #250000250

Netsync Network Solutions 12/5/24 - 12/10/24

 Evaluation
 12/5/24 - 12

 Period:
 12/17/2024

Vendor:

Purpose: To facilitate the documentation of the evaluation committee's scoring of responsive proposals from prospective vendors for the following solicitation. Applicability: This record applies to the procurement of goods and services other than public works (construction services) and professional services or contracts.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria	Weight		Evaluator's So	ore for Respon	dent Name		
	(Refer to Scoring Guide)	[W]	Raw Score	Raw Score	Raw Score	Raw Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
			Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	(Average)
Evaluation Criteria 1 Eligible Costs	 Material and Labor. The total cost of ownership for the eligible components of the proposed service. Total cost of ownership takes into account all one-time and recurring costs. Note that E-Rate eligible costs refers to the pre-discount cost of the solution, not the post-discount portion of costs that are the responsibility of the Applicant. As stated above the bid must clearly identify the E-Rate eligible cortion of the project. E-Rate Eligible Costs: The following formula will be used to determine cost points for scoring when applicable: <i>Formula:</i> (Lowest Proposal Price / Proposed Price) x Assigned Points Example: Price Proposals and scoring results based on a 50-point scale: Proposer Proposed Price Score Proposer A \$10,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$10,500.00) x 50 = 50 pts Proposer B \$1,0500.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$10,500.00) x 50 = 20 pts This scoring method ensures a fair assessment of proposals based on their pricing relative to the lowest bid. 	40%	40	40	40	40	40	40.00
Evaluation Criteria 2 Compatibility	The vendor's proposed equipment is compatible with existing LAN/WAN infrastructure (MAX 25 POINTS)	25%	25	25	25	25	25	25.00
Evaluation Criteria 3 Technical Merit	The vendor described in detail the approach or methodology in which the company will provide services as requested in the RFP. The vendor include detailed services that will be provided, timelines, milestones, deliverables, etc. as applicable (MAX 15 POINTS)	15%	15	15	15	15	15	15.00
Evaluation Criteria 4 Prior Esperience	Service provider has positive experience with schools districts and/or K-12 schools. Vendor's track record and standing within the industry, including past performance on similar projects, client references, and customer satisfaction. Consideration will be given to any accolades, certifications, or industry recognition, as well as the Vendor's history of meeting deadlines, and quality standards, and resolving issues or complaints professionally. Bidders should provide proof of their experience in the industry providing the service/equipment for which they are submitting bids. Note: This will be captured from the provided references on Attachment M - Reference Sheet. (MAX 10 POINTS)	10%	10	10	8	10	8	9.20

Evaluation Criteria 5 Ineligible Costs	The total cost of ownership for the ineligible components of the proposed service encompasses all one-time and recurring costs associated with those components. This includes any expenses that are not eligible for E-Rate funding and must be borne by the applicant. Vendor has clearly identified the E-Rate ineligible costs withing their proposal (MAX 5 POINTS)	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5.00
Evaluation Criteria 6 Terms & Conditions	Vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions Proposal provides a concise description of capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Emphasis will be placed on completeness and clarity of content. The offeror agrees to the General Terms and Conditions and provides, in writing, any exceptions to any of the terms (MAX 5 POINTS)	5%	5	5	5	5	4	4.80
Totals		100%	100.00	100.00	98.00	100.00	97.00	99.00



Solicitation No.: 7-EC2-0125 (OHIO)

7-EC2-0125 (OHIO)

Solicitation Title:	E-Rate CAT2 Form 470 #250000250
Vendor:	Hamilton Clermont Cooperative
Evaluation Period:	12/5/24 - 12/10/24
Final Version:	12/17/2024

Purpose: To facilitate the documentation of the evaluation committee's scoring of responsive proposals from prospective vendors for the following solicitation. Applicability: This record applies to the procurement of goods and services other than public works (construction services) and professional services or contracts.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria	Weight		Evaluator's So	ore for Respon	dent Name		
	(Refer to Scoring Guide)	[₩]	Raw Score	Raw Score	Raw Score	Raw Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
			Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	(Average)
Evaluation Criteria 1 Eligible Costs	 Material and Labor. The total cost of ownership for the eligible components of the proposed service. Total cost of ownership takes into account all one-time and recurring costs. Note that E-Rate eligible costs refers to the pre-discount cost of the solution, not the post-discount portion of costs that are the responsibility of the Applicant. As stated above the bid must clearly identify the E-Rate eligible cortion of the project. E-Rate Eligible Costs: The following formula will be used to determine cost points for scoring when applicable: <i>Formula:</i> (Lowest Proposal Price / Proposed Price) x Assigned Points Example: Price Proposals and scoring results based on a 50-point scale: Proposer Proposed Price Score Proposer A \$ 10,000.00 > \$ (\$10,000.00) \$ (\$0.500.00) x \$ 50 = 50 pts Proposer C \$ 25,000.00 - > (\$10,000.00 / \$10,500.00) x \$ 50 = 20 pts This scoring method ensures a fair assessment of proposals based on their pricing relative to the lowest bid. 	40%	29.37	29.37	29.37	29.37	29.37	29.37
Evaluation Criteria 2 Compatibility	The vendor's proposed equipment is compatible with existing LAN/WAN infrastructure (MAX 25 POINTS)	25%	25	25	25	25	25	25.00
Evaluation Criteria 3 Technical Merit	The vendor described in detail the approach or methodology in which the company will provide services as requested in the RFP. The vendor include detailed services that will be provided, timelines, milestones, deliverables, etc. as applicable (MAX 15 POINTS)	15%	5	13	15	13	15	12.20
Evaluation Criteria 4 Prior Experience	Service provider has positive experience with schools districts and/or K-12 schools. Vendor's track record and standing within the industry, including past performance on similar projects, client references, and customer satisfaction. Consideration will be given to any accolades, certifications, or industry recognition, as well as the Vendor's history of meeting deadlines, and quality standards, and resolving issues or complaints professionally. Bidders should provide proof of their experience in the industry providing the service/equipment for which they are submitting bids. Note: This will be captured from the provided references on Attachment M - Reference Sheet. (MAX 10 POINTS)	10%	5	6	6	6	5	5.60

Evaluation Criteria 5 Ineligible Costs	The total cost of ownership for the ineligible components of the proposed service encompasses all one-time and recurring costs associated with those components. This includes any expenses that are not eligible for E-Rate funding and must be borne by the applicant. Vendor has clearly identified the E-Rate ineligible costs withing their proposal (MAX 5 POINTS)	5%	4	3	0	4	4	3.00
Evaluation Criteria 6 Terms & Conditions	Vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions Proposal provides a concise description of capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Emphasis will be placed on completeness and clarity of content. The offeror agrees to the General Terms and Conditions and provides, in writing, any exceptions to any of the terms (MAX 5 POINTS)	5%	4	5	5	5	5	4.80
Totals		100%	72.37	81.37	80.37	82.37	83.37	79.97

~ 1	
- Ş	Greater Cincinnati

Solicitation No.: Solicitation Title: Evaluation Period: Final Version: 7-EC2-0125 (OHIO) E-Rate CAT2 Form 470 #250000250 12/5/24 - 12/10/24 12/17/2024

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Netsync Network	Hamilton Clermont
	(Refer to Scoring Guide)	[W]	Solutions (Total Average)	Cooperative (Total Average)
Evaluation Criteria 1 Eligible Costs	 Material and Labor. The total cost of ownership for the eligible components of the proposed service. Total cost of ownership takes into account all one-time and recurring costs. Note that E-Rate eligible costs refers to the pre-discount cost of the solution, not the post-discount portion of costs that are the responsibility of the Applicant. As stated above the bid must clearly identify the E-Rate eligible portion of the project. E-Rate Eligible Costs: The following formula will be used to determine cost points for scoring when applicable: <i>Formula:</i> <i>(Lowest Proposed Price / Proposed Price) x Assigned Points</i> Example: Price Proposals and scoring results based on a 50-point scale: Proposer Proposer Price Score Proposer A \$ 10,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00) x 50 = 50 pts Proposer C \$ 25,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$10,500.00) x 50 = 20 pts This scoring method ensures a fair assessment of proposals based on their pricing relative to the lowest bid. 	40%	29.37	
Evaluation Criteria 2 Compatibility	The vendor's proposed equipment is compatible with existing LAN/WAN infrastructure (MAX 25 POINTS)	25%	25.00	25.00
Evaluation Criteria 3 Technical Merit	The vendor described in detail the approach or methodology in which the company will provide services as requested in the RFP. The vendor include detailed services that will be provided, timelines, milestones, deliverables, etc. as applicable (MAX 15 POINTS)	15%	15.00	12.20
Evaluation Criteria 4 Prior Experience	Service provider has positive experience with schools districts and/or K-12 schools. Vendor's track record and standing within the industry, including past performance on similar projects, client references, and customer satisfaction. Consideration will be given to any accolades, certifications, or industry recognition, as well as the Vendor's history of meeting deadlines, and quality standards, and resolving issues or complaints professionally. Bidders should provide proof of their experience in the industry providing the service/equipment for which they are submitting bids. Note: This will be captured from the provided references on Attachment M - Reference Sheet. (MAX 10 POINTS)	10%	9.20	5.60
Evaluation Criteria 5 Ineligible Costs	borne by the applicant		5.00	3.00
Evaluation Criteria 6 Terms & Conditions	Vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions Proposal provides a concise description of capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Emphasis will be placed on completeness and clarity of content. The offeror agrees to the General Terms and Conditions and provides, in writing, any exceptions to any of the terms (MAX 5 POINTS)	5%	4.80	4.80
Grand Total	Scoro	100%	99.00	79.97



Solicitation No.: 7-EC2-0125 (OHIO)

Solicitation Title: E-Rate CAT2 Form 470 #250000250

Vendor: Evaluation Period:

Netsync Network Solutions 12/5/24 - 12/10/24

Final Version:

12/17/2024

7-EC2-0125 (OHIO)										
FORM 470 #250000250										
NAME OF FIRM Final Score RANKING										
Netsync Network Solutions	99.00	1								
Hamilton Clermont Cooperative	79.97	2								

Points will be awarded based on Offerror's ratio to the lowest price received. Points will be awarded based on the following formula: LOWEST BID / PROPOSER'S BID X 40 = POINTS RECEIVED.

As an example, the following sample scoring matrix is provided:

Proposer	Offeror's Proposed Cost	Calculation	Assigned Point Value
Vendor 1	\$	\$2,532,461.25 / \$ 2,532,461.25 x 50 =	50
Vendor 2	\$	\$2,532,461.25 / \$3,450,678.99 x 50 =	36.7
Vendor 3	\$	\$2,532,461.25 / \$5,009,405.3 x 50 =	25.3
Vendor 4	\$	\$2,532,461.25 / \$0 x 50 =	-
Vendor 5	\$	\$2,532,461.25 / \$0 x 50 =	

*DO <u>NOT</u> ROUND YOUR ANSWER!

Example Price Proposals and scoring results based on a 50-point scale: Proposer Proposed Price Score Proposer A \$ 10,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$10,000.00) x 50 = 50 pts Proposer B \$ 10,500.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$10,500.00) x 50 = 47.6 pts Proposer C \$ 25,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$25,000.00) x 50 = 20 pts

Lowest Bid	
(this value	
should remain	
the same)	\$126,000.00
Proposer's Bid	\$209,290.00
Max Points	40
Assigned Point V	24.08

**Proposed pricing submitted by Netsync Network Solutions and Hamilton Clermont Cooperative below.												
7-EC2-0125 for Ohio: Evaluation Criteria #1 - Eligible Costs												
Proposer Name	Lowest Proposed Price - Price Hill (E-Rate Eligible Costs)	Lowest Proposed Price - Valley View (E-Rate Eligible Costs)	Proposed Price - Price Hill (E-Rate Eligible Costs)	Proposed Price - Valley View (E-Rate Eligible Costs)	Assigned Points		Assigned Points					
Netsync Network Solutions	\$ 122,418.49	\$ 56,641.74	\$ 122,418.49	\$ 56,641.74	40		40.00					
Hamilton Clermont Cooperative	\$ 122,418.49	\$ 56,641.74	\$ 162,235.73	\$ 82,313.46	40		30.18					

**E-Rate Central Price Analysis of E-Rate eligible & ineligible items reflected below (email of price analysis from Alex Majweski provided on 12/16/24 (saved to project folder).

	PROPOSED COSTS												
Proposer Nat	ne	Total Quoted Costs Price Hill	E-Rate Eligible Costs Price Hill	E-Rate Ineligible Costs Price Hill	-	Total Quoted Costs Valley View		E-Rate Ineligible CostsValley View		al Quoted Costs oth Sites	Total Eligible Costs Both Sites	Co	neligible osts n Sites
Netsync Network S	olutions	\$ 122,966.17	\$ 122,418.49	\$ 547.68	\$	56,641.74	Valley View \$ 56,641.74	0			\$ 179,060.23		547.68
Hamilton Clermor	it Coop	\$ 162,235.73	\$ 162,235.73	\$-	\$	82,313.46	\$ 82,313.46	0	\$	244,549.19	\$ 244,549.19	\$	-

REVIEW OF PROPOSED PRICING														
Proposer Name	Total Quoted Costs Price Hill	E-Rate Eligible Costs Price Hill	E-Rate Ineligible Costs Price Hill	т	Total Quoted Costs Valley View		E-Rate Eligible Costs Valley View		E-Rate Ineligible CostsValley View		otal Quoted Costs	Total Eligible Costs	Total Ineligible Costs Both Sites	
	FileFile	riceria	FILCETING								Both Sites	Both Sites		
Netsync Network Solutions	\$ 122,966.17	\$ 122,418.49	\$ 547.68	8 \$	56,641.74	\$	56,641.74	\$		\$	179,607.91	\$ 179,060.23	\$	547.68
Hamilton Clermont Coop	\$ 162,235.73	\$ 161,546.00	\$ 689.73	3 \$	82,313.46	\$	82,313.46	\$		\$	244,549.19	\$ 243,859.46	\$	689.73

Proposer Name		tal Quoted Costs Both Sites	Total Eligible Costs Both Sites			Total Ineligible Costs Both Sites		
Netsync Network Solutions	\$	179,607.91	\$	179,060.23	\$	547.68		
Hamilton Clermont Coop	\$	244,549.19	\$	243,859.46	\$	689.73		

ds are not eligible for E-Rate funding. ify that the Network-M3 ca unt for the pricing above ce Hill. This has been taken into acco ssigned cost points refelected below. CORRECTED as ion Criteria #1 -7-EC2-0125 for Ohi Proposed Price - Price Hill (E-Rate Eligible Costs) Proposed Price Light Proposed Light \$ 122,418.49 \$ 161,546.00 \$ Lowest Proposed Price -Price Hill (E-Rate Eligible Costs) \$ 122,418.49 \$ \$ 122,418.49 \$ Lowest Proposed Price -Valley View (E-Rate Eligible Costs) \$ 56,641.74 \$ \$ 56,641.74 \$ Proposed Price - Valley View (E-Rate Eligible Costs) \$ 56,641.74 \$ 82,313.46 Proposer Name Assigned Points Assign Formula: (Lowest Proposed Price / Proposed Price) x Assigned Points Netsync Network Solutions \$ Hamilton Clermont Cooperative \$ 40 40 40 29.37

Evaluation Criteria 1 Eligible Costs	Material and Labor. The total cost of ownership for the eligible components of the proposed service. Total cost of ownership takes into account all one-time and recurring costs. Note that E-Rate eligible costs refers to the pre-discount cost of the solution, not the post-discount portion of costs that are the responsibility of the Applicant. As stated above the bid must clearly identify the E-Rate eligible portion of the project. E-Rate Eligible Costs: The following formula will be used to determine cost points for scoring when applicable: Formula: (Lowest Proposed Price / Proposed Price) x Assigned Points Example: Price Proposals and scoring results based on a 50-point scale:	40%	
	Proposer Proposed Price Score Proposer A \$ 10,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00) x 50 = 50 pts Proposer B \$ 10,500.00 -> (\$10,000.00) x 50 = 47.6 pts Proposer C \$ 25,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00) x 50 = 20 pts This scoring method ensures a fair assessment of proposals based on their pricing		