



*Department
of
Education*

Imaging Vendor Selection Report

**The Department of Education
Office of Student Financial Assistance Programs**

April 20, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....1

 1.1 Purpose 1

 1.2 Project Background.....1

 1.3 Document Organization.....2

 1.4 Information Sources.....2

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA.....3

 2.1 General.....3

 2.1.1 Reliability.....3

 2.1.2 Stability.....3

 2.1.3 Location3

 2.1.4 Experience.....3

 2.2 Resources3

 2.2.1 Staff.....3

 2.2.2 Facilities3

 2.2.3 Hardware, Software, and Connectivity3

 2.3 Time, Process and Cost.....4

 2.3.1 Time4

 2.3.2 Process4

 2.3.3 Cost.....4

3. VENDOR DESCRIPTIONS.....5

 3.1 Concept Interactive, Inc. (CII)5

 3.1.1 General5

 3.1.2 Resources6

 3.1.3 Time, Process and Cost.....6

 3.2 For Your Information, Inc. (FYI).....7

 3.2.1 General7

 3.2.2 Resources8

3.2.3 Time, Process and Cost.....	8
3.3 Information Management Corporation (IMC)	9
3.3.1 General	9
3.3.2 Resources	9
3.3.3 Time, Process and Cost.....	10
3.4 Xerox Corporation/Xerox Business Services (XBS).....	10
3.4.1 General	10
3.4.2 Resources	11
3.4.3 Time, Process, and Cost.....	11
3.5 Proposed Solutions	12
4. EVALUATION AND SELECTION.....	14
4.1 Evaluation	14
4.2 Selection	17
APPENDIX A – EVALUATION MATRIX	A- 1

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the vendors being considered for the back-file conversion effort at the US Department of Education's Office of Student Financial Assistance Programs (SFA). The report will form the basis for selecting the preferred vendor for performing the conversion.

1.2 Project Background

SFA has tasked Modernization Partner to develop an electronic records management system (ERMS) to handle the offices' document management needs. A crucial part of this effort consists of converting a large inventory of archived paper documents to digital format for input into the new system. At the time of the Request for Proposals (RFP), Mod Partner was in the process of conducting the requirements gathering phase. Therefore, some of the information regarding this project was not yet available in detail. Draft requirements will be provided for the vendor(s) awarded the contract prior to starting the imaging tasks. Final requirements will also be provided upon approval. The original estimate of paper to be converted was approximately 32 million pages. However, as requirements gathering came to a close, it appeared that a more accurate count is approximately 10 million pages for all of SFA. The current task is limited to back-file conversion for the Document Receipt and Control Center (DRCC) only, which has a volume of approximately 5 million pages to be converted.

The SFA organization has offices in Washington DC and regional offices in various parts of the country. The scope of this project is limited to the Washington, DC location. There are twelve business areas listed below for which back-file imaging activities will be performed.

1. Chief Operating Officer,
2. Ombudsman,
3. Students,
4. Schools,
5. Financial Partners,
6. Chief Information Officer,
7. Chief Financial Officer,
8. Acquisition and Contract Performance,
9. Human Resources,
10. Analysis,
11. Communications, and
12. SFA University.

1.3 Document Organization

This Back-file Conversion Vendor Evaluation Report consists of the following chapters and appendix:

- **INTRODUCTION** – Provides the purpose of the report, a description of the project, an overview of how the document is organized, and a list of key information sources that have been used to produce this document.
- **EVALUATION CRITERIA** – Provides the criteria used in evaluating the vendors being surveyed to perform the back-file conversion.
- **VENDOR DESCRIPTIONS** - Provides vendor information for each being reviewed.
- **EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDEDATION** – Provides an analysis of the vendors who offer the conversion services and a recommendation for the preferred vendor based upon the evaluation data provided.
- **APPENDIX A** – Contains the Evaluation Matrix, which is a table of comparison for the vendors being evaluated based on the criteria provided.

1.4 Information Sources

These following information sources were used to produce this document:

- Conversion Proposals submitted by each vendor
- Department of Education, SFA Task Order No. 25
- Vendor Company Brochures and Marketing Materials
- Vendor Presentation Handouts
- Vendor Company Web sites
 - www.conceptinteractive.com
 - www.fyii.com
 - www.imcww.com
 - www.qualityassociatesinc.com
 - www.xerox.com

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

This section provides descriptions for the criteria that will be used in the evaluation of the vendors being surveyed. There are ten categories of criteria used to evaluate the vendors being surveyed for the back-file conversion services.

2.1 General

2.1.1 Reliability

The selected vendor should have a good reputation with clients. Vendor support should be easily accessible, timely, and useful.

2.1.2 Stability

The selected vendor should have a proven track record of profitability. A successful implementation of the services/products requested should currently exist and be in use in similar industries. The company should have some longevity as a company doing the type of work that is requested.

2.1.3 Location

The selected vendor should have locations in areas with easy and cost efficient accessibility, preferably in the Washington, DC metropolitan area.

2.1.4 Experience

The selected vendor must have previously performed similar or like conversions. In addition the selected vendor should be knowledgeable and experienced with scanning, indexing, document management, and records management.

2.2 Resources

2.2.1 Staff

The selected vendor must have adequate staff to complete the conversion in the time frame given. Also, there must be enough staff available to fill in for absenteeism and turn over of staff assigned to the project. Staff performing the services must meet the security requirements of SFA and MOD PARTNER such as background checks and signing proprietary/confidentiality statements upon request.

2.2.2 Facilities

The selected vendor must have adequate facilities to house the documents being imaged if the work is done off-site. The vendors' facilities must have adequate security for storing the sensitive data. In addition the facilities should have a protective area to protect the files in event of a disaster involving water, fire, etc.

2.2.3 Hardware, Software, and Connectivity

The selected vendor must have adequate computing hardware and software to perform the conversion. This includes computing hardware needed for processing the conversions as well as hardware needed to store the output to the selected output media. The vendor must also be able to

set up the hardware, software, and connectivity infrastructure needed if the work is done at the customer site.

2.3 Time, Process and Cost

2.3.1 Time

The turn-around time for project completion should be within the project deadline. The turn-around time should also be suitable for the task being performed. Time should be included for proper setup and quality control in addition to the actual conversion. The turn-around time should not compromise the quality of the output.

2.3.2 Process

The selected vendor must have a defined and manageable process for completing the conversion. The process must be suitable for the task at hand. Adequate security measures must be incorporated in the conversion process, which includes secure and adequate storage and tracking for the files during the conversion. The process must also include defined quality control procedures and provisions for disaster recovery.

2.3.3 Cost

The cost of the conversion services should not put the project at risk. The proposed pricing should be reasonable and customary for the work requested. It should also be in-line with the staff, facilities, hardware and software required for the project.

3. VENDOR DESCRIPTIONS

The four companies described below are Concept Interactive, For Your Information, Information Management Corporation, and Xerox Corporation. Each of the companies were researched and submitted responses to the Request For Proposals (RFP). Quality Associates, Incorporated was included in the initial vendor research; however, they declined the opportunity to respond to the RFP due to the high demand required by the work they are currently doing for the Loan Origination Subsystem at SFA. QAI is a small company and does not want to jeopardize the quality of the LOS work by over committing their staff for this effort. Information Management Corporation was not included in the original research and site visits that the other vendors participated in. They were informed about this request from a contact at SFA. They contacted Mod Partner and requested inclusion in the RFP. Mod Partner extended the request to them and accepted their response as one to be included in the evaluations.

3.1 Concept Interactive, Inc. (CII)

3.1.1 General

Concept Interactive, Incorporated (CII) is a technology services company that provides three primary services: document imaging and management, high-end web page development, and multimedia services. The company is located at 5730 Executive Drive, Suite 124, Baltimore, MD 21228. The company was formed in 1998 as a merger of two previously existing imaging and conversion technology companies that had been in existence for five to seven years. CII has performed imaging conversion services previously and has adequate experience with providing imaging and indexing services. They also have experience with electronic document management systems, including populating the system with document profile data and storing the documents on external media, and records management systems. The CII team has provided services for both government and commercial clients. CII's client list includes the following:

- United States Patent and Trademark Office,
- United States Attorney's Office – Baltimore, MD,
- Johns Hopkins School of Public Health,
- American Express Financial Services,
- T. Rowe Price, and
- United States Department of Energy (DOE).

Concept Interactive, Inc. has teamed with Gray Hawk Systems (GHS) to form a team that provides electronic based document imaging and management services. GHS is a small business; established in 1985 that provides system development, networking, Internet development, integration, and engineering support services. GHS offers services and products in the fields of document imaging, systems engineering, design, training, supplies, and maintenance services. GHS provides document imaging services to leading corporate and government entities. In their first full year of operation they implemented an imaging system with an 18-terabyte capacity for

Dyncorp. Both CII and GHS employ Certified Document Imaging Architects (CDIA)¹ who specialize in the development and implementation of complex document conversion projects. Other services include; document preparation, document scanning, electronic bates endorsing, indexing/coding, OCR, PDF, microfilm conversion, database design and internet-based electronic document warehousing.

Information provided by CII and GHS show a consistent annual growth rate in revenue, gross profit, and net income over the past 3 to 5 years.

3.1.2 Resources

CII's combined team consists of experienced professionals with several years of imaging and archival experience and CDIA certifications. They have a core team of imaging, information technology, and networking professionals dedicated to the imaging field. The core team has over twenty personnel, some of who have 16 or more years of experience with imaging, who are immediately available to support this project. This core team will be used to initiate the project and get it up and running quickly. CII also has an available transient labor force, which is used to handle surge requirements. The transient labor force can be brought on immediately for work on the project, while additional staffing takes place to meet the longer term labor requirements.

The combined team has a total of 10 offices. Five of the offices are located in the Greater Metropolitan Washington area. Three of the facilities in the DC area have been targeted for the SFA project. The facilities contain the necessary hardware, software, communication, network, and document handling equipment in place and ready for use.

3.1.3 Time, Process and Cost

Time

The estimated turn around time is six months for project completion of approximately 20,000,000 pages. This duration is within the established deadline and does not jeopardize the project. This time frame includes a comprehensive process that has adequate measures for successfully completing the conversion process.

Process

The process proposed by CII is clearly defined, manageable and suitable for the task given. It is comprehensive with the necessary checks and balances for successful completion. It includes security of the files during transport, storage and processing to provide protection against destruction, unauthorized access, theft, and other security issues. In addition to security measures, the process also includes planning, setup, inventory management, document preparation, document transporting, file tracking and retrieval, reporting, scanning, indexing, quality control, and exporting.

¹ CDIA – certifies that imaging solutions providers and technology professionals have the appropriate level of knowledge in document imaging system design to ensure the success of their imaging initiatives.

Cost

Cost provided for imaging includes document preparation, scanning, indexing, validation, inventory, tracking, quality control and shipping. Pre-preparation and temporary on-line storage costs were provided. There is no extra charge for document access with the purchase of the temporary on-line storage. Indexing cost are priced per hour.

3.2 For Your Information, Inc. (FYI)

3.2.1 General

For Your Information, Incorporated (FYI) has headquarters in Dallas, Texas. They are a document information and outsourcing company that provides services through five business units: FYI Image, FYI Direct, FYI Legal, FYI HealthSERVE and FYI Solutions Group. The company was founded in 1994 and operates nationally at 140 facilities with over 6000 clients and over 10,000 employees. The company has two locations in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. FYI provides services to several industries including government. Some of the services offered by FYI include:

- Document and data conversion,
- Data capture and verification,
- Document management systems integration,
- Database management and web-based services,
- Print on demand,
- Offset, digital and web printing,
- Full service direct mail,
- Imaging and micro-graphic supplies and equipment,
- Records management and storage, and
- Document conversion, electronic record systems, and web-based repository outsourcing solutions for federal, state, and local governments.

FYI provides the image conversion and indexing services that are applicable to the SFA Back-file Conversion project. They also have experience with electronic document management and records management systems. They promote the company's document management product, FYIdocs. FYI's client list includes the following:

- American Express,
- Bank of America,
- Merrill Lynch,
- The Vanguard Group,

- Aetna,
- Microsoft,
- DHL,
- Federal Express,
- FCC/Chase Manhattan,
- State of New York – State Worker’s Compensation Board, and
- State of California Department of Trade and Tourism.

Statistics provided by FYI show a consistent annual growth rate in revenue, gross profit, and net income over the past 6 years.

3.2.2 Resources

FYI states that their Upper Marlboro, MD facility has the experience, capacity and capability to convert over 16 million images monthly. Additionally, they have designated 3 operationally and technologically redundant FYI facilities (Reston, VA; Allentown, PA and Binghamton, NY) to support and complement Upper Marlboro for this Project. These facilities will act as back-up and disaster recovery in the event of a failure at Upper Marlboro. The two facilities that FYI has in the Maryland and DC area have the appropriate hardware and software in place and ready to begin work immediately.

FYI has approximately 500 employees available to perform the work on the SFA project. Some of the employees, targeted for the SFA project, have up to 20 years of experience with imaging and document conversion.

3.2.3 Time, Process and Cost

Time

FYI states that it will take no more than 6 months to convert up to 40,000,000 images. This time frame is within the established deadline and does not put the project at risk. This time frame includes a comprehensive process that has adequate measures for completing the conversion process.

Process

FYI has proposed a defined process that is manageable and suitable for the task given. It is comprehensive with the necessary checks and balances for successful completion. It includes planning, security, inventory control, document preparation, conversion, indexing, quality control, and disaster recovery.

Cost

Cost provided for imaging includes document preparation, scanning, indexing, validation, inventory, tracking, quality control and shipping. Temporary on-line storage costs were provided. An extra charge is required for document access with the purchase of the temporary on-line storage. Indexing costs are based on number of document, number of index fields per document and keystrokes.

3.3 Information Management Corporation (IMC)

3.3.1 General

Information Management Corporation (IMC) is a small business with headquarters in Rocket Center, West Virginia. The company was incorporated in 1998. It is a document conversion services and application services provider. They offer document centric, business intelligence services to both federal government and commercial customers. Some of the services offered by IMC include the following: document conversion, semantic processing, electronic data delivery, and virtual service offerings. IMC is a current holder of GSA contract GS-25F-0039J, "Schedule 36, Part IV, Section II, SIN 51-506 – Document Conversion Services. They are also current holder of GSA contract GS-25F-0522J, SIN 132-51 – Information Technology (IT) Professional Services. IMC's client list includes the following:

- Naval Sea Systems Command,
- National Climatic Data Center, and
- University Health Associates.

Two of the projects listed above are projects currently in progress. Data provided by IMC shows a revenue increase from 1999 to 2000. Estimates for 2001 show additional increases.

3.3.2 Resources

IMC states that they have a staff of over 20 full time employees available to do the work for the SFA project. Personnel and the facility at IMC have been certified by the Department of Defense to handle material at a secret level.

The document conversion operations are housed in 50,000 square feet of a newly constructed facility. The facility is located on the grounds of the Allegheny Ballistic Labs (ABL) of the NAVSEA installation. The facility is climate controlled 24 hours a day. Large amounts of hardware, software and a sophisticated network infrastructure are in place and ready for use.

The electronic storage and access is supported from the 20,000 square feet data center facility. This facility has the hardware, software, network, and communication infrastructure comparable to the conversion facility.

3.3.3 Time, Process and Cost

Time

The sample schedule provided by IMC has a conversion completion date of July 25, 2001. This completion date is based on a contract award date of December 21, 2000 and a project initiation date of January 9, 2001. The completion date is within the established deadline and does not put the project at risk. However, the contract award date of December 21, 2000 is not feasible. This time frame includes a comprehensive process that includes adequate measures for completing the conversion process.

Process

IMC has proposed a defined process that is suitable for the task given. It includes security, project management, assessment, document preparation, scanning, OCR, indexing, and output.

Cost

Cost provided for imaging includes document preparation, scanning, indexing, validation, inventory, tracking, quality control and shipping. Indexing costs are based on number of document, number of index fields per document and keystrokes. Cost was not provided for all of the items requested.

3.4 Xerox Corporation/Xerox Business Services (XBS).

3.4.1 General

The history of The Document Company, Xerox, dates back to 1906. Xerox Business Services (XBS), one of five major divisions of Xerox Corporation, has been in the outsourcing business for more than 40 years. XBS created the concept of facilities management in 1973. Today, Xerox Business Services is a worldwide leader in document outsourcing, providing a comprehensive portfolio of services to more than 5,200 client companies in 40 countries. Xerox Business Services offers advanced, digital, and network-based solutions, as well as strategic consulting service. XBS services both government and commercial clients.

Xerox Document Imaging Services (XDIS), with central production facility located in Hot Springs, Arkansas is a part of Xerox Business Services, a division of Xerox Corporation. XDIS has focused exclusively on imaging services for the past fourteen years. Xerox states that the XDIS business is growing by double digits annually. XDIS provides on-site, near-site, and off-site document conversion services and digital solutions. We assist our clients in migrating documents and data into electronic media and system formats. Services are provided for stand-alone legacy, day forward data capture and hybrid conversion projects. XDIS provides the following services:

- The full spectrum of black and white and color document back-file and day-forward conversion services for document sizes A through J, aperture cards, microfilm and microfiche.

- PDF and multi-format digital conversion services.
- Index attribute capture using OCR/ICR, database extract, barcode, or keystroke.
- Image and database migration to a document management system using digital media or electronic file transfer.

The XDIS client list includes the following:

- Qwest Communications,
- US Steel,
- Edison Source,
- Humana, and
- Enterprise Rent-A-Car.

3.4.2 Resources

The XDIS division has approximately 67 people, and there are others within XBS, available to work on the SFA project. The key staff targeted for the project have up to 20 years of experience with imaging, data conversion and information technology. Xerox's core competency is documents and document processes; therefore, they have a high level of expertise and knowledge to provide to the SFA imaging and electronic document management project.

The central production facility and imaging technology competency center is located in Hot Springs, Arkansas. The center is an advanced facility with 34,000 square feet of space, of which 12,000 square feet is a climate and security controlled building for document storage. The center contains advanced technology, which includes the necessary hardware, software, and network infrastructure to perform the conversion task. This technology is in place and ready for use.

The temporary storage and on-line access will be provided by the Xerox Digital Repository Services (XDRS), which is a fully managed virtual file room. It uses simple interfaces through modern web browsers. It uses RAID Level 5 storage on a Sun E10K system. This hardware, software, and network infrastructure are in place and ready for use.

3.4.3 Time, Process, and Cost

Time

Xerox has stated that they are confident that the July 30, 2001 time frame can be met based on a January 15, 2001 start date. This is well within the established deadline and does not jeopardize the project. This time frame includes a comprehensive process that includes adequate measures for completing the conversion process.

Process

The process proposed by Xerox is clearly defined, manageable and very comprehensive. It includes the following components:

- Document staging and transport,
- Document preparation,
- Imaging,
- PDF conversion,
- Indexing,
- Quality control,
- Document re-assembly,
- Delivery,
- Temporary storage/on-line access,
- Report, and
- Security and confidentiality

Cost

Cost provided for imaging includes document preparation, scanning, indexing, validation, inventory, tracking, quality control and shipping. Temporary on-line storage costs were provided. An additional charge is required for document access with the purchase of the temporary on-line storage. Indexing costs are based on number of document, number of index fields per document and keystrokes.

3.5 Proposed Solutions

All of the proposed solutions have the basics in their defined processes for performing this type of imaging conversion. Each process includes the following components in addition to the workflow required to convert the paper documents to electronic images:

- Planning,
- Security,
- Quality control,
- Inventory control and reporting, and
- Document tracking.

Each of the vendors recommends the combined on/off site imaging solution where the document preparation is done on site and the remaining tasks and processing are done off-site at their imaging facilities. This solution is more efficient, more cost-effective, and less time consuming.

However each vendor provided costs and details for implementing an on-site imaging solution. To implement an on-site solution SFA would have to provide the following:

- Approximately 5000 square feet of space,
- 2 dedicated 110/30amp lines and 40 110/20amp lines,
- A local area network (LAN) if supplied by SFA, and
- 24 hour building access to complete project by due date.

Solution Summary

The table below provides a summary of the differences in the proposed solutions.

Company	<i>Proposed Solution Distinguishing Factors</i>
CII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes indexing in the per/page cost and is not based on keystrokes • Partnering with Gray Hawk, Incorporated to deliver the services • Has 3 DC metropolitan area locations for the project • Proposes the use of the Digitech Alchemy EDMS product for the temporary storage and access of the documents • No additional per/access charge for temporary on-line access • 35% surcharge + cost of network and imaging hardware for on-site solution
FYI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has 2 DC metropolitan area locations for the project • Proposes the use of the FYIdocs EDMS product for the temporary storage and access of the documents • On-site solution costs vary based on page count. Cost difference for on-site processing is significantly higher than the on/off site combination • Indexing cost based on 200,000 documents X 10 fields each document X 25 keystrokes each field; cost method could increase or decrease cost if these assumptions change • Additional per/page access charge for temporary storage and on-line access
IMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has 1 West Virginia location for the project • EDMS product for the temporary storage and access of the documents is unknown • Indexing cost based on 4,000,000 pages X 2 fields each document X 10 keystrokes each field; cost method could is more likely to increase the cost because the field and keystroke assumptions are very low and likely to go higher
Xerox	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has 1 Arkansas location for the project • Proposes the use of the XDRS product for the temporary storage and access of the documents • Indexing cost based on 200,000 documents X 10 fields each document X 25 keystrokes each field; cost method could increase or decrease cost if these assumptions change

4. EVALUATION AND SELECTION

4.1 Evaluation

This section provides an evaluation of the vendors surveyed and the services they provide along with a recommendation for the vendor(s) of choice. It will provide an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses for each vendor based on the evaluation criteria. It will also provide the justification for the recommendation.

The table listed below provides a summary of how each company was rated and the factors used to determine the assigned rating.

<i>Company</i>	<i>Factors</i>	<i>Rating</i>
CII		
General		
Reliability	* Proven reliable via previous services provided at DOE.	Exceeded expectations
Stability	* CII is a relatively new company, GHS has been in business for 16 years	Met most expectations
Location(s)	* 5 DC area offices; 3 targeted for SFA project	Exceeded expectations
Experience	* Federal Government Agency experience	Met most expectations
Resources		
Staff	* High Level Federal Government security clearances * Certified Document Imaging Architects * Staff very knowledgeable in imaging and related technology * 16+ years of imaging experience	Exceeded expectations
Facilities	* Secure facilities	Met most expectations
Hardware	* Extensive hardware capable of converting color, very large documents (i.e. maps), microfiche, microfilm, and videos.	Met most expectations
Software	* Extensive suite of software for imaging, document cleanup, indexing, PDF conversion, quality control, inventory and tracking	Met most expectations
Time, Process, and Cost		
Time	* Able to meet the target completion date	Met most expectations
Process	* Extensive transporting security measures	Met most expectations

Imaging Vendor Selection Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Process very well defined, detailed, and manageable * Extensive security measures * Includes provisions for disaster recovery * Extensive quality control and tracking measures 	
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lowest cost for higher volumes without hidden text * Lowest price on-site costs * Lowest price temporary storage and on-line access costs * Best Overall Cost 	Exceeded expectations
FYI		
General		
Reliability	* Appears reliable based on company information	Met most expectations
Stability	* Relatively new company	Met most expectations
Location(s)	* 2 DC area facilities	Exceeded expectations
Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Minimal experience with Federal Government agencies * Significant financial industry experience 	Met most expectations
Resources		
Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 20+ years imaging experience * Abundant personnel resources 	Met most expectations
Facilities	* Facility very secure	Met most expectations
Hardware	* Had hardware necessary to do the conversion but lacked the capability to do color	Met most expectations
Software	* Had software necessary to for imaging, document cleanup, indexing, PDF conversion, quality control, inventory and tracking	Met most expectations
Time, Process, and Cost		
Time	* Able to meet the target completion date	Met most expectations
Process	* Security measures for shipping lack detail	Met most expectations
Cost	* Comparable costs	Met most expectations
IMC		
General		
Reliability	* Lacking company and services information requested	Sufficient

Imaging Vendor Selection Report

Stability	* New company	Sufficient
Location(s)	* Location not in the DC metropolitan area (West Virginia)	Sufficient
Experience	* Federal Government Agency experience	Met most expectations
Resources		
Staff	* Small staff * Personnel has minimal years of imaging experience	Sufficient
Facilities	* Excellent secured facility	Exceeded expectations
Hardware	* Hardware details not known; appears to have the necessary hardware	Met most expectations
Software	* Software details not known; appears to have the necessary software	Met most expectations
Time, Process, and Cost		
Time	* Not clear if targeted completion date can be met	Sufficient
Process	* Process defined and manageable	Met most expectations
Cost	* Extremely high cost	Poor
Xerox		
General		
Reliability	* Long standing company that is very reliable	Exceeded expectations
Stability	* Unstable financial standing	Sufficient
Location(s)	* Only 1 location for off-site scanning, which is not in the DC area – located in Hot Springs Arkansas High cost	Poor
Experience	* Significant Federal Government Agency experience * Doing imaging and document management for decades	Exceeded expectations
Resources		
Staff	* 20+ years of imaging experience	Met most expectations
Facilities	* Facilities details not known; appears to have adequate facilities	Met most expectations
Hardware	* Hardware details not known; appears to have the necessary hardware	Met most expectations
Software	* Software details not known; appears to have the necessary software	Met most expectations
Time, Process, and Cost		
Time	* Able to meet the target completion date	Met most expectations
Process	* Process defined and manageable	Met most expectations
Cost	* High cost	Sufficient

4.2 Selection

Mod Partner has chosen CII/GHS as the vendor of choice.

All of the vendors evaluated were strong in their imaging processes. Each communicated that their imaging capabilities are suitable for this task. As mentioned previously, each vendor recommended a combination on/off site imaging solution, which Mod Partner fully supports. The combination on/off site solution, consists of performing the planning and document preparation tasks on-site at the SFA Washington, DC location and completing the remaining tasks off-site at the vendor(s) imaging facilities. This allows for a more efficient and effective imaging process. It eliminates some of the time consuming tasks involved with setting up an imaging facility from scratch. It also eliminates the need for SFA to make large amounts of space, electrical power, and network infrastructure available to the imaging vendors. If done on-site SFA would also need to arrange for 24 hour building access in order to meet the targeted timeframe. There would be no need for 24-hour building access with the combination approach. More importantly, SFA would save significantly with a combination on/off-site imaging solution. The combination approach is the optimal solution in regards to cost, turn around time, productivity, and efficiency. Each vendor has very sophisticated security and tracking measures in place to protect the documents and to locate and return them to the customer immediately if needed. The security measures assure the safe transport and processing of the documents, data integrity, adherence to privacy and confidentiality, and overall protection of the documents. This minimizes the need for concern regarding the documents leaving the building. In many cases the documents are more secure than they are in the offices.

Although all vendors show the ability to successfully complete the project, Concept Interactive received more favorable evaluations overall. The Evaluation Matrix in Appendix A shows that CII had the highest scores based on the evaluation criteria. CII/GHS is a relatively new company; however, they have proven reliable through previous contracts with Mod Partner. CII/GHS has very detailed security measures in place for transporting, handling, and storage of the documents. Since security is a great concern for the SFA documents and information Mod Partner felt that strong measures for security are a must. During site visits CII/GHS demonstrated significant levels of knowledge with imaging processes technology. CII/GHS has the ability to process large sized documents such as maps, etc. and the ability to process color documents if required. In respect to cost CII/GHS scored more favorably. As for staff, CII and Grayhawk has staff at three different locations in the Washington area and a transient work force available for this project. It is for these reasons and others pointed out in the report that CII is the vendor of choice.

The Evaluation Matrix in Appendix A shows that CII/GHS and FYI had scores that were very close. However, FYI lacked details in the security measures for transporting documents. Although FYI has an abundance of staff there is still some concern as to whether there is enough staff dedicated to the SFA project in the DC metropolitan area. FYI scored very well but they did not display the level of expertise and technical details that CII/GHS and their partners at Grayhawk. FYI did not have the capability to process large maps and color documents. FYI's

experience with providing services for Federal Government agencies were not as significant as the CII team. FYI's pricing was very favorable, but was slightly higher than CII/GH. FYI's method for computing the indexing cost are based on certain assumptions that could cause the cost to go up if those assumptions were to change. Since there are several unknowns for this project those assumptions are likely to change and therefore the risk of a cost increase is great. FYI's staff do not have the high level clearance as the CII/GHS team has. In addition they do not have staff with the CDIA certification, which clearly demonstrates technical expertise and knowledge performing this type of tasks. Although FYI scored very favorably they did not score as well as CII/GHS and therefore, they were not chosen as the preferred vendor.

Information Management Corporation has very sophisticated facilities with superb security. However, their pricing was extremely high. It was as much as \$1,000,000+ higher than the chosen vendors, whereas the chosen vendors have security that is adequate for the project. IMC, is also a new company with a small staff and minimal experience with imaging services. The services provided by IMC do not exceed the services provided by the chosen vendors and therefore do not justify the higher costs. It is for the reasons listed that IMC was not chosen as the preferred vendor.

Xerox Corporation is a reliable company with several years of experience with imaging and serving Federal Government agencies. However, their pricing was very high. In addition, they only have one imaging facility, which does not allow for backup if needed for disaster recovery. Also the facility is located in Hot Springs, Arkansas and the preferred location is in the Greater Washington Metropolitan area. The services provided by Xerox do not exceed the services provided by the chosen vendors and therefore do not justify the higher costs. It is for the reasons listed that Xerox was not chosen as the preferred vendor.

Appendices

APPENDIX A – EVALUATION MATRIX

Description	CII	FYI	IMC	Xerox
<i>General</i>				
Reliability	4	3	2	4
Stability	3	3	2	2
Location(s)	4	4	2	1
<i>Resources</i>				
Staff	4	3	2	3
Facilities	3	3	4	3
Hardware	3	3	3	3
Software	3	3	3	3
<i>Cost, Time, and Process</i>				
Cost	4	3	1	2
Turn-Around Time	3	3	3	3
Process	3	3	3	3
TOTALS	34	31	25	26

Scale:

Not Evident	Poor Did not meet expectations	Fair Sufficient	Good Met Most Expectations	Excellent Met Every Expectation
0	1	2	3	4

