

RESOLUTION NO. 23-13

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PANAMA CITY BEACH, FLORIDA,
AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT FOR THE
PURCHASE OF ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SOFTWARE
WITH UNIVERUS, INC.**

WHEREAS, in June 2022, the City solicited requests for proposals for an Enterprise Resource Planning Software to replace multiple software systems currently used by the City; and

WHEREAS, three vendors responded to the solicitation; and

WHEREAS, a seven member evaluation committee reviewed the proposals, and observed 12 days of demonstrations of vendor software to numerous City departments; and

WHEREAS, the committee ranked Univerus, Inc. No.1 and Edmonds & Associates No. 2 for purposes of entering negotiations for satisfactory contracts for this work.

BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. The appropriate officers of the City are authorized and directed to attempt to negotiate a Purchase Agreement for Enterprise Resource Planning Software with one of the Firms in the following order of ranking:

First – Univerus, Inc.
Second- Edmonds & Associates

and to return the negotiated Agreement to the Council for approval.

THIS RESOLUTION shall be effective immediately upon passage.

PASSED in regular session this 13th day of October, 2022.

CITY OF PANAMA CITY BEACH

By: _____

Mark Sheldon, Mayor

ATTEST:

Lynne Fasone
Lynne Fasone, City Clerk

ERP Selection Project

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates	Tyler Technologies	Univerus	(Out of 100)		(Out of 100)	
				Weight	Score	Weight	Score
Functional Requirements	0.30	16.71	0.30	23.57	0.30	27.43	
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	0.30	19.71	0.30	20.57	0.30	21.86	
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	0.30	20.14	0.30	16.71	0.30	24.00	
Cost/Fee Schedule	0.10	10.00	0.10	2.92	0.10	2.57	
		66.57		63.78		75.86	

Ranking based upon overall scores

1	Edmonds & Associates	66.57142857
2	Tyler Technologies	63.78
3	Univerus	75.86

Ranking based upon FeeSchedule

1	Edmonds & Associates	10.00
2	Tyler Technologies	2.92
3	Univerus	2.57

Ranking based Experience, Quality of RFP, Understanding and References

1	Edmonds & Associates	56.57
2	Tyler Technologies	60.86
3	Univerus	73.29

ERP Selection Project

Scorer: Jason Pickle

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Score
Functional Requirements	3	0.3	18	0.3	5	0.3	30	0.3	4.5	27
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	3	0.3	18	0.3	4.5	0.3	27	0.3	4.5	27
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	4	0.3	24	0.3	4	0.3	24	0.3	4	24
Cost/Fee Schedule		0.1	10	0.1		0.1	2.92	0.1		2.57
			70.00				83.92			80.57

RATING

- 1-Poor
- 2-Fair
- 3-Good
- 4- Excellent
- 5-Superior

ERP Selection Project

Scorer: Lori Philput

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Score
Functional Requirements	2	0.3	12	0.3	5	0.3	30	0.3	5	30
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	18
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	3	0.3	18	0.3	2.5	0.3	15	0.3	4	24
Cost/Fee Schedule	0	0.1	10	0.1	0	0.1	2.92	0.1	0	2.57
			58.00				65.92			74.57

RATING

- 1-Poor
- 2-Fair
- 3-Good
- 4- Excellent
- 5-Superior

ERP Selection Project

Score: Debra Gibson

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight
Functional Requirements	3.50	0.3	21	0.3	5	0.3	27	0.3	5	0.3
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	4	0.3	24	0.3	4.5	0.3	27	0.3	5	0.3
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	4.5	0.3	27	0.3	4	0.3	24	0.3	5	0.3
Cost/Fee Schedule		0.1	10	0.1		0.1	2.92	0.1		0.1
			82				80.92			92.57

- RATING**
- 1-Poor
- 2-Fair
- 3-Good
- 4- Excellent
- 5-Superior

ERP Selection Project

Scorer: Kim Skibba

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight
Functional Requirements	2	0.3	12	0.3	4	0.3	24	0.3	4	0.3
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	2	0.3	12	0.3	2	0.3	12	0.3	4	0.3
Cost/Fee Schedule		0.1	10	0.1		0.1	2.92	0.1		0.1
			52				56.92			65.57

- RATING**
- 1-Poor
 - 2-Fair
 - 3-Good
 - 4- Excellent
 - 5-Superior

ERP Selection Project

Scorer: Carrie Jagers

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus		(Out of 100)	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	
Functional Requirements	2	0.3	12	0.3	3	0.3	18	0.3	5	0.3	30	
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3	18	
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	3	0.3	18	0.3	2	0.3	12	0.3	3	0.3	18	
Cost/Fee Schedule		0.1	10	0.1		0.1	2.92			0.1	2.57	
RATING			58				50.92				68.57	

- 1-Poor
- 2-Fair
- 3-Good
- 4- Excellent
- 5-Superior

ERP Selection Project

Scorer: Erica Van Praet

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Rating	Weight	Score
Functional Requirements	4	0.3	24	0.3	3	0.3	18	5	0.3	30
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	4	0.3	24	0.3	3	0.3	18	4	0.3	24
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	4	0.3	24	0.3	3	0.3	18	5	0.3	30
Cost/Fee Schedule		0.1	10	0.1		0.1	2.92		0.1	2.57
RATING			82				56.92			86.57

- 1-Poor
- 2-Fair
- 3-Good
- 4- Excellent
- 5-Superior

ERP Selection Project

Scorer: Doris Fowler

Per the RFP, scoring for each responding firm was determined using the assigned points for each of the referenced criteria elements:

CRITERIA ELEMENTS	Edmonds & Associates		(Out of 100)		Tyler Technologies		(Out of 100)		Univerus	
	Rating	Weight	Score	Weight	Rating	Weight	Score	Rating	Weight	Score
Functional Requirements	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3	18	4	0.3	24
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	3	0.3	18	0.3	3	0.3	18	3	0.3	18
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	3	0.3	18	0.3	2	0.3	12	3	0.3	18
Cost/Fee Schedule		0.1	10	0.1		0.1	2.92		0.1	2.57
			64				50.92			62.57

- RATING**
- 1- Poor
 - 2- Fair
 - 3- Good
 - 4- Excellent
 - 5- Superior

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria	Doris Fowler			
	Weight	Taylor Technologies	Univerus	Jones Edmonds GovTech
Functional Requirements	30	3	4	3
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	30	3	3	3
Cost including both one-time and on-going	10			
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	30	2	3	3
Evaluation Source / Reference				
Functional Specifications				
Plante Moran's Analysis				
Application Software response				
Implementation Plan response				
Staffing Plan response				
Cost Proposal				
Consider scope of solution based on modules bid				
Technical Infrastructure response				
Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable)				
Ongoing Support Services response				
Weighted Score	100	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rank		1	1	1

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria

Doris Fowler

Doris Fowler

10-6-22

Date

Tyler - not available support @ holiday

Univerus - 3rd party vendors for most modules, but very good vendors - more able to keep up with current and future needs

GovTech - Not much better than current system not able to close end of period

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Kem Skisba

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Replace Text with Scorer Name			Evaluation Source / Reference
		Taylor Technology	Univerus	Jones Edmunds GovTech	
Functional Requirements	30	4	4	2	Functional Specifications Plante Moran's Analysis
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	30	3	3	3	Application Software response Implementation Plan response Staffing Plan response
Cost including both one-time and on-going	10	—	—	—	Cost Proposal Consider scope of solution based on modules bid
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	30	2	4	2	Technical Infrastructure response Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable) Ongoing Support Services response
Weighted Score		100	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rank		1	1	1	1

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria

10/6/22

Enter your name in Cell D2 before printing and signing.

Replace Text with Scorer Name

Date

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria	Jason Pickle				Weight	Weighted Score	Rank
	Leifer Technology	Univerus	Jones Edmunds GovTech	Evaluation Source / Reference			
Functional Requirements	5.00	4.50	3.00	Functional Specifications Plante Moran's Analysis	30	81.00	1
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	4.50	4.50	3.00	Application Software response Implementation Plan response Staffing Plan response	30	78.00	2
Cost including both one-time and on-going				Cost Proposal Consider scope of solution based on modules bid	10		
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	4.00	4.00	4.00	Technical Infrastructure response Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable) Ongoing Support Services response	30	60.00	3
					Weighted Score:	100	
							Rank:

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria


10/6/22

Date

Jason Pickle

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria	Lori Philput			Evaluation Source / Reference
	Weight	Tyler Technology	Univerus	
Functional Requirements	30	S	S	Functional Specifications Plante Moran's Analysis
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	30	3.00	3.00	Application Software response Implementation Plan response Staffing Plan response
Cost including both one-time and on-going	10	↖	↖	Cost Proposal Consider scope of solution based on modules bid
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	30	2.5 3.00	4.00	3.00 Technical Infrastructure response Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable) Ongoing Support Services response
Weighted Score:		66.00	72.00	68.00
Rank:		2	1	3

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria

 10/6/22

Lori Philput

Date

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria	Debra Gibson			Evaluation Source / Reference
	Eyer Technology	Univerus	Jones Edmunds CowTech	
Weights	5	5	5	
Functional Requirements	4.50	5.0	4.5	Functional Specifications Plante Moran's Analysis
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	4.50	5.00	4.00	Application Software response Implementation Plan response Staffing Plan response Cost Proposal
Cost including both one-time and on-going				Consider scope of solution based on modules bid
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	4.00	5.00	4.50	Technical Infrastructure response Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable) Ongoing Support Services response
Weighted Score	78.00	87.60	78.00	
Rank	7	1	2	

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria

<i>Debra Gibson</i>	10/5/2022
---------------------	-----------

Debra Gibson

Date

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria		Erica Van Praet			Evaluation Source / Reference
Weight	Tyler Technology	Univerus	Jonas Edmunds Government		
Functional Requirements	30	3.00	5.00	4.00	Functional Specifications Plante Moran's Analysis
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline	30	3.00	4.00	4.00	Application Software response Implementation Plan response Staffing Plan response
Cost including both one-time and on-going	10				Cost Proposal Consider scope of solution based on modules bid
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	30	3.00	5.00	4.00	Technical Infrastructure response Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable) Ongoing Support Services response
Cumulative Score		54.00	84.00	72.00	
		3	1	2	

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria



Erica Van Praet

10/5/22

Date

Client Name - Project Name
Round 2 Scoring Worksheet

Round 3 Evaluation Criteria	Carrie Jagers			Evaluation Source / Reference
	Tyler Technology	Univerus	Jones Edmonds GovTech	
Weights	3.00	3.00	2.00	Functional Specifications Planite Moran's Analysis
Functional Requirements	3.00	3.00	3.00	Application Software response Implementation Plan response Staffing Plan response
Implementation Requirements, Plan and Timeline				Cost Proposal
Cost including both one-time and on-going				Consider scope of solution based on modules bid
Technical Requirements and Ongoing Support	2.00	3.00	3.00	Technical Infrastructure response Vendor Hosted Option (if applicable) Ongoing Support Services response
Weighted Score	48.00	60.00	48.00	
Rank	2	1	2	

Scoring Definitions

- (1) Does not satisfy this criteria
- (2) Minimally satisfies this criteria
- (3) Satisfies this criteria
- (4) More than satisfies this criteria
- (5) Achieves significant satisfaction with this criteria

Carrie Jagers

Date